**Eric Widmer and
Norbert F. Schneider
(eds.)**

# State-of-the-Art of Mobility Research

## A Literature Analysis for Eight Countries

# Table of Contents

**Eric Widmer, Gil Viry, and Vincent Kaufmann**

# I. Introduction

This report is presenting the state-of-the-art of scientific research on occupational spatial mobility in eight countries. It is part of the background analyses in the research project *Job mobilities and Family Lives in Europe* that is studying this issue. The six national teams, participating in the research project, each have contributed a literature review on the scientific scientific debate in their country: for Belgium, Germany, France, Poland, Spain, and for Switzerland. Additionally, external experts have been invited to add reviews on the United States, and the Netherlands. These countries were considered to have a relatively rich research tradition on occupational spatial mobility. So the scientific debates in these countries were considered worthwhile (if not necessary) being taken into account, even though these countries will not be studied within *Job mobilities and Family Lives in Europe*. So, in total literature reviews for eight countries are presented in this paper. They correspond to the chapters Three to Ten.

A chapter of its own (chapter 2) is the summary of the *theoretical* debate on occupational spatial mobility. Unlike the discussion of empirical findings, that turns out to take place mainly on a *national* level, the theoretical discussion is a rather one *international* debate. Theoretical views on spatial mobility, published by Swiss, Germans, or French, are read and discussed throughout the global scientific community. As such, the state-of-the-art in terms of theoretical approaches is reported in one chapter for all countries.

As a final chapter, the conclusion follows. Here, the main findings regarding the state-of-the-art in Europe and the USA are summarised. Complementary, the main gaps concerning the state-of-the-art are described as well. And a number of new insights and confirmations of assumptions is reported that seem especially relevant for the further research agenda in *Job mobilities and Family Lives in Europe*.

Each country specific review is following a shared structure of aspects that were considered relevant: Reported literature either investigates on occupational spatial mobility as such. Or it investigates motility, as a concept of the ability to become mobile, including the infrastructure for mobility in a given country. Or it links mobility to one of four fields that were assumed to strongly interact with mobility: family, job market, social integration and social capital, or quality of life.

**Detlev Lück, Ruth Limmer, and Wolfgang Bonß**

# II. Theoretical Approaches to Job Mobility

Aside from literature presenting *empirical* research (as it is presented in the next chapters), there is, in all countries, literature presenting *theoretical approaches* to job-related mobility. Whereas the discussion of empirical findings turns out to take place mainly in national scientific forums and therefore will be summarized in national reports, the theoretical discussion is a rather European or *international debate*. Theories may be country-specific in a sense that they are influenced by specific national traditions; but they are usually not limited to a specific nation regarding their claim and their ability to explain mobility. Therefore theoretical publications are, much more than empirical ones, *internationally* noted, discussed and reacted to. And therefore this debate shall be presented in an own chapter, summarizing the theoretical approaches from all nine countries, and beyond.

There are very few theories that focus *only* or *mainly* on spatial mobility. (Among these, the concept of motility can be introduced as the most important approach. It will be summarized in section 2.3.) Even theories focussing *explicitly* on spatial mobility, as one issue among others, are not easy to find. However there are many theoretical approaches, dealing either with social change in general or with behaviour in general, that are used for explaining spatial mobility. This variety shall be presented in the following sections, at least in their basic outlines.

Views on mobility can be constructed from all sorts of theoretical perspectives, on the macro and micro level. On the *macro level* one can state that either the change of economies and labour markets (post-industrialisation, flexibilisation) induces mobility (of certain kinds). One can open the perspective to interactions of economies with other structural changes, such as communication and transportation technologies, increasing economic interactions between distant places (modernisation, globalisation). Or one can issue changes in the social relationships and cultural identities, allowing more mobility (of certain kinds) or making it desirable (reflexive modernisation, fluidity).

Other approaches take *micro perspectives* or link the micro and macro level. These again, can issue structural barriers or incentives (rational choice), cultural patterns like attitudes and identities ("mobility culture" and life style approaches), or they can combine these arguments, on the macro and on the micro level, into a more holistic perspective

(motility). The concept of quality of life and stress theories need to be mentioned, especially, regarding the *consequences* of job mobility for the private sphere. However, also quality of life may have an impact on mobility.

Linked to one or more theoretical perspectives, there is a number of important *theoretical concepts*, so to say: sets of established and empirically supported hypotheses, that either explain job-related mobility or its consequences or both. Among these, the most important might be gender, generation and position in the life course, family background, social networks, and socio-economic status. It seems that for almost all of them the causal relation to mobility is rather reciprocal than one-sided (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a, 2002b; Vignal, 2005a, 2005b, see also chapter 4). Especially the biography of couples and family in its interdependency with mobility experiences reveals a promising perspective.

## 1. Macro level perspectives

Macro theories have been interested mainly in explaining change of social structures, change of social relationships, or change of social mobility. Spatial mobility and its change come in often, but mostly as explaining variables among others or as boundary conditions. Mobility may be considered a driving mechanism behind the emergence of social relationships over long distances, within bigger groups of people, which again leads to qualitatively different social relationships. This is true for theories of modernisation, detecting a change from *Vergemeinschaftung* to *Vergesellschaftung* (Tönnies, 1887; similarly Durkheim, 1999), as well as for some theories of globalisation. A second driving mechanism usually is seen in new communication technologies, with communication being interpretable as virtual mobility. Similarly, these theories may take spatial mobility as a side-effect of the change of economic production, from agricultural to industrial society, or from industrial to knowledge-based, post-industrial society, with consequences for social relationships within these societies (Simmel, 1992, p. 791). Or, spatial mobility has been seen as a pre-condition for social upward mobility, and therefore has been predicted to characterize a modern society, open for social mobility.

In the last decades spatial mobility has played a minor role in the theoretical debate in sociology. Concepts like globalisation, cosmopolitisation ("Kosmopolitisierung"), debounda-risation ("Entgrenzung"), transnationalisation, hybridisation, and reflexive modernisation, for a long time, have been discussed only with reference to migration. Since very recently, these concepts are being systematically re-linked to spatial mobility in general (Pries, 2000;

Verstraete & Cresswell 2002; Ahmed et al., 2003; Sheller, 2003). Mobility and its acceleration are more and more perceived as central aspects of social change and keys to the understanding of modern societies (Sennett, 1998; Bauman, 2000; Urry, 2000b, 2003b; Kaufmann, 2002; Thrift, 2004; Rammler, 2001; Canzler & Schmidt, 2003). The core thesis in this macro theoretical debate is this: current social change in Western societies can be summarised as a process of comprehensive mobilisation. Some authors even already want to have detected a "mobility turn" in social theories and the birth of an interdisciplinary "new mobilities paradigm" (Urry, 2004). It is discussable whether we really have a "mobility turn" in social theories. However, there certainly is a new interest in mobility, especially in the linkage of mobility and modernity.

### 1.1. Theories of modernisation

Mobility is not at all a new phenomenon. But since the beginning of sociology, prominent authors have claimed that only in the (occidental) modernity, mobility has become something like a core principle for the organisation and structuring of societies (comparable to principles like individuality, rationality, equality, and globality). Increasing mobility is considered a major *cause* for as well as a *consequence* of the emergence of modern societies.

Karl Marx, for instance, saw the most important attribute of modern societies in its dynamic. For him, modern societies are affected by permanent change, and the people living in them, unlike people in more ancient societies, are highly mobile: socially as well as geographically. However, Marx, like for many authors, considered social change, social mobility, and spatial mobility as too related to always clearly distinguish between them. He emphasized the breaking down and speeding up as central elements of capitalism. He noted an "uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation" (Marx & Engels, 1848, p. 29). With "Bewegung" being translatable as well as "agitation" or as "motion," this diagnosis can be read as defining not only ongoing fast social change, but also mobility as a core principle of modernity. For good reason, Marx saw the railway as the icon of capitalism.

A more clearly outlined causality can be found in the theory of modernisation according to Émile Durkheim (1999). The changes that characterise modernisation, with social relationships becoming more formal, functional, and emotionally distant, for Durkheim, are driven by the increase in "moral density." That means: people interact with more other people more frequently. Durkheim notes three basic causes for this trend: (a) Whereas

agricultural societies (as well as hunters and nomads) needed to limit the proportion of people to geographical space to a certain ratio that allowed it to feed itself, the industrial society allowed demographic changes leading to an increase in the density of the population. (b) The higher number of people within a given nation moved even closer together in the process of urbanisation. (c) Communication and transportation technologies bridge the still existing spatial gaps (Durkheim, 1999, p. 314). In short, Durkheim assumes that spatial mobility increases due to technological progress. And the increasing spatial mobility (in addition to an increasing density of population) is assumed to bring people closer together, with the consequence of social relationships changing.

A similar, slightly more complex picture is drawn by Georg Simmel. Also he notes that, in modern times, people get in touch with more other people, described as widening of "social circles," with consequences for the quality of social relationships in society (Simmel, 1995, 53, 1992, pp. 456). And, like Durkheim, also Simmel considers spatial mobility a cause among others, including growth of population (idem) and urbanisation (Simmel, 1903, pp. 185), or the establishment of widely accepted currencies (Simmel, 2000, pp. 220). Geographical distances and barriers limit social interactions. Therefore *bridging* distances and *overcoming* geographical barriers allows new social interactions. This makes social relationships more "modern" in two ways. First, Simmel assumes that social interactions over long distances are limited in their contents, and therefore remain focussed on one single issue (like a specific professional relation), instead of including every aspect of the interacting people's lives. Second, mobility indirectly forces *all* social interactions to be less personal, by allowing people to interact with *more* people at the same time (Simmel, 1995, pp. 221, 1992, pp. 698).

However, in Simmel's theory, the role of spatial mobility is more limited and more ambiguous than in Durkheim's theory. For one, Simmel assumes that the increasing mobility in modern society requires a fix point of reference, even more so than in pre-modern times. Whereas occasionally, slowly moving pre-modern tribes could be nomads and wander without returning to a specific place, the fast moving people in modern societies need to be mobile around cities with a fixed infra-structure, in order not to break apart (Simmel, 1992, p. 698). For two, modernisation is not necessarily seen as a steady increase of *people's* mobility. Simmel assumes that mobility of goods or (virtual) money through space can bridge the physical gap between people as well and in this way can substitute human spatial mobility (Simmel, 1900, p. 700).

Not necessarily mobility, but *ability* to be mobile (socially as well as in space), is also a *consequence* in Simmel's (1992, p. 791) like in other theories of modernisation. In pre-modern societies mobility has certainly happened (Hradil, 2002, p. 369), but it was not a positive, guiding value with relevance for individual decision-making or for the functioning and structuring of societies. The aim of being on the move was to return to the place of origin. In pre-modern societies, the notion of stability and immobility dominated the construction of social situations and contexts. The most important concepts for social integration were local belonging and the (unchangeable) social status.

Modern societies, in contrast, are "mobile" in several senses: They are mobile in terms of allowing and being affected by social change. They are mobile in terms of allowing and being affected by social (economic and cultural) mobility. And they are also mobile in terms of allowing and being affected by *spatial mobility*. In theories of modernisation, these three dimensions are thought as closely interrelated and therefore are often addressed together under the term "mobility" as a summarising category. In the "first modernity," the ideal of a mouldable society and of human beings as self-responsible subjects on their way to perfection were melted together with the imagination of physical, i.e. spatial mobility as the "engine behind" this project, as the instrument for putting it into reality. Another reason for this linkage is the assumption that interaction requires physical presence: You must have been there to understand what's happening. This idea is also described as the "tourist gaze" (Urry, 1990). And third, modernity allows mobility that norms of pre-modern societies did not allow: People are no longer (or less) bound to small social or geographical spaces. Therefore a theory of modernisation would expect a significant increase of mobility and, even more so, an increase in acceptance or even aspiration of mobility. There should be a linkage that Rammler (1999, 2001) called an "elective affinity" ("Wahlverwandtschaft") of mobility and modernity.

### 1.2. Post-industrialisation, knowledge-based society, and globalisation

Modernisation was used as a concept for summarising the universal patterns of social change of occidental societies in industrial times. However, since these theories were published much further social change has happened, and at some point, authors noted patterns that did not quite fit into the same categories anymore. Therefore, in the late 20th century, new concepts were formulated.

This change of societies in the late 20th century has been described by many concepts. Among the most popular ones are the transition *from industrial to post-industrial societies*

(Fourastié, 1954; Touraine, 1969; Bell, 1973; Deutschmann, 2002) and the concept of *globalisation* (Featherstone, 1990, 1995; Reich, 1991; Sklair, 1991; Sassen, 1991; Robertson, 1992; Held, 1995; Waters, 1995; Albrow, 1996, 1998; Castells, 1996; Hirst & Thompson, 1996; Altvater & Mahnkopf, 1996, 2003; Beck, 1997; Bauman, 1998; Martin & Schumann, 1996; Beisheim et al., 1998; Zürn, 1998; Hübner & Petschow, 2001; Dürrschmidt, 2002; Müller, 2002; Kemper, 2003; Glyn, 2004; Thurow, 2004; Badura, 2005; Banse, 2005). Looking at numbers of publications, it seems obvious that the latter has replaced the first as the most established concept.

*Post-industrialisation* notes the shift of economic activities, away from industrial production of goods towards the third sector. At the same time, the efficiency of industrial (and agricultural) production is rapidly increased by introducing complex, computer-based, automated technology, turning factories (and farms) into high-tech work places that require much more skilled workers than the factories in the early 20th century did. Since the third sector has been defined as the "service sector," however, many newly created jobs that are classified as third sector jobs are rather about processing complex information and providing knowledge, the post-industrial society has been called the *knowledge-based society*, which may be a more precise label.

Post-industrialisation is a concept that describes economic change. Its relevance for society lies in the fact that jobs in the third sector require differently skilled employees, different resources and different infra-structures. For instance, the increasing necessity of highly skilled workers gave education a higher value and made educational expansion happen. In terms of mobility it is important to notice that third sector jobs are less bound to a specific place of production, as industrial jobs are. They require less infra-structure, less physical resources and can be organised much more flexibly. Therefore they also can move or be mobile more easily. This makes it likely that, with the change from industrial to post-industrial societies, mobility should be increasing even more.

Concepts of *globalisation* come in very different variations. Their origin lies in economic descriptions, noting the expansion of international trade and of international capital flows, and an increase of interdependencies of national economies. Social sciences have corrected the pure economic view by including complementary processes into the concept: these are the increase of interdependencies of national policies, of cultures, of ecological problems etc. Anthony Giddens defines globalisation as the "intensification of world-wide

social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and visa versa" (Giddens, 1990, p. 85). It is the element of rising *interdependencies*, of *reciprocal causal impacts between distant places* that can be seen as the core element of the globalisation concept.

With this core understanding, some globalisation concepts may additionally describe related processes, such as the shift towards a knowledge-based economy (Reich, 1991; Castells, 1996). In other words: the concept of post-industrialism has partly been implemented into globalisation theories.

Globalisation concepts like to emphasize that globalisation is more than a process towards a "borderless world" (Ohmae, 1991). Borders may just be *re-organised* in a way that borders between nation states, or continents become less relevant whereas those between local regions or social groups might become more important. However, most authors will agree that *geographical distance* becomes less important. Malcolm Waters, for example, defines globalisation as "social process, in which the constraints of geography on social and cultural arrangements recede and in which people become increasingly aware that they are receding" (Waters, 1995, p. 3). This concept is naturally highly relevant for framing mobility research since the fact that constraints of geography recede is directly linked to spatial mobility.

The reasons for this decrease partly are borrowed from modernisation theories or concepts of post-industrialisation: Third sector work is more mobile by being more independent from infra-structure and resources, compared to industrial work. Technological progress makes world-wide travel faster and more affordable for more people. This way the ability to become mobile as well as the factual mobility rise. In other words: Spatial mobility is assumed to be increasing, for the simple reason that technological innovations are making more mobility possible. Other events may also lead to an increase of interdependencies, such as the growth of economies outside of the "western world." The fall of the iron curtain is assumed to foster both, the (opportunity of) world-wide mobility as well as the growth of Eastern European and Asian markets.

What are the consequences of globalisation for the character of societies? Authors like Robert Reich (1991) or Manuel Castells (1996) assume that interdependencies in society are becoming more ambiguous, less stable, and affected by faster change. Castells (1996) describes globalised societies as "network societies," that can hardly be controlled by national policies anymore, and therefore are becoming more dependent on social networks. The

declining relevance of national policies and of national contexts has also been described by Martin Albrow (1998) and by Ulrich Beck (1997). The strong linkage of society and nation state that had been established in industrial societies in the 19ᵗʰ and early 20ᵗʰ century is weakened again. However, as a reaction to rising uncertainty through globalisation, also a *re-strengthening* of nation states – or of regional or local spaces – has been proclaimed. The term of "glocalisation" (Robertson, 1995) has been introduced in this context. There are two further questions authors are disagreeing so far: Does globalisation lead to a more homogenous world society or to a more heterogeneous world of diverse societies? And: Is globalisation a break in the development towards modernity (Albrow, 1996; Bauman, 1998) or is it a continuation or intensification of this process (Altvater & Mahnkopf, 1996, 2003).

## *1.3. Flexibalisation and precarious occupation*

Another concept that emphasizes economic aspects of social change in the late 20ᵗʰ century is the concept of *flexibalisation*. In this aspect, it is related to the notification of the post-industrial society. However, instead of the shift among economic sectors, it is focussing on the *types of occupations* societies establish. This way, it may not be based on primary causes of social change, like the concept of post-industrialisation is, but it certainly is based on phenomena that have a more direct impact on other aspects of social life. The same concept is framed in a more critical way, using the terms *precarisation* ("Prekarisierung") or increase of precarious occupations and economic household situations.

In the 1960s there was a firmly established and largely realised ideal for "normal" employment careers that included a full-time position, an unlimited time contract, a steady work place and relatively steady work hours (Mückenberger, 1985, 1989). During the last two decades, fewer and fewer occupations fulfil this ideal. The forms of occupations are varying stronger and they are becoming more flexible. We especially see more part-time work and more insecurity, due to occupation in series of short time limited contracts or as formally self-employed work. Work hours are becoming more flexible and dependent on the companies' capacities. Protection of employed work, as far as it existed in the 1960s, is cut back. As a consequence, multiple employments are inclining. In short, one can state that occupations are becoming more diverse and more variable, shifting responsibilities, risks and uncertainties from the employer to the employees. What used to be dependent employee appears more and more as a self-employed worker, offering nothing but his own man-power on a flexible, volatile labour market (Voß & Pongratz, 1998).

This development has been called *flexibilisation*, giving it a neutral or even positive connotation, because the flexibility allows the economy to react fast to changing demands, in order to maximize its efficiency. It has been described as increase in *precarious occupations*, emphasizing the loss of economic security for the employed people.

At the same time that occupations are drastically changing, the normative *ideal* of secure and steady full-time employment, at least in Central and Southern Europe, has remained surprisingly stable. This may, at first, seem paradox or anachronistic. However, since other societal structures, norms, and institutions are still taking a certain level of economic security for granted, there are good reasons why societies persist in considering flexible work deviant. The socially accepted standard of living and level of consumption, the established norms regarding women as caregivers with men as single earners providing the household income alone, the lack of public childcare allowing both parents to be full-time employed, social security and pension systems are examples for institutionalised solutions that depend on the ability of employees, especially of male breadwinners, to provide a decent and steady income. In Germany, it takes about 40 years of full-time employment to earn the entitlement for a decent pension in old age. Structures like these *are* changing, for example with many European countries introducing additional private pensions to bridge the opening financial gap. However, these changes take time. And until new comprehensive patterns have been institutionalised, for securing the economic grounds of households over the entire life-course, the normative ideal of reliable full-time employment will persist and the flexibilisation will appear as precariousness to private households.

With no doubt, this has *consequences* for private social life, and for the structures of society. For the far developed "western" societies, following effects have been considered as potential consequences of the precarious economic situation of households: stress, quality loss of partnerships, postponing of family plans, low fertility, loss of social integration and social networks, a loss of quality of life, and increase of dual earner couples. Some of these potential consequences have, in fact, been empirically noted, e.g. the low fertility in Central and Southern Europe or the increase of dual earner couples in most European societies. However, to what degree these are caused by flexibilisation is left open for speculation since potential alternative explanations cannot be excluded. Spatial mobility comes in as an intervening variable: It certainly can be considered an additional potential consequence of flexibilisation since becoming mobile is one way of being flexible and trying to maintain a steady income. At the same time, spatial mobility is likely to cause or intensify many of the other potential

consequences, mentioned above.

It also must be said that many of the potential consequences were not yet empirically confirmed, at least not in a convincing way for several societies as a whole. A reason could be that the uncertainties do not affect societies as a whole, but rather specific groups within societies who are already marginalised. This is likely to be the case for young cohorts, entering the labour market (Mills, Blossfeld, & Klijzing, 2006), and for women (Hofmeister & Blossfeld, 2006). Men in their mid ages, still have full-time employments to a relatively high degree. On the other hand, especially highly skilled people, especially women with high educational levels, are affected by flexible work (Sacher, 1998, p. 173). It is discussed whether this indicates that flexible jobs are partly wanted, e.g. by women trying to combine a supplement household income with a role as a primary caregiver, (idem) or whether the combination of employment and care-giving work is just a consequences of young, educated women being pushed towards the edge of the labour market (Hofmeister & Blossfeld, 2006). The correlation of precariousness and educational level also indicates that flexibilisation is mostly introduced in the "new" third sector jobs of the post-industrial society.

### 1.4. Theories of reflexive modernisation, individualisation and fluidity

Usually, the beginning of *reflexive modernisation* or *individualisation* (being the major component of reflexive modernisation) is historically connected to at least one of the two processes: the transition from industrial to post-industrial societies or the concept of globalisation. So, it is not a different phase or process that is described, but rather a different interpretation of the same or of a similar empirical phenomenon. However, it tries to integrate concepts like post-industrialisation, globalisation, and flexibilisation. And it tries to lift them on a higher level of abstraction in order to get to a more universal theory to describe social change in the late 20th century.

Reflexive modernisation basically describes a radicalisation of modernity (Beck, Bonß, Lau, & 2003). The core principles of modernity, so the theory says, could only be successfully introduced, because they, at first, remained embedded and weakened by pre-modern structures: The industrial society has introduced social mobility and social change based on a rational maximisation of efficiency. However, mobility and change were mainly limited to the *organisation* of labour and took certain needs of private life, certain ascribed gender and class differences within the division of labour and certain geographical spaces of labour for granted. The principles of modernity then have been applied to their own scope,

with the consequence of claiming to be applied universally and to overcome *any* legitimation through tradition. This way the social change due to modernisation has been accelerated. The claim to maintain a residence in a traditional, familiar place and to keep investing in traditional, familiar social ties, now, is considered problematic because it restraints productivity. The trend towards being socially and geographically highly mobile, that Karl Marx has described already more than 150 years ago, is now expected to come true by theories of reflexive modernisation.

According to the expectations, in the 21st century, the needs for mobility are inclining, even beyond what was noted for the (early) modernisation, especially the mobility related to economic and labour market demands. As the flexibilisation concept describes, people are expected to sell their manpower as self-responsible, quasi self-employed entrepreneurs on liberal labour markets. And as such, they are expected to be flexible and mobile: professionally, socially, and geographically. Whereas life-courses in *pre-modern* societies, and even in advanced *industrial* societies, have been rather certain and predictable, but less open for individual accomplishment, life-courses in *late modern* or post-industrial societies are becoming more open and more uncertain. However, this openness is not only an aspect of freedom, but also of restraint, with people experiencing pressure to become mobile. Mobility does not guarantee employment, a decent income, or social integration. It is not a *sufficient* precondition for economic and social success. But it has become a *necessary* pre-condition.

In analogy with the changing responsibilities of employees on the labour market, the theory of reflexive modernisation predicts a comprehensive change of role models. The final step towards reflexive modernity corresponds with the model of the "flexible man," described by Richard Sennett (1998). His main character is to not know about traditions or unquestionable values, to not strike roots, but to always be ready to go. He is willing to be socially and geographically mobile in order to sell his man-power. Sennett is interpreting the social changes connected with this trend as "erosion," as a crisis bearing the danger of anomy. Other authors (like Manuel Castells or Ulrich Beck) have a more optimistic view, assuming that the change may lead to new forms of social relations. These relations are not defined by tradition, but need to be actively created.

Life-courses in general are not following clearly pre-defined patterns anymore. Men will not necessarily marry at a certain age and then turn into full-time breadwinners until retirement; women will not necessarily have a family, interrupt their job career and turn into

full-time housewives until the children move out. Life-course tracks have become uncertain. However, this uncertainty can be experienced not only as a threat but also as freedom of choice.

The tendency towards more mobility, flexibility, and change does not only affect individuals. Structures are affected too, maybe even more so. More capital is moved faster around the globe. With this, there are increasing demands for labour to be mobile and for social structures to be flexible. Within the economy there is rising acceptance for the principle of "creative destruction" ("schöpferischen Zerstörung"), as described by Peter Schumpeter. Within politics there is a call for more readiness for reforms. Tendencies like these have been described as "liquid modernity" (Bauman, 2003) or as "reflexive modernisation" (Beck, Giddens, & Lash, 1994).

Looking for empirical confirmation in history, three steps of development have been distinguished (Bonß & Kesselring, 1999, p. 47):

(1) The first period where a modern perspective on mobility can be found is the 18th century. Here, mobility was mainly an issue among the new bourgeois elite. Mobility was associated with the transition from absolutism to civil society and, as such, strongly positively evaluated and even normatively demanded. Changing one's geographical position and, with doing so, the social or cultural context was considered an opportunity for collecting new insights and intellectual perspectives. Based on this view, among bourgeois elites a culture of travel developed (Bausinger, Beyrer, & Korff, 1999).

(2) In the 19th and early 20th century, mobility became an issue for wider parts of society. Mobility and ability to become mobile was established as a social value, being strongly associated with social mobility on the one hand, and with technological success and ruling nature on the other hand. Also acceleration of speed became an important goal. However, the factual mobility did not increase as much as its evaluation. Also, mobility was mainly thought only within national borders.

(3) Reflexive modernisation can be considered a third step: The claim for mobility becomes international and global. It is considered important not only from an economic perspective anymore, but also in other contexts.

The analysis of current changes that we can summarise as reflexive modernisation is

still going on. A number of recent trends have been noted that are implemented into the theory, in more or less convincing ways. These debates are interesting since they may lead to the expectation of new forms of mobility and of ability to become mobile. The accents of the reflexive modernity debate have changed at least in three ways in recent years:

(1) There is an emergence of *virtual mobility*: New communication technologies allow us to transport huge amounts of digital data from one place on earth to another. This gives "communication" a new quality in a way that not only face-to-face *conversation*, but also physical presence is simulated, including the visual impression of places and the option to interactively collect information that fits very specifically one's interests. Combined with the trend towards third sector job that are mainly about processing information, often all resources that a work place needs can be sent through cables around the world at the speed of light. This way, employees may work on projects for far-away customers and purposes, with far-away colleagues and resources, without being corporeally on the move. This is a new phenomenon that, at least in its social consequences, is more than just a new way of communicating. And it is discussable in what way *virtual mobility* is a better term. On the one hand, it *substitutes* for mobility and creates physical *immobility*. On the other hand, it simulates travel around the world at a speed that hardly can be accelerated any further and therefore shows a lot of the characteristics of spatial mobility to a higher degree than mobility itself does. This may lead to the interpretation that e-mail and internet are a new level of acceleration of mobility.

(2) The intense *linkage between social and geographical mobility* as it has been assumed by theories of modernity and early theories of reflexive modernity is breaking up. The compulsion to be mobile does seem to increase. However, the readiness for geographical mobility is not any longer a prerequisite or a guarantee for social upward mobility, rather a means to avoid social downward mobility.

(3) It is questioned in what way the role of *mobility* needs to be re-put into perspective. Whereas during the "first modernity" social and geographical mobility were conceived as a doable but mainly *not yet realized* path towards a better life, mobility now to some degree is experienced as a reality. However this experience makes persisting boundaries for mobility as well as downsides visible, including the insecurity concerning social descents. So, the vision of unlimited mobility of autonomous subjects through time and space is unmasked as illusionary. "We have never been mobile" is Latour's conclusion about

modernity (1995). At least, mobility today rather appears as an ambiguous phenomenon. On the one hand, it continues to be a thought of as a positive guiding value for the organisation of modern societies. On the other hand, institutional settings actually change in ways that make mobility more difficult and less necessary. For instance, people do not have to travel corporeally to be mobile.

At this point, the role of mobility in and for society becomes unclear. Some theories of reflexive modernisation (e.g. Sennett, 1998; Urry, 2000b) still expect a very significant increase in mobility that will introduce us to the "flexible man" (Sennett, 1998). John Urry (2000b) even postulates that sociology needs to change its main focus: it needs to study forms of mobility, instead of structures. *Fluidity*, he argues, is the main characteristic for societies in the 21st century. Fluidity means an increase of movement of people, goods, and information – being virtually, imaginatively, or physically on the move. This prediction, however, is not well supported by empirical data.

## 2. Linked micro-macro level perspectives

Macro level theories are helpful to understand cross-national differences and long-term societal change. However, they are usually unable to explain variance *within* societies, which is unsatisfying for research with micro level data. And in the case of mobility, a further disadvantage is that they do not make it easy to differentiate between different forms of mobility.

This differentiation and the explanation of within country variance can be achieved more easily with theories of action that focus the micro level. Some theories may appear as pure micro level models. But most models link their predictions regarding individual behaviour on the micro level to influences that may lie on the micro or macro level. Three main approaches are presented here: *Rational choice theories* start out by assuming that individuals make rational decisions, following their individual interests and reflecting structural incentives and barriers. Complementary there are approaches, framed as *cultural or life style theories*. These assume that individual behaviour (like choosing whether to become mobile or not) reflects immaterial normative concepts: established cultural concepts in society that are followed unconsciously, expectations from significant others, social values and norms, or personal habits, attitudes, values and life styles. The concept of *motility* could be considered a synthesis between the two.

## *2.1. Rational choice approaches*

Rational choice theories have in common that they assume that individuals follow own subjective interests with their behaviour. Most models assume that people are making conscious rational decisions regarding their behaviour, taking into account the circumstances they act in. With picking one out of many options how to act, they are trying to maximize the ratio of benefits and costs. Coming from economics, the early rational choice theories would consider only monetary benefits and costs as relevant. Also, it was assumed that actors were free in their decisions and fully informed about the benefits and costs of all their options. These assumptions have the advantage of making the decision process and its outcome calculable and predictable. Adopting rational choice theory to *non*-economic social issues, however, made these assumptions appear rather unrealistic and has lead to more complex and more realistic variations.

Instead of assuming that actors are free in their decision, newer "RC" models assume that they are limited by *constraints* (Simon, 1957, 1991). These constraints can be of multiple kinds: for example lack of physical strength, lack of resources, or lack of knowledge. For a decision whether to become occupationally mobile, constraints could be not having a driver's license, living far from a train station, or not knowing about an alternative job in the neighbourhood. So, the assumption of constraints also implies that actors may not be fully informed about all options they have and about the benefits and costs coming with them. Simon (1957, 1982, 1991) therefore speaks of *bounded rationality* that leads to the choice of behaviour.

Bounded rationality is *likely* to lead to behaviour that comes with relatively high utility and relatively low costs. However, there is no guarantee for that. And it is certainly not guaranteed that the *best* of all possible ratios of benefits and costs is achieved. Therefore the goal of behaviour under bounded rationality is not maximising, but *satisficing* (idem), meaning achieving at least a specific, defined minimum level of utility. An employee, for example, might not go for the best paid job or the shortest of all commutes, but rather for a job that pays at least X Euro a month, that allows him to spend at least four nights per week at home etc.

Applying RC to non-economic issues brings up another argument why it is an illusion to predict behaviour based on the maximisation of utility. This reason is that the height of benefits and costs are subjective and therefore, for a social scientist as an external observer,

often indefinable. Whether it is more "valuable" enjoying time with one's family during the week or, instead, having a well paid, prestigious job depends not only on the actor's specific situation, but also on the actor's individual preferences. These benefits are not measurable in any "currency" or objective quantifiable unit, and even less so in the *same* currency where their values would be comparable. To weight up between the two, is something every individual has to do for her- or him-self. Therefore, a variation of RC theory has been introduced, known as the *SEU* model. It assumes that it is the *subjectively expected* utility that explains an actor's behaviour (Savage, 1954), not an objectively measurable utility.

An RC model that tries to correct the major critiques quite well has been introduced by Siegwart Lindenberg (1985). Pulling together the classical economic theory, based on "homo economicus" (Smith, 1776; Spranger, 1914) as an ideal actor, with "homo sociologicus" (Dahrendorf, 1958) being the ideal actor of sociological role theory, he designed the *RREEMM* model, assuming a *resourceful, restricted, expecting, evaluating, maximizing man* as an ideal actor. Unlike RREEMM's ancestor "homo economicus," this actor is *restricted* in his options (by constraints), and not fully informed. He can only *expect* certain benefits and costs that depend on his subjective *evaluations*. On the other side, he can be resourceful in creating new options and compromises that did not appear at first.

The argument of bounded rationality has gone further. New RC models assume that, in some situations, the lack of information or time for decision-making can be severe enough or the achievable advantage in terms of utility, in comparison, low enough, that reflecting consciously on costs and benefits does not happen at all (not even according to subjective preferences). A paradox situation can appear: The most *rational* way of deciding for a specific behaviour may be *not* to decide *rationally*. For example, choosing an ice cream flavour in an ice cream bar in a foreign country (without understanding of the language or translation available) is likely to happen intuitively or instinctively. Finding a dictionary or somebody to translate would be more "costly" than choosing a not so much preferred flavour. So, in this situation, it is rational not to be rational about the decision. Therefore, Hartmut Esser (1993b, 1996, 2000, 2001) in his *frame selection model* would expect an actor to go through a two-step decision process: In a first step he will *define the situation*, meaning he will note the circumstances of the situation and pick a basic pattern how to react to it: a *frame* of action. If the situation calls for the *reflecting-calculating mode (rc)*, meaning a conscious reflection of (subjective) benefits and costs, the actor, in a second step, will make a rational decision in a strict sense. If it does not, he will, in the second step, go on *automatic-spontaneous mode (as)*,

instead, and make an instinctive decision.

In the context of occupational mobility, it may not be necessary to include an automatic-spontaneous mode into a rational choice model. It is possible that employees get into a long-distance commuting situation without much conscious reflection, since the importance of staying employed is a strong frame that might not be questioned as long as it "only" implies a long commute. However, deciding between unemployment and *relocation*, or between daily long-distance commute and *weekly commute* will probably always need to be considered a *high cost* situation. So, it is worth trying to get enough information for making a well reflected rational choice. And mostly, the relevant information will be accessible in the available time. Also there are few alternatives to a consciously reflected decision. Most people can not draw on biographical experiences or cultural patterns when they are facing a decision regarding becoming mobile. There are no well proven, established ways how it is *usually* done to balance between labour market demands and the demands of family and friendship networks.

For this reason, rational choice models that were applied to mobility issues remained rather strict in their assumptions (Sjaastad, 1962; Wolpert, 1965; Kalter, 1997, 1998). These authors explain migration mainly by assuming that people migrate if they expect the long-term utility to be higher in a new place. The differences between the models are marked by secondary questions: Are only monetary or also social benefits and costs relevant for the decision? Does the current place of residence gat a "bonus" for avoiding mobility costs? And on which level are decisions made: individual, partnership, or family?

The latter question is a more crucial one. A theory may lead to very different predictions, depending on whether it assumes individuals to be maximising (or satisficing) their individual utility or whether it assumes families to be maximising the family's utility. In the context of family decisions, it seems hard to believe individuals would make decisions independently from their family members. Since family members, at some point, have to come to a *common* decision (or break up) pure individual rationality should only be found within the family internal debate towards a common decision. Here, it could be framed by negotiation theory or game theory. However, the outcome of the decision whether a family should relocate or migrate or a family member should take a job that requires long-distance commuting should rather be framed as partnership or family decision. An in between solution is formulated by Gary S. Becker (1981) who applies economic theory on family decisions. He

almost gives up the core assumption of rational choice theory by claiming that individuals can be *altruistic*. However, he assumes altruism only for parents in the sense that they consider the utility of their children in the same way as their own.

Individual as well as family decisions are made on the micro level. How does the macro level come in? James Samuel Coleman (1990) has explained the interrelation in a scheme, known as the micro-macro graph. A condition on the macro level may be part of the potential costs and benefits that many individuals are reflecting, while making a rational decision in favour of their utility. Therefore the macro condition influences these individuals' decisions. And with *many* individuals tending to decide in a specific way, a new macro phenomenon may emerge. For instance, a general tax break for costs for long-distance commuting, as it exists in Germany, may make employees in Germany more likely to accept a job that requires long commutes. So, the consequence might be a high ratio of long-distance commuters in Germany. This is a macro phenomenon that again may affect individual choices (for example by jamming highways).

As Esser notes, the micro-macro graph, in a more abstract form, describes the interrelation of macro and micro level according to *any* theory of action (Esser, 1993a). According to any theory of action, all or at least many individuals will, in some way, react to macro level conditions. So, according to any theory of action, one macro level condition is likely to cause another macro level effect.

## 2.2. "Mobility culture," life style perspective, and role theory

The development of rational choice theories is characterised by weakening the formally strict assumptions and by including more and more non-rational or non-utility oriented elements. This indicates that there are ways in which people act that are *not* captured by the assumptions of maximising utility and making conscious rational decisions. The range of *alternative* ways of acting is probably large. However, these alternative ways of acting are also rather difficult to formalise. Therefore alternative theories of action, beyond rational choice, are not very well developed.

One way to summarise this range of alternative ways of acting is the concept of *culture*. For this reason, in debates on mobility research, it has been claimed that "*mobility culture*" should be introduced as an explaining concept (e.g. Bericat, 1994). The term "mobility culture," so far, is only arbitrary. It has not yet been defined or elaborated as a

theoretical approach. However, we can understand it as those aspects of culture that affect decisions and behaviour in the context of spatial mobility. So, mobility culture is deductible from culture, as a broader concept.

Culture is a rather well established concept, but one with many deviating definitions (see Kroeber & Kluckhohn, 1952). Most definitions try to capture culture by listing elements it consists of. Which elements exactly these are is being discussed. However, there is a common understanding according to which the elements of culture share a few criteria that probably mark the outlines of this concept relatively well: (1) Elements of culture are non-material, addressable maybe as knowledge, beliefs, habits and frames, or social constructs. (2) This knowledge enables individuals to interact with others, by reducing the infinity of ways to act to a small number of established, appropriate options. (3) In order to so, cultural knowledge must be shared by, more or less, all members of a group or society. The distinction of people who share and people who do not share cultural knowledge is one of the core criteria that identify a group or society. (4) In order to maintain this common knowledge in a group or in society, each new member or generation is made familiar with it in a process of socialisation. (5) However, with the exchange of members and generations and the permanent re-production of culture by new members and generations, the common knowledge and beliefs may gradually change. Tylor (1974) offers the following definition: "Culture [...] is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." A more straight forward definition might be: Culture is the *knowledge* and the *beliefs* that are shared by the members of a group or society, and that one member of this group or society *expects* another member to share when they interact with each other.

Keeping in mind this *function* culture has for enabling humans to interact in society, it is not difficult to identify examples for knowledge that qualifies as cultural. Sharing a language, for example, is a necessary pre-condition for many forms of interaction. Similarly, it is of major importance to know about appropriate forms of greeting, about the meaning of red and green traffic lights, to know how to get cash from a cash machine, or how operate a public phone or an elevator, when being exposed to public life. Some of this knowledge is about knowing *facts* (e.g. a hot burner will burn you if you touch it); some is about *beliefs* that are thought to be true (e.g. you might be reborn as an animal if you behave sinful). But mostly cultural knowledge means knowing about *social values* and *social constructs* in the group or society one lives in (e.g. the importance of respecting authority, the gender and age

appropriate ways of dressing in public, the rules of politeness, the value and usage of money etc.). Also aspects of *mobility culture* seem clearly detectable. In order to become mobile it is important to know about traffic signs and speed limits, to know about train schedules and how to research them, to know how much luggage is allowed on an airplane etc.

These examples mainly describe cultural knowledge characterising *national societies* or even bigger units, such as the modern "western world" of post-industrialised countries. As such, they will only be able to explain *cross-national* or *cross-cultural differences*. Freisl, for example, explains differences in the mobility of Europeans and US Americans by basic social values. In the United States, he sees stronger values of freedom and equality which have promoted mobility. In contrast, he considers European values to have a stronger emphasis on property ownership and education. This has, on the one hand, enforced emotional ties to one's hometown and, on the other hand, fostered a hierarchical understanding of authority, both hindering mobility (Freisl, 1994). Such comparisons can also be made within Europe. For example Spain, compared to Northern and Central European societies, is considered to have a rather immobility oriented culture, given that the split shift doubles commuting time and relocation is hindered by a very high share of homeowners in a very rigid housing market (De Miguel & De Miguel, 2002).

It is not necessarily only the *content* of culture that fosters or hinders mobility. Also the *size of geographical spaces that share the same culture* can be an explanation. For example, Freisl also considers the different education systems in the various German states and the language barriers within Europe as obstacles for mobility that the United States does not have (Freisl, 1994).

Below the national level, there are several kinds of social groups that each are characterized by sub-cultures. Such groups can be populations of a specific region, town or quarter, ethnic minorities, religious denominations, social classes and strata, milieus and life style groups, generations, colleagues in a work place, students in a specific university, peers, etc. Ronald Inglehart (1977, 1989) has, for example, shown that newly born generations tend to be more "post-materialistic" than earlier born generations. The same is true for highly educated in comparison to less educated social groups. Given that each individual is member of a national society and of many social groups at the same time, given that cultural knowledge diffuses from one social group to another using the common members as bridges, given that culture is permanently changing, and given that many cultural elements are not

shared by *all*, but only by *many* members of a group, it is impossible to clearly identify what is part of which culture or sub-culture at a given moment. There may be a clearly identifiable *core* culture, but the borders of cultures and sub-cultures will always be blurred.

For designing a theory of action, explaining *micro level differences*, it is important to consider not only cultures of national societies, but also sub-cultures of social groups. Unique for an individual is, by definition, no single culture or sub-culture. It is only the specific *combination* of cultures and sub-cultures the individual shares – due to membership in a specific set of social groups.

With culture being a macro phenomenon, sub-culture being a meso phenomenon, and a specific combination of cultures and sub-cultures being a micro phenomenon, the *micro-macro link* for a cultural theory of action is obvious. The influence of the macro level on individuals happens through socialisation. The influence of individuals on the macro level happens through variation that new generations create re-producing culture. Ronald Inglehart describes a value change (1977), and a cultural shift (1989) that moves from materialism to "postmaterialism" or from modernization to postmodernization (Inglehart, 1997) and thus links the macro theories of reflexive modernisation to micro level analysis on culture. Whereas Inglehart shows that these core values shape people's behaviour in many ways, he does not look at their effect on mobility decisions. It is possible that post-materialism makes people *less* likely to become mobile for job reasons, given that they consider a secure income not as important, but emphasize more social values. It is also possible that post-materialism makes people *more* likely to become mobile, given that they put higher value on self-fulfilment.

*Values* can certainly be considered one element of culture. The assumption that values are guiding behaviour is already part of their definition: A value is "a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or characteristic of a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means and ends of action" (Kluckhohn, 1951). Values have been explicitly named as one influence for behaviour (among others) by Max Weber (1980) describing the ideal type of value-rational action. And also Talcott Parsons (Parsons & Shils, 1951) included them, in his general theory of action, as one component among others, describing action as a social system and values as a cultural sub-system.

Values and *attitudes*, being more situation specific conceptions of the desirable, are also core explaining variables behind the concept of *life styles*. Life styles are sets of

preferences and patterns of behaviour regarding clothing style, furnishing and arranging one's apartment, consumption, especially consumption of media, and ways of spending leisure time (Toffler, 1980). Since these private spheres of life are hardly restricted by external influences they are good indicators for the pure individual character. So, it is assumed that they express individual taste and habits, individual world views, values, and attitudes. Other areas of behaviour might be less good expressions since they may be affected by circumstances as well. But nevertheless life style theory assumes that basically all areas of behaviour are, to some degree, affected by life styles as well. These can be arranging partnerships, family planning, preferred kind of jobs, voting, etc. For many societies, researchers have empirically identified life style groups, using large sets of indicators and cluster analysis. They have come to various classifications (Mitchell, 1983; Plummer, 1974; Schulze, 1993), showing that the borders of life styles are fuzzy and ambiguous to draw. However, according to more or less each classification, the core assumptions could be confirmed that there *are* sets of correlating forms of self-expressions, and they *do* affect behaviour in many ways. It also has been shown that life styles are structured by socio-demographic variables, especially by generation and education. This again goes well with Inglehart's findings, showing the same influence for values.

It is not true that culture can only explain variation in behaviour inasmuch as the cultural knowledge varies. Cultural beliefs may apply only for specific situations. Then, even if all members of society share the same cultural patterns, only people who find themselves in this particular situation will behave accordingly. This is demonstrated by *role theory*. Role theory assumes that people take on *social positions* in society. Social positions are positions in a field of social relationships (Dahrendorf, 1958). For example the intercept point of the relations teacher – students, teacher – parents, and teacher – school director marks the role of a teacher. The expectations that these groups of people, students, parents, director, have regarding the position of the teacher and the person who fills it defines the *role* of he teacher. According to role theory, people are defined by the set of roles they hold. Human behaviour is shaped by the *expectations* that people are exposed to. If we consider the expectations of society as a whole also as relevant, then we consider *social norms* to be an explanation for human behaviour.

How can expectations and social norms explain micro level differences in behaviour? Whereas cross-national macro level differences may be explained by the existence of different norms in different societies, micro level differences within a society must either be explained

by individual perception (or priorities) regarding the importance of social expectations or by differences in the situation. If it is a social norm to take care of one's parents in old age, if they need support, then this will not keep everybody from relocating, but only those whose parents need support. If it is a social norm that wives should support their husband's careers then this will affect married women with their husbands who are confronted with a job-related mobility demand. People are reacting to a situation, similarly as they would do according to rational choice theory. The only difference is that the motivation for the reaction is not maximising utility, but following expectations and social norms, avoiding exclusion and other negative sanctions for deviant behaviour.

The difference between acting according to *values or attitudes* and acting according to *social norms and expectations* cannot be told from a *macro* level perspective. In both cases a specific culture fosters a specific pattern of behaviour. On the *micro* level, however, they are very different. Whereas following norms means following *other* people's world view, maybe renouncing own beliefs, acting according to values means following *own* beliefs, and maybe offending other people's world view. The first one avoids social conflicts; the second one avoids psychological conflicts.

There is at least a third mechanism how acting based on culture can work. Between the own belief and the social definition of how to do "it" right, there are patterns that are followed *unconsciously*. We may call such a pattern a *model* or a *"leitbild."* Sometimes people do not reflect how things should be done. They do not have an attitude of their own, and they are not aware of anybody else's expectation. They just know that there has been a specific way of doing "it" that worked out. And since there is no need of inventing a second way, people follow the example, without even reflecting whether this might be a desirable or an undesirable behaviour. This type of acting is also often assumed in role theory. It also is implied in the theory of *doing gender*, as an explanation how women and men take on gender specific ways to behave, based on the examples they see growing up in a gendered society (West & Zimmerman, 1987; West & Fenstermaker, 1995). The broader theoretical framework consists of symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology (Goffman, 1959, 1977; Garfinkel, 1984).

### *2.3. Motility*

Strictly speaking, *motility* is *not* a theory that tries to explain mobility. Instead, it is a concept that claims to *replace* mobility as an interest of social sciences. And it comes with a theoretical model for explaining it. However, motility does not really exchange the dependent variables; it rather claims to be a "reconceptualisation" and a "fine-tuning" of mobility (Kaufmann, 2002, p. 37). Mobility is interpreted as a manifestation of motility. In that sense, motility *can* be understood as a theoretical model that explains mobility.

Motility is the "capacity of a person to be mobile." (idem). The concept of motility is introduced to overcome two obstacles for meaningful research on mobility: (1) Unlike the term "mobility" that is used for very different phenomena (movement of people through space, movement of goods through space, exchange of data, diffusion of culture, change of social status, change of occupational position, etc.), motility is supposed to offer an unambiguous term for a clearly defined phenomenon. (2) Unlike most understandings of mobility, motility is supposed to capture a socially relevant phenomenon. The problem with mobility is seen in the fact that the motion through geographic space, as such, from a social science perspective, might not be too relevant. Motion can happen in very different contexts, with very different intensions, and very different social consequences. Instead, motility refers to an *attribute of the actor* who eventually becomes mobile, and it is not limited to the process of motion itself (Kaufmann, 2002, p. 36).

Vincent Kaufmann offers a more precise definition: "Motility can be defined [...] as the way in which an individual appropriates what is possible in the domain of mobility and puts this potential to use for his or her activities" (2002, p. 37; similarly: 2005, p. 126). It is the aggregation "of *all factors that define a person's capacity to be mobile*, whether this is physical aptitude, aspirations to settle down or be mobile, existing technological transport and telecommunications systems and their accessibility, space-time constraints (location of the workplace), acquired knowledge such as a driver's licence, etc." (2002, p. 38). These factors can be sorted into the categories "access," "skills," and "appropriation."

*Access* (or "accessibility") summarises the theoretically available *means of transportation and communication* ("options" – existence and density of a railroad network, availability of high speed trains, etc.) and the practical *conditions* under which these means can actually be used (price for a train ticket, schedule of trains running,...). The factors summarised as access will vary strongly between different geographic places and their density

of population (urban versus rural).

*Skills* (or "competences") summarise the physical abilities (ability to walk, to see, to ride a bike, etc.), the achieved competences (driving licence, knowledge of English language for international travel, etc.) and organisational competences that help to make mobility happen (ability to research cheap flight prices, spontaneity, etc.). Skills depend on socialisation as well as on age and life experience.

*Appropriation* (or "cognitive appropriation") is an individual's subjective interpretation of access and skills. It refers to the difference whether people consider their skills and access to be sufficient for becoming mobile. And it also refers to the difference whether people consider mobility being worth investing time, money, or energy to achieve necessary skills. Appropriation reflects people's individual preferences, values, attitudes, and habits, as well as their plans for the future (Kaufmann, 2002, p. 38-39).

The three dimensions of motility represent various theoretical approaches that all add to its explanation. In that sense, motility is an approach that integrates others, such as rational choice and "mobility culture." Access is a structural component that will follow a rational choice type logic. Skills may be comparable to the concept of human capital as individual characteristics that affect rational choice behaviour. Appropriation rather represents cultural influences. However, linkages can be made to more specific theoretical concepts (as they shall be described in section 3): Skills depend on age and biography, probably also on gender and the socio-economic background. Appropriation is likely to depend on generation, gender, family background, and social networks. And so on. Motility combines influences on the micro level, such as individual experiences shaping a person's skills, with macro level influences, such as the infrastructure for transportation.

## 2.4. Stress theory and quality of life

In understanding mobility decisions, quality of life, *expected changes* of quality of life as well as the experience of stress can frame the analysis. Furthermore the concepts of quality of life and stress theory are approaches that can explain *consequences* of job mobility. Both, quality of life and stress theory are very heterogeneous concepts, used in various scientific disciplines. *Quality of life* basically addresses the well being of people. Depending on the specific operationalisation, a number of relevant levels is taken into account. Cummins (1996) has identifies 173 different ways of operationalisation.

One common sense is that stress and burdens lower the quality of life. Therefore, *stress* usually is considered a subordinate concept to quality of life. It is empirically proven that burdens can have negative effects on the psychological and physical well being as well as on the satisfaction with the partnership. So, several levels of quality of life are affected (Bodenmann, 2000; Diener, 1984; Faltermeier, 1994).

*Spatial mobility* requires that people adjust in many ways. We can distinguish burdens that are directly related to cover geographical distances, such as dense and noisy traffic or the loss of time for commuting, from secondary effects. But not only people who are mobile, also their family members can be affected indirectly in specific ways. And the analysis of these indirect effects can draw on a relatively long history of stress theoretical research. Regarding *long-distance commuting*, there are meanwhile many studies, reporting about intensified stress and loss of health (Blickle, 2005; Häfner, Kordy, & Kächele, 2001; M. Koslowsky, 1997; Novaco, Stokols, & Milanesi, 1990; Ott & Gerlinger, 1992; Rapp, 2003; Schaeffer et al., 1988; Stadler et al., 2000). In these studies, the concept of quality of life is only seldom referred to. Therefore, in the following, a stronger emphasis will be put on stress theories.

The *psychological* research on stress is dominated by the theory of *Lazarus* as a main framework (Becker, Schulz, & Schlotz, 2004; Kaluza, 2003). It understands stress neither as external stimulus nor as internal reaction, but as a relationship ("*transaction*") between individual and environment (Lazarus & Folkman, 1984). If an individual gets the impression not to be able to cope with a situation anymore stress emerges. This implies that stress depends on the subjective evaluation of the requirements of a given situation as well as on the subjective evaluation of the own capabilities to fulfil them.

Based on the transactional model according to Lazarus and on the salutogenic model by Antonovsky (1988), Becker, Schulz, and Schlotz (2004) have developed a *systemic demands-resources model*. This model differentiates attributes of the environment and of the individual in the moment of emerging stress. Furthermore, it claims to explain both, the subjective experience of stress and the effects on health related quality of life. The health constitution is defined by the individual's ability to cope with external and internal requirements, using external and internal resources. If requirements exceed resources over a longer period of time, chronic stress will emerge and diminish the person's health constitution. But also aside from causing chronic stress, excessive requirements have a direct negative effect on quality of life.

Based on social-medical and social-psychological findings, Koslowsky, Kluger, and Reich (1995) present a model which specifically explains the *emergence of commuting stress* and its consequences on the experience and the behaviour of commuters. Also this model builds on the understanding of stress according to Lazarus. However, it focuses on the empirically measurable requirements that are directly related to commuting, such as commuting time, condition of the means of transportation, or condition of traffic. The transaction perspective and the interrelation of subjective evaluation are underemphasised. Just like Becker's systemic demands-resources model, Koslowsky, Kluger, and Reich design an individual centred psychological model without elaborating the role of interaction.

In the context of *sociology of the family*, concepts on stress have been formulated that deal with the emergence of stress and with its compensation in social groups, like the family (Burr et al., 1994; H. McCubbin & Patterson, 1983; M. McCubbin & McCubbin, 1989; Schneewind, 1999). A core problem of most of these theories is that they take families as units without explaining how the experience and compensation of stress by families emerges from the individual perspectives of the family members. Newer models overcome this weakness, for example the *systemic transactional stress-coping model* by Bodenmann (2000). Bodenmann also describes the relationship between individual coping strategies and coping strategies that involve partners and the further social environment, based on the cascade model. He assumes that under stress, in a first stage, only individual coping strategies are used, even if the partner is available. If the stress continues the individual strategies are supported by strategies involving the partner ("dyadic coping"). If they still continue further support is mobilised involving further significant others. This succession is confirmed well by empirical studies, also for job mobiles (Schneider, Limmer & Ruckdeschel 2002a, 2002b). For the strengthening of competences of coping, this means that, in a first step, individual competences should be addressed, and in a second step those of the partnership (Bodenmann, 2000).

Across theoretical models, it is known that the experience of stress varies, depending on the objective situation, the subjective evaluation, and the individual ability of coping. In the following, factors shall be presented whose influence on the experience of stress and the health condition is empirically well confirmed.

Regarding the *objective situation*, it has been shown that factors that are foreseeable and influenceable cause less stress. Also the degree and the continuity of challenges play an

important role. It is considered certain that even major singular "life events," in the long run, have much less impact than continuing burdens or "daily hassles." For example, a car crash on the way to work should cause much less stress than frequently recurring obstructions of traffic or car repairs.

Regarding the *subjective evaluation* and the *individual ability of coping*, it has been shown that the individual character has an important influence. Neuroticism and the subjective conviction of control are considered especially important characteristics. A strong sense of control and a minor tendency to being neurotic help to actively focus on coping with challenges. An active problem oriented coping style is considered favourable: First, it increases the chance that burdens can be diminished. Second, an individual will be enabled to continuously develop further coping strategies.

There has been a large international comparative study regarding the conviction of control among managers (Spector, Cooper, & Sanchez, 2001). It has shown strong cross-national differences. Managers in the United States and in Germany, for example, were clearly more confident regarding their abilities to organise their job situation than their Spanish or Polish colleagues. However, the study was not able to clarify whether these differences were due to cultural stereotypes or rather of different structural conditions within the companies in the various countries.

Regarding *challenges related to mobility*, there is evidence from studies by Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel (2002a, 2002b) and Konopaske, Robie, & Ivancevich (2005) that the individual characteristic "being open for new experiences" or "adventurousness" have influences on evaluation and coping. People who are open for change have an easier time deciding to relocate, and they experience this decision as less stressful than people who try to avoid change. There is consensus in psychological research that people with a large set of coping strategies, especially of active, problem-focused strategies, are able to cope with challenges very efficiently. Studies about the behaviour of long-distance commuters on their way to work emphasize the importance of coping strategies. For example, those long-distance commuters who were consciously trying to make use of their commuting time, for reading, listening to music, or for relaxation, felt healthier than those who were unable to make use of the commuting time.

Studies about major burdens, such as a critical illness, comparing objective circumstances and subjective evaluations, have shown that the two can deviate strongly. The

differences can be interpreted as an effect of coping or adjustment strategies (Herschbach, 2002). Among these strategies is the ability to make use even from negative experiences. Furthermore, comparisons to former biographical events and to situations of other people play an important role. Following this evidence, mobility should be experienced as especially stressful if it is associated with an aggravation of the overall situation over the life course, or if people are making upward comparisons, for example with people who are able to work in their home town. If the mobility is, instead, interpreted as a chance for improvement over the life course, or if it appears to be a problem that affects others as well the burdens of job mobility should be experienced as less stressful.

## 3. Socio-demographic and socio-economic perspectives

Empirical research does not always go back to theories in order to develop hypotheses or interpret findings. There are a number of *theoretical concepts* that stands in between and can serve as a substitute. Theoretical concepts, in that sense, are either single explaining, dependent, or interacting variables, or they are sets of interrelated explaining, dependent, or interacting variables. One could also refer to them as established (sets of) hypotheses. They may be based on one or more theories. But they describe rather specific causal interrelations than general mechanisms. Here, a number of theoretical concepts are presented that are often used as approaches to mobility research. These are: gender, generation and life course, family background, social networks, and socio-economic status.

### 3.1. Gender approach

Social sciences have shown that most differences between women and men are not determined by their biology. Especially when it comes to social behaviour and social positions, we are mainly facing differences that are due to gender specific socialisation. In a process of "doing gender," women and men, often unconsciously, copy the existing models they perceive in the society they grow up in, and thus provide an additional example for other women and men (West, & Zimmerman, 1987; West & Fenstermaker, 1995). Gender also works as a gender role, implying that gender appropriate behaviour is rewarded and deviant behaviour sanctioned, mainly by integration into and exclusion from social groups.

In industrialised societies, the social construction of gender has been associated with paid work in the labour market and unpaid work in the private house, as maintenance or care-giving work. The two spheres, often referred to as *production* and *reproduction* work, were only separated through the rise of industrial work. Production work became men's

responsibility, reproduction work women's responsibility. Other gender attributes, such as manly strength and rationality or female kindness and emotion, were associated. The contrast became so accentuated that even sociological theory took the different characters and destinies of women and men for granted (Durkheim, 1999; Parsons, 1949).

In the late 20th century, the change towards post-industrial society has weakened the contrast. The 20th century is a history of women's movements, achieving, at least formally, equal rights, entering universities, entering the labour market, becoming economically independent and socially respected. However, in the social behaviour the contrast has not disappeared. It has only become more subtle, with women studying typically "female" subjects, working in "female" professions, and leaving the prestigious and powerful positions for their male colleagues. Also the male gender role has, so far, hardly changed since men have taken on care-giving and housework responsibilities very slowly.

So far, gender is still likely to affect all spheres of women's and men's lives. Social behaviour may not be determined anymore by gender, but the tendency, as research shows, is still strong. This implies that men are likely to invest more into their job careers and to sacrifice private life, whereas women are likely to take on care-giving responsibilities and follow job demands only inasmuch as these private responsibilities allow them to. This should also be visible in job-related mobility behaviour. In return, also mobility is likely to affect a couple's specific distribution of work and of power, re-structuring gender roles on the micro level.

In fact, striking gender differences are noted in the literature, especially in the context of family functioning, family structure, and family development. Women and men have different strategies to integrate job mobility into their life courses. They have different ways of making mobility-related decisions. They become mobile in different ways. And also, mobility has different consequences for women and men.

Empirical studies have put a special focus on the division of labour in couples. For all countries included in the literature analysis, there are findings that *men's* job mobility leads to a *traditionalisation* of the division of labour. Women take on more unpaid care-giving and housework, after their spouses become mobile, even beyond what the couple had planned (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a). If, instead, *women* become mobile and the partner works in the same town or region, he takes on more unpaid work, so the distribution becomes more equal. However, the effects are not symmetric. Men become mobile more

often than women do, so women step back from their careers more often than men. Also, mobile women are generally much more involved in housework and care-giving than mobile men. Striking examples are Polish women, working in Western Europe, who even try to organize their household and their families' daily schedules from the distance via phone.

The theoretical framing of these findings exists in outlines. Beck-Gernsheim (1995) focuses on the phenomenon of the traditionalisation of gender roles. She sees a major reason in globalisation and the tendency that labour markets today are expecting perfectly flexible and mobile employees. Individuals, following these expectations, seek to adjust their private life to the mobility demands. In this process women turn into unpaid service crafts, organising the private life of the couple, and releasing their partners from any responsibilities aside from their employment. This way, men and women follow the patterns of gendered life courses of their grandparents that had been thought of as history already decades ago.

But what explains the gender difference? Why are women more likely to step back from their job careers and support their partner's career? Why do women feel more responsible for managing family life when they become mobile than men do? Bonnet, Collet and Maurine (2006a, see also chapter 4) point out that mobility may intensify conflicts within the couple about the distribution of work. Their answer to the question of gender difference is that the relation of power within the couple will decide upon the partner's life courses. The persisting tendency that men hold the stronger position for negotiations within the couple leads to a traditionalisation. Mobility intensifies an inequality that has never fully disappeared and makes it visible again. Bonnet, Collet and Maurine also point out that the negotiation about the couple's priorities is likely to cause conflicts and to stress the partnership.

Challiol (1998, 2002) assumes that, during the negotiation process in the context of mobility, there are rules of reciprocity deciding upon the outcome. Also from a rational choice perspective, there are interpretations offered. These assume that not the *individual* interest, but rather the maximisation of the *couple's* utility is guiding the decision process. This interpretation is supported by Badoe (2002). However, these studies do not define which costs and benefits are actually compared. A study of Pochic (2004) makes it likely that economic long-term interests are *not* crucial for the couple's decision, at least not long-term interests alone. In this study the mobility decisions of managers were studied. The result was that couples did follow the mobility demands towards the man's employment, but they did not follow mobility demands towards the woman's employment, even if he was unemployed.

### *3.2. Generation, life course perspective and biography*

A second variable that tends to explain variance in almost any field of social research is age. However, behind this variable, there are three related concepts: generation, life course and biography.

The concept of *generation* reflects birth cohorts: the combination of a specific age at a specific historical time. The concept is based on the insight that there is a specific phase in the life course with major importance for the development of an own identity, with own world views, habits, and life styles. This phase is referred to as the phase of socialisation or the formative phase, and it is located somewhere between 10 and 20, in late childhood and youth. Not necessarily the year of birth, but rather the historic time that shapes this formative phase shapes a structure of generations (Mannheim, 1978). People growing up during world war II tend to be concerned about pure economic survival issues and are referred to as the war generation. The "baby boomers" grew up in peace and economic prosperity. It is them to develop new life styles, seek self-fulfilment, found green parties, and celebrate Christopher Street Day (Inglehart, 1977, 1989; Strauss & Howe, 1991).

How can the generation affect mobility decisions? It is, for example, imaginable that later born cohorts have weaker ties to their places of origin than earlier born cohorts. It is possible that later born cohorts have healthier and wealthier parents who do not expect the same intensity of support in old age. Also an impact in the reverse direction is likely. If a birth cohort entering the labour market is exposed to significantly more mobility demands than the birth cohorts before, something like a "mobile generation" could emerge: a generation that is characterised by the experience of mobility demands and that reacts to it, for example with weaker ties than generations before. However, these are interrelations that are not yet empirically tested.

The *life course* is defined by age alone, independently from historic time. Based on the number of years since their birth, people face different expectations, deal with different responsibilities, and probably develop different attitudes and life styles. But it is not just a biological process of maturing and aging that determines the life course. Life courses are socially constructed by social institutions (Kohli, 1985; Mayer & Müller, 1989). In western societies, children have caretakers, providing a home, food, all physical and many other needs. Their only major responsibility is attending school. The legal ages of adulthood, be it 16, 18, or 21, and the graduation in school or university marks a new phase. People now are

self-responsible for providing the economic means to make a living, to organise their own daily life in a home of their own, and eventually to care for own children. And then, again, laws and the pension system mark a border to retirement. It is the fact that institutions and laws define age specific rights and duties that creates various stages in the life course. This construction of the life course has become more standardised and institutionalised during the industrialisation (Kohli, 1985; Mayer & Müller, 1989; Leisering, 2003; Mayer, 2004). In the late 20th century, a counter development became visible with tendencies towards de-institutionalisation (Tyrell, 1988; Kohli, 1988).

How can the life course affect mobility decisions? It is likely that young adults, at the beginning of their job career, are more mobile than elder adults. Young adults are more likely to be single, not to have a family, not to have invested into homeownership. In short: They tend to have viewer ties. Therefore they are more likely to follow occupational mobility demands. Also a reverse influence is imaginable: If job mobility, for example, keeps young adults from having a family until a higher age, this would mean postponing the classical phase of adulthood to a higher age and expanding the phase of "post-adolescence."

The biography is limited but not defined by age. It is the individually experienced and subjectively perceived own life course. In the strict sense, the biography is a subjective construction of the own past, based on social expectations to be goal-oriented, planned, steady, successful etc. The biography is part of the identity. And especially the objective experiences shape the character and later behaviour (Kohli, 1978).

How can the biography affect mobility decisions? It is shown in research in Germany that prior mobility experiences increase the likelihood to become mobile again. The experience may reduce fears and teach skills how to compensate for the difficulties that are involved with becoming mobile.

## 3.3. Family background, social networks, and socio-economic position

Other concepts are less elaborate in their theoretical foundation. Therefore they shall only be sketched in their main outlines.

### *Family background*

A first aspect of the family background, certainly, is the *family form*. Having a partner makes mobility more problematic than being single, because a second individual, with own career plans and social networks, is affected and the partnership may suffer from separation. Having children makes mobility even more problematic. Also they are integrated in friendship networks and a school class. And for them, it may even be harder to cope with relocation or with losing time with a parent. In return, mobility may, for the exact same reasons, hinder mobile people from investing into a partnership or from planning a family. In the literature, also the thesis can be found that mobility promotes a job career, and by doing so, makes family foundation more likely. However, empirical studies rather support the assumption that mobility introduces additional burdens that hinder family foundation.

Important are furthermore *family structures*. In a male breadwinner relationship with a male fulltime employee and a housewife, job mobility can be integrated easier into the living arrangement than in a dual earner couple. These interrelations are already described in the section on gender.

Finally, *family relations* and *family ideologies* play an important role. Close relations and an ideology that promotes the importance of time spent together, certainly hinders mobility. In Spain, the Mediterranean family system also includes close ties to relatives outside the household who are met and visited on weekends. Here, the family ideology prevents relocation and fosters commuting, instead. On the other hand, weak ties can be translated into little time spend together and into spreading out geographically. Also the reverse effect, with mobility reducing the intensity of family relations, is imaginable.

### *Social networks*

What is true for family ties is basically the same for all social networks. Strong ties hinder mobility. Mobility may weaken ties. Grosetti (2006) confirms such a relation for France. Not necessarily a biography with few moves, but a long time spent in the current place of residence makes it likely that people are well integrated and have a big social network. It also is shown that only strong ties tend to endure spatial distance, whereas weak ties tend to break.

On the other hand, there is the hypothesis that through occupational spatial mobility

the social networks of mobile persons increase. This relationship could be explained by an increased number of contacts with unknown persons. However, this effect is not empirically confirmed.

Empirical research indicates that the causal relationships are more complex. Probably there is a set of various factors, interacting with each other: the form of mobility, the job itself, the extent of perceived external control and/or autonomy and the personal ability to maintain the network.

### *Socio-economic position*

For a long time, it has been assumed that occupational mobility would lead to social upward mobility. This may have been true in the middle of the 20$^{th}$ century. However, current research tends to disprove it. Occupational mobility is mainly rather a means to prevent downward mobility.

This is found, for example, in Poland. Most households, with a household member becoming mobile, can only secure a low social position. As an exception, only *well educated emigrants* achieve an improvement of socio-economic status. In cross-national comparison, Spain is an exception. Here a correlation of spatial mobility and social upward mobility is found. Two reasons are offered: Emigrating means breaking with a series of traditional social commitments, giving the emigrant greater freedom of time and resources. In addition, emigration involves a significant psychological cost, which implies the selection of the most capable (De Miguel, 1965).

An effect in reverse direction is rather related to education than to income. Highly educated people are more likely to be in professions with mobility demands. Therefore they are more strongly affected by job mobility. In Spain, the educational level stands out as an explaining variable, fostering daily commuting (De Miguel & De Miguel, 2002; Bancaja Report, 2005). However, in terms of relocation, in Spain, the effect is u-shaped: academics and those with less than Compulsory Secondary Education are more mobile than the "medium level" educated (Occupational Labour Observatory, 2005).

## 4. Conclusions

There is a wide range of theoretical approaches that can be used to study job mobility. As for any research topic, there is no "*true*" approach, and not necessarily one *best* approach.

Different research interests may call for different theories. And also within the study of mobility, single questions may need to be framed in a different theoretical way.

However, the project "Job Mobilities and Family Lives in Europe" needs a specific theoretical background that allows to develop hypotheses and to guide the design of research instruments and the interpretation of findings. And with its defined set of research questions, it is possible to choose such a specific theoretical approach.

Given that the project chooses to study job mobility in a very *broad* way, to capture preferably *all* forms of job mobility in several countries and to provide an *overview* over the main reciprocal interdependencies that link mobility decisions with the family situation and other social aspects, it is clear that also the theoretical perspective needs to be *broad*. Since very different sorts of mechanisms are to be detected, the theoretical background needs to *consider* a wide range of different mechanisms. Therefore the research interests of "Job Mobilities and Family Lives in Europe" call for a broad theoretical background, integrating several single approaches.

The project also chooses to collect *individual data*, comparing differences on *macro level* (cross-country comparison) as well as on the *micro level*. This calls for a *theory of action*. As a relatively broad approach for explaining individual behaviour, the concept of *subjectively expected utility (SEU)* is very useful. It assums that the individual advantage people are seeking are not objectively given; instead, they reflect the subjective *preferences* regarding the highest benefit as well as the subjective *perceptions* regarding the expectable outcomes of available options. By doing so, the SEU approach integrates structural and cultural components.

As an even broader perspective, also the concept of *motility,* is of major interest. It is less specific in describing the mechanisms that lead to an individual action. But it is more elaborated in identifying the range of influences on individual behaviour. Therefore it is a good supplement to the SEU approach: Whereas SEU describes the mechanisms of individual decision-making, motility provides a basic list of the conditions that individuals consider while making decisions. Also the motility concept is able to integrate the perspectives of rational choice models and of cultural approaches by considering structural influences (as access or skills) as well as cultural ones (as appropriation). Additionally, influences of (expected) stress or of (expected loss of) quality of life on mobility can be included. The concept of motility also integrates macro and micro level influences, which is crucial in a

project that claims to study individual behaviour (micro level) and, at the same time, to compare countries (macro level).

Although, as Kaufmann (2002) argues, motility might be a sociologically more relevant category than mobility, it is not the interest of the project to study *only* motility as the final dependent variable. This would also seem strategically unwise with motility being almost impossible to fully empirically capture. But motility certainly can serve as an intermediate variable; and its conceptualisation can help to identify potential influences on mobility. These influences can be part of the human capital (skills), structural barriers and incentives (access), the individual attitudes and perceptions (appropriation), as well as sub-cultures and cultures (macro influences on the formation of appropriation). In this way, motility will be the core of the theoretical model used in "Job Mobilities and Family Lives in Europe."

The theoretical concepts of *gender, life course, generation, biography, family background, social networks, and socio-economic status* can help to further supplement, to limit and to structure the identification of potential influences on mobility. On principle, one has to assume that the universe of influences on mobility decisions is infinite or, at least, unmanageably huge. The concept of motility reduces this complexity by drawing attention to specific aspects, such as the available means of transportation and the conditions to which they are available. Concepts like gender or generation do the same. They point out specific influences that have proven to be relevant in other contexts and that are likely to be relevant also for job mobility. These aspects can and should be used, in addition to the motility concept, to identify potential influences on mobility decisions. At the same time, they serve as theoretical framework for detecting consequences of mobility decisions, since they mainly describe reciprocal interdependencies. The same is true for theories of stress and of quality of life.

Macro theories, like *reflexive modernisation, individualisation, flexibilisation, globalisation, post-industrialisation or the shift towards a knowledge-based society*, may also be integrated into the theoretical framework, supplementing the macro influences on individual SEU-based behaviour. These approaches describe changes and characteristics of societies in the 21st century that are of major relevance for understanding the social interaction of the people within them. Mostly macro theories describe *structural* characteristics, such as transportation technology, economies and labour markets. In the terminology of the motility

concept, these can be implemented into the theoretical model as part of the "access." Partly macro theories also describe *cultural* changes and characteristics, such as the (rising) importance of individualisation and self-fulfilment (individualisation, reflexive modernisation, postmodernisation). Similarly to "mobility culture," these can be implemented as macro influences on the formation of "appropriation." Macro theories may, just like the concepts of gender, life course, etc., supplement the influences formulated in the motility concept by drawing attention to further structural and cultural conditions that are of major relevance for our societies.

**Bertrand Montulet**

# III. Literature on Job Mobility in Belgium

## 1. Preamble

Belgium has no tradition in the study of mobility[1], as evidenced by the fact that it has carried out only one national survey on «mobility of households», in 1999, while neighbouring countries have recurrently developed studies of this kind since the sixties. What little information there is of national scope concerning the mobility of households is taken from ten-yearly censuses and does not cover country-wide commuting home/work travel. Such data are generally used in a « transport» perspective (behavioural medium) rather than from the viewpoint of «mobility» (behaviour). Consequently, most Belgian studies apparently to do with mobility are actually about transport, dealing essentially with structural availability and modelling aimed at developing traffic control or pollution monitoring tools associated with travel.

This being so, the question linking employment, mobility and family life has so far never been openly explored in Belgian scientific research even though a number of research elements do implicitly provide some information about it.

## 2. Job mobility and motility

From a quantitative standpoint, the Mobel survey (Hubert and Toint, 2002) is the only one to date to cover the mobility of households throughout the whole of Belgium. At present, together with ten-yearly census data[2], it is the sole 'objectivizing' national reference when it comes to mobility. The data collected in the course of this work have served to identify various underlying schools of thought relating specifically to the mobility of Belgians. They form the basis of numerous studies and debates of the "Research Group on Transport (RGT)" of the University Faculties of Notre Dame de la Paix in Namur.

Aside from outlining aspects of mobility in Belgium, this survey does include elements of interest for the purposes of our present study. In Belgium, day-to-day mobility can be said to decrease with age, although less so among persons of a «higher» level of

---

[1] For this state-of-the-art analysis, aside from looking to bibliographical sources, we contacted some 200 researchers throughout Belgian universities and administrative research centres.
[2] The census data relate only to "home/work." The latest information currently available is still that from 1991.

education than the rest of the population. Moreover, women travel locally more than men. The latter travel less and generally farther (essentially for work purposes) than their partners.

This having been said, household mobility surveys relate little or nothing as to what underlies how families function and travel or spatial mobility for professional reasons having nothing to do with travel on a day-to-day basis. Apart from daily commuting, their synchronic approach is of little use for our present investigations.

From a more qualitative standpoint, some works do address issues of mobility, notably those conducted at the Facultés Universitaires Saint-Louis by B. Montulet and his colleagues. In his theoretical work, «Mobility: space-time in society and the world today" (Montulet, 1998, 2005a), B. Montulet sets out to identify various forms of mobility. His approach goes beyond the conception of mobility as a monologist variable changing only in terms of intensity (very mobile and not-so-mobile people). If one views mobility as how action is perceived in space and time, i.e. spatial and temporal forms, this approach serves to avoid adopting a technical point of view of the phenomena of mobility that would confine travel to a space and time perceived as "objective." More fundamentally, the author seeks to look at the social construction of forms that lead one to perceive what is termed time and space and, from there, to identify the forms of mobility valued in contemporary society and their influences on global social dynamics. This theoretical approach sets out clear elements to help ascertain the cultural context in which enhanced mobility and the emergence of this issue socially have come about.

B. Montulet develops a space-time theory which defines two extremes of spatial-temporal tension. On the one hand, there is «form-limit», where 'de-limited' space invokes a concept of permanent time. On the other hand, we have «organizing-form», where time is conceived as change expressed only as ephemeral, thus preventing any institutionalization of spatial boundaries. In this case, space becomes "extent."

On the basis of this spatial-temporal tension, the author defines four types of mobility linking time and space, that is to say, ephemerality and eternity (permanence) on the one hand, and delimited space and extent on the other hand:

1. "Sedentary mobility" combines delimited space and permanence. In other words, for any one person, it is the delimitation of (their) space that is the more meaningful. It is from within this space that he/she engages in activities characterised by their recurrence.

2. "Reconstituted mobility" (Montulet 2005b) combines delimited space and ephemeralness (time perceived as change). Reconstituted mobility is thus that of those who are still strongly attached to delimited spaces, but have along their life path been confronted with forms of uprooting.

3. "Kinetic mobility" combines extent and ephemeralness. Ready to respond to each and every new opportunity arising in time, the kinetically-mobile covers the space between one point and another, without any boundary or delimitation being meaningful for the action. Here, it is indeed the relationship to time conceived as change that appears to prevail in the spatially static. The notion is still ephemeral.

4 "Incursive mobility," finally, combines extent and permanence. Incursive mobility is akin to the kinetic functioning within an extent, but looking to time within in. The incursively-mobile "takes the time." What is important here is discovering spaces while retaining total freedom as to the volatility of rootedness. Incursions are made into it. Hence the incursive is enthusiastic about technology which can speedily convey one to new spaces perceived as an integral part of the opportunity, not as a medium for activity.

These space-time rationales identified by types of mobility can be applied to various metric theories of space and time according to the researcher's analytical choices. They similarly apply to all concepts where «space» is used metaphorically. The author thus reveals the homology between types of mobility identified in physical space and of a typology specific to the sociology of professional mobility[3]. «Types of mobility can also serve as a basis for professional mobility studies. With this is mind, Driver[4] establishes a typology of career choices whose homology with our formal construction of mobility types is striking.» (Montulet, 1998, 172).

---

[3] This type of homology can also easily be made with the couple types of J. Kellerhals.

[4] "This typology, which is the most validated among those relating to careers according to Mercure, also proposes four types of pathway. The first, «the transitional», which we associate with 'kinetic mobility', designates a path where a job or occupational field is never chosen permanently. A 'transitional' simply goes from job to job with no particular aim in mind. The second, «the homeostatic», which we associate with 'sedentary mobility', "applies to anyone choosing a job and sticking to it forever." The third, «the linear», refers to a situation or occupational field that is chosen very early on in life, but where an upward mobility plan within the field is developed and implemented." This type could correspond to 'reconstituted mobility' in that attachment to an occupational field is the first consideration, even though value is attached to change within the activity. Finally, the fourth, «the spiral», refers to medium-term integration in a given chosen occupational field, in a fairly cyclical fashion, through career re-orientation in another field of activity. » We logically associate it with 'incursive mobility'. Extracts commented by Mercure (Mercure, D. (1995) Les temporalités sociales. Paris: L'Harmattan, pp.111-112." In: Montulet, B., (1998). Les enjeux. Paris: L'Harmattan, p172.

"More pragmatically, the study of forms of mobility in space 'qualified as material' can, for example, help us to understand the norms of the more or less high value placed on technologies of displacement and communication in various social contexts. It can also shed light on the 'social mobility' of the actors. Grafmeyer thus observes the use of various forms of 'material' mobility by actors not having the same resources in order to ensure their professional upward mobility[5] (Grafmeyer, 1992). Concretely, some actors will prefer to opt for «sedentary mobility» rather than «kinetic mobility» to ensure the stability of their social status or upward mobility». (Montulet, 1998, 172)

The space-time perspective also provides insight into the particularities of a society. It thus leads one to perceive how, from a society where spatial delimitation and permanence were predominant in collective organisation, contemporary western European society has come to value a space-time relationship favouring the perception of time as ephemeral and the perception of space as extent.

Here «kinetic mobility» is enhanced. Adopting such behaviour thus constitutes an added plus for the individual actor in terms of potential for acceding to better social standing (Montulet, Kaufmann, 2004). It enhances the individualisation of behaviours through the need to reduce rootedness (be it in terms of «property» in physical space, or of the couple and family in emotional space). In return, collectively, the development of this form of space-time relationship favours the setting up of a sociality no longer based on the definition of durable social spaces as valued by the Nation-State in its structures, but on the construction of social networks favouring access to exclusivities for those knowing how to connect to them while excluding those not having the resources to do so. The corollary of this is that forms of mobility open up perspectives for studying norms of mobility according to social contexts. In this sense, forms of mobility can be viewed as resources for the actors in their various social games, whether it be in the «professional space», «emotional space» or «physical space».

Actors in whose interest it is to enhance kinetic space-time can be recognised by their ability to take advantage of opportunities, that is to say, by their aptitude to speculate on contingent changes and to take risks in relation to their present situation. This is mainly to do with their aptitude for mobility or for *mobilizing resources*. However, although this rests on risk-taking, it presupposes taking part in a game where the outcome may be negative. For the

---

[5] See also the examples of spatial logic among banking executives, with or without titles, developed by Grafmeyer (Grafmeyer, 1992)

prudent player, this therefore means having a stable enough guarantee so as not to be part of the ante (what is actually at stake). Herein lies the paradox: where the not-so-foolhardy opt for the kinetic, they do so only through the assurance of stable guarantees elsewhere. These "reserves," or *mobilizable* resources are, by definition, set in a duration and thus appear to be spatialised.

So it is that in a society where flow is organised, the balance of equity tips in favour of 'resourceful' actors because they have the potential to develop new connections at a lesser risk. Yet, given that the environment is ever-changing, the greater the number of connections, the lesser the risk of being excluded from the dynamics, even though all of these connections are not equally determinant. Space and time are indissociable, hence it is for the sociologist to uncover where the one is situated when the other is in the forefront.

"With talk everywhere of liberalisation and the opening up of the markets for goods and communications, it is interesting to note, *a contrario*, what is happening in immigration control. While mobility is being promoted, «de-localisation» outside the reference framework of the labour market or family is discouraged. Looking into the spatial-temporal workings would certainly shed light on the lines of reasoning underlying the construction/decon-struction of the European political space/area" (Montulet, 1998, 190-191).

On the basis of this theory, Camille Thiry (Thiry, 2004) examines the relationship between the «physical» mobility of the young (what is termed 'actual mobility'), their «virtual» mobility via the Internet, and their projective identity (oneiric or 'dreamlike' space).

She demonstrates first of all just how restricting a norm of «mobility» can be in the process of building one's identity. «We at times noted the same tension between actual and virtual mobility of the identity on the one hand, and projective mobility on the other hand. Some form-limit youngsters perceive leaving school as a break-up, a time when they must start «to live up to what is expected of them». They consequently believe they have to leave their parents, to «get moving», to open up to 'otherness', and to explore the outside world. This tension seems to depend on the degree of integration of the societal norm enhancing the organizing-form morphology. These young people have in fact deeply integrated the injunction (as conveyed by the media, peers, and the education system) that they «have to get a move on», but this deeply impacts their very nature. They find themselves torn between the dominant referent and their current lifestyle, and are thus filled with apprehension about their future which appears vague and abstract». (Thiry, 2004, 133)

She further shows that there is no determinism between virtual mobility and spatial mobility. The relationship between these two forms of mobility therefore continues being "hyped-up" by the system of perception, of representation, and by the life plan of each individual. There is consequently no determination of any virtual technology usage on spatial practices.

In the study entitled «Temporalités urbaines et organisation des transports», B. Montulet, M. Hubert and Ph. Huynen, delve deeper into the relationships between the organisation of time and mobility. For their research purposes, they conducted interviews in Brussels of the parents of children under the age of 12, empirically identifying five types of «temporal attitudes» (Montulet, 2005c):

- The «regular-as-clockwork», for whom the relationship to time is passive, where activities just happen with no planning required. The activities merely occur at given and regular times and never overrun the time frames allocated to them. "Run-of-the-mill" kind of people are usually either inactive or hold subordinate jobs.

- The «strict planner» wants to control time and therefore strictly organises and plans forthcoming activities. This is often associated with poor if any adaptability to change and unforeseen events. There is some degree of improvisation, but within previously defined time frames.

- The «flexible planner» seeks to control time. Regularity is appreciated, but all the while defying routine. Although activity planning continues to provide structure, novelty and change still remain a possibility.

- The «reactive improviser» constantly responds to a changing environment that presents new opportunities for activities. Mastering time means constantly having the capacity to meet all demands. Planning is therefore not something restricting/limiting/overly-structuring, but a possible scenario of dealing with constraints in time.

- The «impulsive improviser» rejects all time constraints that would stand in the way of what one wants to do when one wants to do it. All forms of programming/scheduling are therefore perceived as restrictive. Controlling time thus merges into improvisation as in the sense of being able to choose what is happening when it happens.

These five types of attitude towards time can be observed in both professional

situations and in family life. Any one individual's attitude here is frequently influenced by his/her activities. For example, planning (flexible or strict) is often associated with family life management, while reactive improvisation is frequently referred to, by those in professional executive positions, as an appropriate response to time in the realm of working life. Inversely, a person's generic temporal attitude may have them preferring or avoiding such or such an activity. The authors moreover show that, although a good many of those interviewed have a homogeneous temporal attitude (which may or not be due to the quest for coherence in the interviewing process), some do adopt a variety of attitudes to time depending on the sphere of life (work, family, leisure) being referred to.

For instance, one of the cases examined is that of a divorcee having custody of the children every other week. She explains that during the week that the children are with her, everything is programmed (strict planning) so that everybody's needs can be met; during the other week, she does not have to keep an eye on the time and is better able to address constraints at work, i.e. working late or going off to attend a meeting abroad (reactive improviser). Childcare planning thus becomes a structuring factor for professional mobility outside the space of the day-to-day.

Another case is that of a multi-national executive who gives up endless travelling throughout Europe to spend more time with the family. In order not to lose too much in the way of salary or socio-professional status, this person currently combines long hours of commuting with days of tele- (or remote-) working.

This research also reveals that all of the parents of children aged under twelve speak of how the child's arrival restricted their mobility, either because of the need to have to adjust to its pace of life or the difficulty of transporting all the 'paraphernalia' needed for its wellbeing.

The study similarly shows how combining work and childcare responsibilities calls for time (temporal) strategies. This may involve opting for part-time working, or the job itself can become the "adjustment variable" for family needs in the case of a worker free to organise his/her own working time. Tele- or distance-working is a way for some to continue doing a full-time job while not always being "at/in the office." As this particular study demonstrates, it is perfectly possible for a father to be at home during the day while engaging in a self-employed activity where some business can be conducted during evening hours.

This need for time strategies is often linked to «quality of life» so that there is more

time for family and less time spent/lost on day-to-day travel. This is in keeping with the wishes of men wanting to be "more active on the home front, especially as parents" (Fusulier and al., 2005, 224).

This line of enquiry moreover also highlights "time gender/ing." A recurrent theme in almost all of the interviews with parents of children under 12 years of age is that the female is "in charge of domestic time-keeping," whether or not she also has a job outside the home. She therefore has to manage recurrent daily events (meals, general childcare, laundry, etc...) not easily reconciled with rationales of improvisation - (see also Montulet 2005d, pp.3-24), as well as planning collective time (get-togethers with friends and family, and so on). So, what we see here is that, in addition to "doing double time," women have to adopt extremely diverse attitudes to time between the realm of work and home, while the man can "make up time" at work while resting on his partner's time management.

Positioning within the life cycle is clearly important in understanding attitudes to time. Most of the interviews concerned parents with very young children who were roughly at the same stage in their life cycle. The «impulsive» logic, present at the age of 20, can be identified among some parents who see themselves freed of professional and household obligations. The «impulsive» logic involving improvisation does not sit well with run-of-the-mill activities and responsibilities of caring for young children. Yet such responsibility is just one of the stages of a life cycle.

There are two further elements to be taken into consideration at this particular point for the purposes of our study. On the one hand, we can observe that the future spatial autonomisation of teenage children is anticipated when it comes to the choice of location of a new family home. On the other hand, for some, there is the importance of being able to have children when they come out of school being cared for at the parents' place of work until they can travel home together.

Finally, the links between attitudes to time and the use of means of transport were also tested quantitatively within the scope of this research. From an exploratory investigative standpoint, the authors manage to demonstrate not only significant statistical links between temporal attitudes and choice of means of transport, but also between temporal attitudes and the value and expectations placed on means of transport.

Other more specific research works also provide interesting input for our study. Serge

Schmitz (Schmitz, S., 2001, 2004), for example, has looked at the last remaining rural municipalities in Belgium. In his research, he observes a demographical renewal stemming from daily mobility possibilities as well as pre-existing local relations allowing for property and/or land to be inherited or acquired at low cost.

He moreover notes that «when they decided to live in the countryside beyond peri-urban spaces, most inhabitants living in national or international life spaces invest part of their capital in local relations». (Schmitz, S., 2004, 65).

He further observes that «residential mobility and change of work places are not directly a handicap for integrating local social networks unless they translate a precariousness (loss of security) that does not allow the person to integrate local social networks for relatively long periods of time. Nevertheless, the influence of residential mobility is marked via its effects on daily mobility. Choices between the local social networks of former places of residence and the new place of residence are made according to the strategies and aspirations of the inhabitants». (Schmitz, S., 2004, 66)

Through his study of the genesis of urban transport management engineering in the USA in the 1920-1930s, Pierre Lannoy (Lannoy, 2004)[6], demonstrates that the notion of flow is a social construction imposed by a corporation of engineers in their quest for legitimacy. His research shows how the acceptance of traffic management norms and instruments making it possible (traffic lights, semaphore signalling…) was difficult to achieve. By default, he thus shows both the importance of learning specific traffic-related skills and the authoritarian nature of imposing behaviours which to us today appear perfectly normal.

Lastly, in his study concerning the city of Charleroi, Sébastien Nahon (Nahon, 2001) stresses the value(s) placed on mobility and flexibility by the inhabitants who do not want to see their personal identity associated with this city.

«Others, inversely, refuse the past, defining themselves as opposed to their region, and willingly adopt a disdainful attitude to their fellow citizens, their anti-modernism, their passiveness. How they look to portray themselves is then telling first and foremost of the cultural break with the region, exaggerating their flexibility, their capacity to be mobile, to

---

[6] Lannoy, P., (2004), La mécanique des flux: l'ingénierie du trafic routier comme politique d'intégration. In Montulet, B., Kaufmann, V. Mobilités, fluidités,... libertés ? Bruxelles: Publication des Facultés Saint-Louis, pp.99-119.

live and adapt positively in all cities of the world. The regions they elect to live in are exclusively substitutable. Under the cover of a proud perception of themselves, and indeed sometimes a veneer of how heroic they have been, such actors flee from a world, refusing to return to their origins, as if in spite of themselves they had changed their identity in an intense confusion». (Nahon, 2001, 71)

## 3. Family functioning, family structure, family development

As regards family-related data, Belgium has an interesting bank of information thanks to the «Panel Survey on Belgian Households» (Doutrelepont and al., 2004). It relates to eleven waves of surveys conducted between 1992 and 2002 on a sampling of 3000 households. Although no mobility study has been compiled on the basis of this data, a number of research works based on the findings of this panel are of interest to us in this present study as regards « Job market » and «Quality of life».

There are no studies as such linking evolutions in family life and questions of mobility in Belgium. Three research works do, however, address issues closely relating to our present theme.

One such work, entitled «L'évolution contemporaine de la parentalité», by Marquet and al. Marquet and al. (2005) looks at the evolution of family structures in Belgium. What is original in their approach is that it is essentially from a male standpoint. Parentality (or parenthood) is viewed, on the one hand symbolically, in an attempt to analyze how the legal framework has evolved as regards the formation, functioning and break-up of the family. On the other hand, more practically, by seeking to elucidate the concrete means deployed by individuals at grips with what is at stake in the re-composed or re-constituted family realm, it places the emphasis on emergent forms of life (or lifestyle) and the problems encountered day-to-day.

While also working in cooperation with the above, B. Fusulier (Fusulier, 2003, 2005 a, b) (Fusulier and al. 2005) has developed his own line of enquiry into the conjunction of working life and home/family life. His research seeks to identify and compare, at an international scale, various models of working life and home life balancing models, by looking at the same time at the gender factor in the equation and the national social welfare or work organisation structures tipping the balance one way or the other.

Fusulier thus identifies four theoretical models linking work and family (Fusulier, forthcoming):

A. The cumulative non-gendered model: men and women engage on equal terms in the professional and domestic sphere;

B. The gendered cumulative model: one or other of the genders invests massively in the sphere of activity traditionally reserved for the other gender, with the latter doing little in the second sphere (e.g. women have as much of a professional career as men, but they also look after the family and run the home);

C. The alternative non-gendered model: the investment in one or other sphere is independent of gender (e.g. a man is just as likely to be at home as a woman);

D. The alternative gendered-model: each gender invests in a sphere not invested in by the other (e.g. men at work, women at home).

Unfortunately for our research purposes, although the author is particularly sensitive to the question of professional flexibility, the issue of mobility is not addressed.

Finally, the studies of F.Degrave (Degrave and al., 2002) provide input as to the institutional context of family help and childcare.

## 4.  Job market

Here again, although surveys concerning the job market do exist in Belgium, none of them actually directly link working life, family and mobility. Works have of course been conducted on commuting long distance mobility, but the questioning in this case concerns organisational aspects or economic impact. Furthermore, commuting long distance mobility (type 1) is generally considered as an epiphenomenon and its effects on the family are thus not examined.

A workshop on professional mobility was organised as part of the «Women and Mobility» conference held in Liège in August 2005, but the transcripts are not yet available. Some elements should, however, be of interest to us (Cornet, 2005).

A number of other works are also to be mentioned at this juncture. L. Thomsin (Thomsin, 2002) looks at the system of tele-working introduced by the company IBM when

moving to a site that is almost only accessible by car. This system applies only to a population of highly-qualified workers.

This researcher reports a saving in time as regards both work and family life and, according to the people questioned, this makes for a better balance between the two. As for mobility, she does indeed note a reduced mobility of workers at "rush hours," but a significant increase in travel outside normal office hours.

Claire Gavray (Gavray, 2004a, b, 2005) (Broze and al., 2002) develops her research around the issue of gender as regards access to the labour market. "Our findings confirm that the process of job market integration is no longer either immediate or automatic among the younger generation. Moreover, the data show that getting started on a career path is gender-related." Our research similarly revealed a progressive linking of socio-cultural, family, professional and human capital dimensions in the construction of life paths. Gender and relations between the sexes in society today can also be seen to impact in terms of employment. Our study findings show this to be so as regards the job market from the very outset of working life. Getting started in a job thus continues to be difficult for women because of family considerations, and initial professional opportunities tend to heighten or alleviate this factor. On the whole and in time, the gap in terms of positioning and resources widens not only between men and women, but also between women and social groups owing mainly to the persistence of the phenomenon of social homogamy within couples. A 'high-flying' career often continues to rest on one of a lower calibre. Here, the structuring and sharing of time reveal themselves to be major issues, both within couples and on the job market. While having diplomas can play a crucial role in getting a job, this is by no means as emancipating for women. One can observe that while a man is establishing his career, the woman usually barely manages to hold down a job - assuming she can - given the major hurdles facing women with no qualifications.

More highly-qualified women, and especially young mothers, like less-qualified young men, feel the greatest frustration and suffer most from lack of recognition. In reaction to this, but sometimes also proactively, they deploy certain "protective" demographic strategies in a bid to achieve autonomy and satisfy their aspirations for freedom of action. Such strategies confirm women in their position of social actor and somewhat compensate for the problems of family and job market 'negotiations'. Both groups are in some ways penalised because of the persistence of gender-related expectations and traditional balances of

powers between men and women on the one hand, and between the masculine and feminine on the other. Work and job market organisation is still largely the domain of men maintaining a clear separation between personal and social integration. While it is acceptable in certain respects for women aspiring to a career to have children, men do tend to delegate and offload their " care" duties as quickly as they can. Moreover, corporate employers do not always look favourably upon male employees, colleagues or partners, especially those in executive positions, sharing the responsibilities of fatherhood, let alone enjoying or finding an identity in this role. This can sometimes lead to competition between the different spheres and tension in relations between the sexes. This impacts evolution of the concept of 'family' and 'the couple' and the problems they face. Promoting an alternative model of the diversification of male/female commitments is all the more arduous in a context that exacerbates competitiveness, and where dictates of mobility and flexibility at all levels are omnipresent and not up for discussion. This remains true even in a context where men are gaining awareness of the illusions of the power of gratification of a job and where young people of both sexes are starting off with the desire to 'get the most' out of life, to have time to themselves, and to explore the many facets of self-fulfilment.» (Gavray, 2004a, 317-319)

Studies by D. Mortelmans (Mortelmans and al., 2006; Buyens and al., 2008; Heylen and al., 2006; Heylen and al., 2005; Soens and al., 2005; Kuppens and al., 2004; Mortelmans and al. 2006) on career development can also be of interest to us in that they help to identify the proportions of "job nomads" (Type 9), as well as bring to light the diversity of career rationales.

Type of professional occupation noted during the PSBH (1992-2002)[7]

|  | N | % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Stable occupation | 778 | 50.36 |
| 2. Job succession | 355 | 22.98 |
| 3. Form succession (combination of part-time and full-time) | 246 | 15.92 |
| 4. Combination of 2 and 3 | 146 | 9.45 |
| 5. Others (hyper-transitional) | 20 | 1.29 |
| Total | 1545 | 100% |

---

[7] Doutrelepont R, Mortelmans D, Casman MT, (2004), Onze ans de vie en Belgium [Eleven years of life in Belgium], Gent: Académia Press, p. 347.

Furthermore, D. Mortelmans generally remains attentive to the dimension of gender in his analyses. One good example of these works is given in the "Panel Survey on Belgian Households." Among the workers who pursued their activity during the nine years of the study (N=1545, namely 36.3% of the PSBH sample), D. Mortelmans and A. Kuppens distinguish "stable career paths" and less linear paths. Among the latter, they differentiate:

- *Succession of jobs: full-time occupations*. While frequently changing jobs is fashionable today, this is also telling of a labour market reality. This category is characterised by the transition to new full-time employment. Such transitions occur mainly in full-time occupations and remain relatively rare among part-time workers. There exists a distinction between individuals who change jobs once only and "out-and-out nomads" who had several different ones during the nine-year period. Professional nomadism is not always a personal choice. In a number of cases, there is a period of unemployment preceding the start of a new job. There is also a pattern of "new job-unemployment," where the period of joblessness occurs after the professional transition, showing that a career path of this kind is not always to do with a personal strategy of "forging a career." This category also includes workers forced to change jobs regularly for reasons other than personal choice. In such cases, this is not "professional nomadism" in the strict sense of the term. Other types of status sometimes intertwined here are unpaid work and inactivity due to a handicap of some kind. These are therefore transitional trajectories with a rapid succession of different statuses.

- *Succession of work regimes: alternation of full-time and part-time working*. The alternation of full-time and part-time employment is also a frequent pattern. This succession of work regimes usually occurs within the same function and leads to a succession of periods of full-time and part-time employment within the scope of a fixed/stable/permanent job. It is interesting to note the temporary nature of part-time working. A period of several years of part-time working succeeds a full-time occupation, after which the worker resumes a full-time activity. This pattern can be repeated many times throughout a career. Part-time work therefore represents a temporary strategy implemented along the career path and rarely constitutes a permanent form of work. Successions of different regimes can sometimes include periods of unpaid work. Often this status is combined with others. Among a number of the people questioned, the transition to part-time working corresponds to a handicap. The part-time job is then preceded or followed by a period of inactivity. This same inference can apply to periods of unemployment. In this case, the choice of a part-time job is not necessarily the result of a carefully thought out personal strategy. It can also happen that temporary part-

time work is not a matter of personal choice, but a solution dictated by a given set of circumstances.

- *Combination: alternation of different occupations and part-time working*. A small group of workers (3.4 %) combines changes of jobs and work regimes. They thus move simultaneously or successively from one job and work regime to another. In some cases, the transition to a new occupation is combined with a change of work regime. In other cases, the worker first changes jobs, then switches to another work regime the following year. These are highly transitional trajectories involving a great many transitions.

- *Hypertransitionally active*. Not all professional paths can be characterised by a clearly identifiable pattern. Such non-coherent professional types are classed under the category "hypertransitional paths." During the course of their career, some of those questioned come to have all kinds of professional status and undertake as many transitions as possible to and from the job market. Here trajectories have no clear pattern or main status. Inactivity can be due to a handicap, unemployment, unpaid work, full-time work, part-time work, the interim period between jobs: this category combines all possible kinds of status. Retirement is not however taken into account. Our analysis groups together these hypertransitional trajectories in a single category. This group is to be regarded as a heterogeneous one covering the scenarios not easy to categorise." (Kuppens, Mortelmans, 2004, 350-352).

Other works to be mentioned are those of M. Alaluf (Alaluf, 2004) and his team on immigration and employment which can be of interest for our study. Similarly akin to our studies are those de T. Périlleux (Périlleux, 2001) on the flexibilisation of labour, and those of P. Vendramin (Vendramin, 2004) or I. Glorieux (Gloryeux, Vandeweyer, 2002a, b) on working time and time-budgets, even though they do not address mobility issues as such. Finally, the «grey» literature (For example: Dries, 2005, Petitjean, 2001) also refers to studies very close to ours.

## 5. Social integration, social capital

In the collective work «Mobilité, Fluidité... Libertés?» (Montulet, Kaufmann, 2004), V. Kaufmann and B. Montulet et al. investigate the links between spatial mobility and social fluidity. They show how mobility has come to be enhanced, among others, through the confusion between social mobility and spatial mobility, and how mobility has consequently

become fundamental in social structuring.

«Since its origins, industrial society has enhanced social mobility, for it serves to found collective development dynamics on individuals' desire to improve their personal socio-economic standing. People strive to be productive in the hope of improving their living conditions and social status based on merit. This presupposes two principles. The first asserts individual freedom in the definition and achievement of one's plan for a better station in life. The second appeals to the equality in principle of individuals so that a prescribed original status can no longer hinder the desired social ascent. Paradoxically, this is an egalitarian discourse in the competition for what are in principle inegalitarian statuses. The paradox is generally lifted through the implementation of procedures aimed at ensuring an initial equality for the various actors. Critical sociology has often highlighted the inadequacies of such procedures.

The contemporary value placed on spatial mobility is part of this. Spatial mobility today embodies the idea of freedom. Through it, the individual would be free to establish the desired contacts unhindered by spatial or temporal considerations. This discourse also provides for an interpretation in terms of social mobility, where it is implied that the individuals most likely to occupy enviable social positions are also those ready to merge into a rationale of unfettered mobility. So it is that the contemporary ideology of spatial mobility confounds spatial mobility and social fluidity; in other words, it surmises through a shift in meaning that mobility in space necessarily makes for the fair distribution of individuals in the social scale. All it would then take is to promote accessibility to promote a level playing field socially. Through this confusion between physical space and social space, liberal industrial dynamics garner a twofold advantage.

The first is that it allows liberal economic ideology to develop by refuting all collective constraints seeing that, in this concept of reticulated material space, the individual would be free to be spatially and therefore socially mobile. Promoting physical mobility would thus be tantamount to enhancing individual promotion. On the one hand, this concept perceives mobility as a socially neutral process, which motility studies have denounced. On the other hand, this ideological concept refutes the social constraints and demands which *de facto* render such mobility non-egalitarian. Refusing to be spatially mobile – or being prevented from it – is in this concept likened to refusing to promote oneself as an individual, or dropping out of the social-climbing race. He who is immobile is a *loser*.

The second advantage garnered by the ideological dynamics thus has to do with the moral pressure that leads the actors into actually being more mobile. Individual mobility becomes an assertion of individuality. Mobility as a demand is consequently in itself continually reinforced, thereby fuelling the demands of flexibility expected by economic developments. The pressure of physical mobility complained about by the «highly mobile» is internalised through the individual claim to status-related aspirations. The tension between these aspirations and the 'hassle' of undesired mobility is particularly perceptible in the call for a "right to mobility." This is often merely the expression of a desire to preserve the potentiality of mobility of the individual actor. In other words, it is about «keeping doors open» in a social context one has no control over in order to assert one's individual freedom in regard to future potential, or to assert one's freedom to access the desired mobility. This interpretation sheds light on the apparent paradox of people who express their suffering at being too mobile on the one hand, while clamouring for a "right to mobility" on the other hand. The ideological trap closes, however, when the call for a "right to mobility" sees itself interpreted not as a guarantee in the face of an uncertain future, but as a desire to be more mobile. Under this ideological interpretation, the right to mobility will rapidly translate as new demands to be more mobile.

The contemporary development of mobility continues having responsibility for his/her destiny rest on the individual, all the while refuting the fact that social structures also come into play in mobility behaviours, that there are social constraints to mobility, and that the opportunities to evolve in terms of socio-economic status which the individual responds to through physical mobility are just as much the fulfilment of desired opportunities as choices by default. Mobility as the embodiment of freedom consequently loses substance.

Far from an ideological development, contemporary mobility is just as much the result of ever more improbable socio-spatial mainstays that impose undesired mobility as the freeing of mainstays to fulfil desired individual plans. They are as much factors of inequality as of equality seeing as they constitute a resource that is unequally distributed socially, while promoting access to resources unequally distributed in space. They are part of the processes of social hierarchical organisation and of social reproduction phenomena». (Montulet, Kaufmann, 2004, 291-293)

The most assiduous users of the potential for speed provided by technical systems are frequently people whose daily life is locked into multiple constraints associated with the

professional sphere. Their mobility is often a more or less direct response to the flexibility employers demand of their personnel. Their mobility seems more of a submission to the system than a desired way out.

It therefore appears that high-speed mobility, often regarded in literature as an indicator of the growth of individual freedom in our societies, are on the contrary essential for social and professional integration. These forms of mobility are in fact increasingly necessary for linking up the various spheres of life in society. They make it possible to combine a maximum of activities more and more disseminated in space (taking the children to school, doing the shopping, keeping up with friends and family,..), while coordinating work, school or relational timetables». (Montulet, Kaufmann, 2004, 288)

Technical transport and telecommunication systems, although saving time, do not free one from the social constraints specific to each sphere of life. They merely facilitate the development of «remote» relations, which are just a new form of spatial and temporal coordination establishing social links.

Furthermore, the development of remote relations, since the start of modernity, has helped to separate the various spheres of life (work, family, leisure...) and gradually effaced the social controls stemming from one sphere of life over another, which for a long time was seen to be a source of individuation and freedom from constraints. However, this distancing of various spheres of life does nothing in providing insight into constraints brought to bear by one sphere of life over another. This poses few problems for the individual when each sphere of life operates in a partitioned space-time, with the range of demands and of control being specific to each space-time (the demands and controls of factory-working during work hours for example). However, when personal communication technologies provoke the porosity of spaces-times specific to activities, the individual is forced to combine the demands of each sphere without there for as much being any spatial superimposition. Yet, the less awareness the spheres have of one another, the less these demands are taken account of. Consequently, although social control has lost some of its totalizing nature with modernity, the demands of spheres of life are, for their part, maintained. The individual confronted with delocalised demands often has to recourse to his/her own spatial mobility in order to respond to them». (Montulet, Kaufmann, 2004, 289)

**Béatríce Maurines, Estelle Bonnet, Beate Collet, and Lionel Durand**

# IV. Literature on Job Mobility in France

## 1. Job mobility and motility (incl. infrastructure)

### 1.1. Demands of high mobility of modern life

Exploring the literature on the theme should contribute to reconsidering the social inequalities implied by mobility. With a view to this, V. Kaufmann (2003, 2005) defines the concept of «*motility as the way an individual or group appropriates the realm of possibles concerning mobility and puts it to use*» (2005, p. 126). «Motility» is three-dimensional, and consists in «accessibility» (a set of economic and spatial-temporal conditions accompanying a mobility proposal); «competences», which depend on socialisation, and finally, «cognitive appropriation», i.e. the meaning that actors ascribe to the opportunities mobility offers. These dimensions «*occur simultaneously and cannot be dealt with separately*» (2005, p. 127). From that point of view, the literature examined reveals forms of social inequality in accessing mobility and informs us as to the sociological and psychosocial capacities it implies. No direct link is established between those dimensions, which are presented either singly or in contrast to one another.

### 1.2. Mobility potential or motility: the access to transport infrastructure

Eric Le Breton (2005) applies the notion of «transportation network» both to private automobile travel and to public transportation. Accessing transportation networks obeys a set of norms that sometimes turn out to be more or less costly, depending on individual economic situations. The cost of automobile transportation depends on obtaining a license, acquiring a vehicle, getting all the official papers authorizing it to be put in circulation (insurance, owner's certification, technical control[8]), upkeep (repairs, petrol), tolls, etc. Private automobiles are thus a means of transportation that poor populations cannot afford; public transportation is simpler for them and Le Breton stresses the fact that several surveys have «*established that using public transportation is more popular the lower one descends in the social hierarchy*» (p. 92). But though public transportation is doubtless an element of comfort, the poorest households live in areas where the time spent travelling is longest and requires the greatest number of transfers. Such constraints make getting anywhere a real problem. To that

---

[8] Mandatory in France, the « contrôle technique » means all vehicles must be checked by an independent and certified mechanic every two years (Translator's note).

must be added the financial expenditure: modest populations cannot afford travel cards and prefer buying tickets one at a time.

In the review published by Bonnet and Desjeux (2000), some of the articles show that far from destroying the social link, the automobile can be a powerful vector of sociability. V. Mondou's work on the urban zoning of Rouen (2006) noted two types of reasons given by those who prefer the automobile to public transportation:

- «objective» reasons, connected to the mediocre quality of service (overly long travel or waiting time, irregular hours, insufficient service at certain hours, difficulty of connecting from suburb to suburb)

- «psychological» reasons (feelings of insecurity - unverified, since the survey was carried out among non-users - and identifying public transportation with schoolchildren and youths who do not own cars).

### 1.3. Mobility potential or motility: the competences

In his analysis of how poor people relate to mobility, Le Breton (2005) elucidated the basic psycho-social aptitudes. Their social and economic situation has altered those psychological motor faculties that several of the Associations studied by the author try to have them recover: they need to relearn laterality, cognitive reactivity, balance, body flexibility, physical synchronisation. Competences such as those are just as necessary to ride a bicycle as to drive a car. The persons concerned also suffer from what Le Breton calls «atopy» (a difficulty in «understanding the meaning of a place, in sketching a useable map» (p. 161). To that must be added the fact they are unable to organise their time, to recognise and accept norms (highway regulations; buying tickets, etc.) and that they have difficulty in being with others.

Chevrier and Sauvage (2006) confirm the importance of these capabilities in the case of mobile international managers, but note they are less indispensable in contexts where the individual is well cared for (trip organised by a secretary, the role of travel agencies, taxi companies…). A consequence of the standardisation of hotel rooms and travelling routines is that having to confront the other is cut down to a minimum. International managers travel as they were in a «dark room»; the expression reflects the distance international managers want to keep with respect to the territory, the foreigner and the tourist. Thus a different set of capacities must become operative in the case of mobility, aiming first of all at limiting the

cost of work in terms of fatigue and stress (knowing which seat to choose on the plane, how to cope with jetlag, etc.).

Learning to socialise with different others cannot be taken for granted, such is the message of research on the training of Euromanagers (Davoine, 2000) or on international executives' intercultural experiences (Pierre 2001). In the first case, gaining international and intercultural competence is the aim of a three-year training period during which French and German students were diversely confronted to otherness. Differences in the way Euromanagers integrate professionally were pointed out: German graduates are relatively immobile nationally speaking, while French graduates are relatively mobile, in particular prep school[9] alumni. Also of note is the very marked geographic mobility of students belonging to the national minorities in each country. The research carried out by Pierre (2001) on «the identity profiles of international mobility» aims to show on an individual level how being an international manager or executive is a specific way of having an intercultural experience. «*Cultures and identities can become useful resources in social action, can be worked into meanings that multinational companies need to acknowledge*» (p. 53).

Globally speaking, geographic mobility as a competence is most often associated with the managerial category. Cadin, Bender, and Saint Geniez (1999) created a typology made up of three sorts of "mobile" managers: the "itinerants," the "frontiers," and the "nomads." The "itinerants" are professionals who constantly change companies within the same branch of work they have frequently experienced short periods of unemployment. The "nomads" are typically on the lookout to start their own business, often after several radical conversions, long-term unemployment or long periods of inactivity. As to the "frontier" managers, they shuttle between salaried employment and independent work within the same field, either simultaneously or successively. The category of «nomad managers» was picked up by Guerrero (2001). At the outset of her study, she hypothesised that new patterns of behaviour appeared during the 1990s among managers, in connection with the spread of flexibility. Such behaviour is spotted less in the loyalty towards one's employer than in the desire for mobility. Her research results show that French managers have fairly traditional career strategies, giving internal mobility priority over other forms of evolution (p. 3). Whereas companies prefer functional and geographic mobility rather than vertical mobility for their managers, the latter are more individualistic where their own careers are concerned and consider

---

[9] These schools prepare the entrance examinations to the « Grandes Ecoles », the elite establishments that dominate the French system of higher education (Translator's note).

international experience important to realise their professional ambitions. This is mainly true of young French managers. Among them, mobility is «*functional by definition, earning them more frequent and larger salary rises*» (p. 6). Overall, French managers adopt middle-of-the road patterns of behaviour, between the traditional and the nomadic career. Mobility is above all internal, taking place in the same company.

Spatial mobility for professional reasons is connected with the actors' desires rather than type of job. This form of employability belongs to «the new spirit of capitalism» (Boltanski, Chiapello, 1999). These authors described how nomad managers develop, working at various projects that end up by creating "employability" rather than careers, thus giving rise to the "project-oriented" paradigm. Typical jobs of the new era of capitalism correspond to managers, coaches, or other mediators.

For such individuals, work is valued because it allows a person to be flexible, and to become a member of networks (of people, of techniques…).

On this point, we may conclude with Bonnet and Desjeux (2000) that mobility is a plus and an opportunity for the more well-to-do, but it may turn into a prison for less privileged groups.

### *1.4. Mobility potential or motility: the appropriation, the culture of mobility*

L. Gobillon's article (2001) is useful for studying old boys' networks: having acquaintances on a potential site may (when moving away) allow individuals to obtain information about the local labour market more easily and lower the cost of migration by taking advantage of existing facilities (research by Bauer, Epstein, Gang, 2000 quoted by Gobillon, 2001). Losing one's social network in the place one has left represents a high cost for individuals and may discourage them from moving. The cost is higher the farther away one must go since it becomes more difficult to continue seeing members of the network left behind. Degenne, Fournier, Marry, Mounier (1991) expose the way that unemployed people find new employment, by analyzing both the role of entrepreneurs and the social relations mobilised by the job-seeker. The authors lean on M. Granovetter's theory (*The strength of weak ties*, 1973) and validate the idea that weak ties are more efficient than strong ones when looking for work. They illustrate the importance of studying actors' logics to account for professional integration in the labour markets, which are the same for both employees and employers. They allow us to understand how, since all the actors use their networks to attain

their goals, a system of rules emerges. The various statistical surveys studied by the authors show that the nature of the connection when accessing employment varies according to social criteria. On the other hand, the Survey *Jeunes* (1986) shows that: it is «the strength of their strong ties that count in accessing a first job for the low-skilled young» (p. 82). The study carried out among engineers (FASFILD, 1987) elucidates the interest of a «theory that combines the strategies of both entrepreneurs and employees». The network effect is important but is different for both sexes, «less efficient for low-skilled young women, and professional networks are relatively inefficient where female engineers are concerned».

### 1.5. *Mobility potential or motility: a resource*

To sum up, one observes inequalities in mobility among different socio-professional categories. Among the poorer populations, who also have difficulty accessing and using transportation networks, competences expected for mobility are lacking or not up to par. Managers possess the competences and a socialisation that make it easier for them to access the communication infrastructures and they usually can choose the type of transportation they use. However, these capacities are as much a potential as a reality. Managers can, more easily than persons in other socio-professional milieus, leave for far-away places, become mobile and move, become nomads.

## 2. Family functioning, family structure, family development

### 2.1. *Family structures*

We know of no research that bears explicitly on the various forms of families and situations of geographic professional mobility. In their report for PUCA (2006 d), Bonnet, Collet and Maurines provide statistical evidence based on their analysis of the "Life Stories – building identities" survey (*Histoires de vie – construction des identities*, MIRE-DRESS, 2003). The question «Does your work involve travelling that obliges you to spend nights away from home?»[10], produced a four-part variable (never; yes, once a month; yes, more than once a month; yes, at least once a week). Persons declaring they were mobile for professional reasons represent 16,75 % of the working population, and quite obviously among these mobilities, the irregular ones are more frequent (7,27 %) than the regulars ones (4,00 %). Persons who live in couples are more liable to experience these mobilities than those living alone (17,8 % *vs* 13,76 %). The conclusion was that persons living alone are both younger

---

[10] « Effectuez-vous des déplacements professionnels qui impliquent de dormir en dehors du domicile ? »

and older – it is true that the most mobile categories are to be found in the 30-39 and 40-49 age groups – and these persons in these age brackets who live alone are thus more likely to move closer to their place of work. The same report also gives figures for the number of children in the household and their age, but no significant correlation with professional mobility was noted.

Several French studies have been done on the question of non-cohabiting couples (living apart together), especially at the National Institute for Demographic Studies (INED) where, since the 1990s a variety of surveys have been carried out on the subject (Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1997), but the phenomenon is considered to be the first phase in a young couple's life. Caradec (2003) noted that as a conjugal lifestyle, it seems to be gaining in popularity among couples forming at a later stage in life too. Generally, family sociologists look at the question preferably from the point of view of couples trying to reconcile private time and time spent together. But the question is not dealt with in connection with geographic professional mobility. A paper read at the symposium of the AISLF-CERLIS in May 2006 did however report on the first statistics available from the Study of family and intergenerational relations (*Etude des relations familiales et intergénérationnelles*, INED-INSEE 2005), and it is permitted to think that more explicit interpretations in that direction will be forthcoming. Over 10.000 individuals between the ages of 18 and 79 were interviewed: three out of ten declared they lived alone, six out of ten lived in couples and one out of ten declared their couple was stable even though they did not live together (Regnier-Loilier Arnaud, Beaujouan Eva, 2006). The authors concentrated on the third category. They proposed to interpret it by comparing voluntary and involuntary non-cohabitations. The first corresponded rather to older couples, divorcees who wanted to preserve a certain degree of independence. One frequently meets up with the second among younger people, often students; non-cohabitation in their case is the result of distant universities or first jobs. The authors ended their paper by saying that non-cohabitation is rarely a long-term arrangement, that it is followed either by separation or by setting up house together. Non-cohabitation imposed for professional reasons seems to be a specific form among some dual-career couples, although the present state of the research does not permit giving exact figures. But the survey should theoretically allow a more precise analysis of the phenomenon.

### 2.2. Family functioning

If we consider the ways couples cope between their family and their professional obligations, various sources show that being favourably disposed to mobility largely depends

on their conjugal philosophy or on the rules of reciprocity they set for themselves. We will first examine research on the importance of family networks in decision-making concerning mobility, and then look at studies dealing with how couples handle job and family when one of the partners is mobile.

Hélène Challiol's work (1998, 2002) falls into the domain of personnel management. Its interest lies in the fact she examines the connection between being open to geographic professional mobility (transfers) and the reciprocity rules couples follow. The author postulates that mobility produces conflict as the couples negotiate their professional and family roles. Their reciprocity rules are based on the manner professional and family investments have been apportioned between the partners. Results of a quantitative investigation carried out among 153 persons show that reciprocity rules play an important part in accepting geographic mobility. In dual-career couples, where both partners attach great value to their professions, mobility is accepted if the individual feels that their partner will be able to find a position that lives up to their expectations. For individuals whose reciprocity rules require the partner to cut down on their professional investment, acceptance of mobility is limited by the latter's degree of involvement in the life of the local community. Finally, if the couple's reciprocity rules are based on both partners' subordinating their professions to family living, acceptance of mobility depends on the possibilities of upholding the reciprocity rules elsewhere. It seems, however, that in this study, the author assumed that the mobility of one partner spurs the mobility of the other, thus setting the stage for an «initiator» and a «follower» in mobility.

In the research Cécile Vignal (2005 a) carried out by interviewing mostly industrial workers who in the year 2000 were faced with the shut-down of their factory and the prospect of moving 200 kms away, she also insisted on the importance of family logics when weighing the pros and cons of geographic mobility for professional reasons. Basing herself on the results of this survey, she produced a second publication (Vignal, 2005b) in which she developed a four-part typology. The first two types are dominated by family logics, which appear more important than professional ones. The «migration based on family compromise» thus attempts to preserve professional and at the same time domestic and family integration (workers accepting transfers but choosing a strategy of double residence). In the «family rooted» type, the relation to their job is not the all-important one. Workers choose to be laid off, giving precedence to their residential roots and family spaces. The other two types are marked by the dominance of professional logics when deciding between being transferred or

laid off. «The cost/benefits of the transfer seem obvious here, since family and professional logics are less antagonistic and do not call for any radical sacrifice». «Career migrations» are thus central to the professional arena. Transferring opens up possibilities of upward mobility and makes one's professional ambitions seem realistic. The family project adapts itself to this professional logic without too much trouble. In the "project rooted" model, workers choose to be laid off. This choice is marked by «the opinion that there is a professional and economic advantage to staying put». Several options are then available to them: changing profession, preserving the spouse's job considered stabler or more profitable, accepting the conditions of the local job market. Vignal followed through (2005c), and was even more outspoken in this third article about how family spaces develop and considerably influence economic decisions.

Research by Bonnet, Collet and Maurines (2006a), on the other hand, bears on the consequences of professional geographic mobility on the couple's life together. Their study is based on comprehensive interviews and explores the experience of couples in which one of the partners is away from home one or several nights a week for their job. In point of fact, the sample was mainly made up of executives, company directors, intellectual and intermediate professions, i.e. categories likely to be on the move. On the whole, the authors note that the sedentary partners adapt to the mobile partners' obligations and that they do so as much when the latter are away (child-care) as when they are home (socializing together). The mobile partners essentially account for the time given to their professional activity away from home, while the sedentary ones (mainly women) juggle between their professional investment and managing the domestic arena. Despite this, the women explain that they like to do their own thing while the partner is away (going out with girlfriends, reading). The survey clearly confirms that men's professional mobility reinforces the traditional and thus sexual division of domestic and educational roles. However, when it is the woman who is mobile, she continues to invest, more than the man, in the domestic sphere, particularly by preparing for the time she will be away (doing housework and shopping ahead).

Already in their first paper, these authors suggested accounting for the realities of couples confronted by geographic mobility for professional reasons in terms of "family careers." The concept implies considering the professional, social and family careers of each partner, not only individually but also as they interfere. In two other papers published the same year (2006 b, 2006 c), they refined the concept by pointedly taking into account the couples' tacit or explicit adjustments and negotiations. Deciding about mobility and the various ways to handle their own lives can only be understood in the light of the couple's

power struggle. The paper published in *Cahiers du Genre* (2006b) gave the authors the opportunity to present a preliminary typology of family careers in situations of geographic mobility for professional reasons. The first type bears the strong imprint of the mobile partner's professional realities on the couple's mode of functioning, both professionally and as a family. The partners markedly differentiate their roles following the traditionally gendered model. Since the man is the mobile one, the best arrangement is when the woman dedicates herself entirely to running the home when her man is away. The second type leaves relatively more room for the professional self-fulfilment of each partner, thus revealing more of the constraints attached to geographic mobility. The third type is one in which the mobility of one is clearly felt as an impediment for self-fulfilment ; their life as a couple and a family, socializing with family and friends, and participating in local activities seem to win out over individual professional satisfaction. In that case, then, couples generally quickly put an end to the situation of mobility.

In their research report to the PUCA (*Plan urbanisme construction architecture*, 2006d), Bonnet, Collet and Maurines continued to explore the articulation between professional and family logics in situations of mobility, by paying more attention to the question of socially gendered relations. Geographic mobility for professional reasons is not experienced in the same way by men and women. The men's profiles bear the stamp of their strong investment in the job, with which they personally identify. It is nevertheless necessary to distinguish those who place work above all else (a more traditional model, where roles are complementary and the way of imagining life together not very egalitarian) and those who in spite of everything try to reconcile the professional and the familial (a rather more egalitarian way of imagining life together). There are also two sorts of mobile women: one is the woman involved in her professional career as deeply as her partner; in that case, if mobility is a necessity, it becomes a family affair. These women are in relationships where the roles and division of domestic and educational labour are very egalitarian. On the opposite side, there are women who, having strongly invested in the family and accepted to put their career second to their husband's, assert themselves professionally once the children are grown up and they are freed from their educational duties.

In her book of 1998, Yvonne Guichard-Claudic clearly put herself in the women's shoes. Faced with the regular, long-term absences of their husbands embarked on the tuna fishing boats for months at a time, sailors' wives construct their personal identities between the family and the profession. All these women must adjust their ways of being wives,

mothers and workers to fit in with the obligations imposed by their husbands' absences. Y. Guichard-Claudic also proposed a typology for the forms of identity[11] of sailors' wives: First, there are the "assistants" who conceive of their identity as completing their husbands'. They put all their energy into supporting their husbands' professional identity, with an eye to the family group rather than to the individual. They participate actively in the life of the community, especially to maintain their men's presence while they are at sea. Then there are the "stay at homes" who fill the same complementary role as the "assistants" but without taking part in community activities. The next two types however break with the traditional models. The «negociators» value subjective rather than objective memberships. Work is an important part of their personal identity even though they experience periods of professional inaction, mainly during the family cycle when the children are small. As to the "rebels," they reject objective membership to such a point that they don't even want to reveal their husband's profession. They value their own professional identities and lead two separate lives, between the times the husbands are away and the times they are home.

This empirical research on the functioning of the family in connection with geographic mobility for professional reasons is echoed in the work by François de Singly, especially in his book *Libres ensembles* (2000). While postulating that conjugal and family socialisation demands regular, day-by-day co-habitating, he concentrated on the degree to which individualities are taken into account in how couples function, particularly around the question of place of residence. Couples who do not live together on a daily basis create a lifestyle that highlights the moments of interaction, differentiating between the time given to other relationships (oneself as a member of other groups), and the time dedicated to the conjugal relationship (oneself as part of a couple). François de Singly most clearly espoused the theory of reflexive modernity in his 2003 book. From then on, he has defined family ties as being freely consented: individualities fully express themselves in inter-personal relations, in freedom and mutual respect. The fact of not cohabiting, for whatever reason (one's profession, university studies, or conjugal philosophy), is interpreted as a sign of greater individual freedom of expression.

Yannick Sencébé (2006) studies more particularly the lifestyles of people who shuttle back and forth each day because they live on the periphery of towns and thus of their place of work. She refers to the phenomenon of peri-urbanisation as reflecting a lack of a better

---

[11] following Claude Dubar's theoretical model (1992, « Formes identitaires et socialisation professionnelle », *Revue française de sociologie*, vol. XXXIII, pp. 505-529).

arrangement, typical of modest households (a detached house closer to their place of work would be infinitely more expensive). In such situations, people seem relatively closed into their family and home, which absorb the largest part of the family budget, their free time and their social activities.

There is no research bearing specifically on the connection between professional geographic mobility and the stress that it might cause in the way the family functions. We can only refer to work by psychologists (Robin et al. 2001, Le Floch et al., 2005) who study the perception of stress (subjective stress) and the reality of stress (objective stress) when reconciling professional and family roles. They underline the lesser perception of stress, namely thanks to the existence of a supportive family or a network of friends, and insist on the impact of couple dynamics in handling women's professional stress, especially thanks to the man's participation in the domestic and family arena and the fact he acknowledges his spouse's salaried employment. Le Floch et al. pursue the project, especially by showing that people in middle-ranking professions and managers are less prone to suffer from the stress due to the «family/work» interface than blue-collar workers and employees. These differences might be explained by the articulation of professional and family roles, the constraints of labour organisation and the strategies that individuals invent in order to offset the tension induced by stressful factors, such as professional mobility.

### 2.3. Family life cycle

Since Courgeau's pioneering study on the subject in 1985, it has become customary to think that certain periods in people's lives are more particularly favourable ones for mobility, e.g. the end of formal education and the beginning of working life, the unfolding of one's professional career which parallels the growth and evolution of the family, and retirement. C. Détang-Dessendre, V. Piguet and B. Schmitt (2002) studied the micro-economic determinations of urban-rural migrations according to the stage of the life cycle, paying particular attention to how professional and residential choices worked together. An analysis par logit models estimation of a set of data taken from INSEE's permanent demographic sample (Echantillon démographique permanent, EDP) in 1982 and 1990, allowed them to grasp the various motivations for migrating between the rural and urban for three age groups (15-24, 25-44 and 45-64). For the youngest group, it is clearly setting up house with a partner and the birth of the first child that increase the probability individuals will migrate, especially if they live in peri-urban and rural towns. But professional motives are also extremely important for this group: the younger people migrate to get training and because they have

had training. Those who became managers in 1990 are the most likely to have migrated since 1982 and within each social-professional category, the most highly skilled were the most mobile. On the other hand, for those aged 25-44, residential motivations overshadowed professional ones. They migrated for professional reasons far less than the younger individuals (15-24). But forming a couple and having children explain the migrations of this age group the same as for the younger group, and becoming a one-parent family or celibate once again quite significantly increase the likelihood of migrating towards an urban centre. As to the 45-64 year-olds, retirement obviously, but also the changes in the family structure motivate the various migrations. For all the age groups, the study noted that having migrated in the past increased the likelihood of migrating once again.

## 3. Job market

### 3.1. Social mobility and spatial mobility

Research on connections between social and spatial mobility shows that the relationship between the two forms of mobility is a strong one, but without significantly pointing to cause-and-effect. A recent INSEE publication (Baraton, 2006) shows that accessing the status of manager implies a change of company but also of department[12]. However, the meaning of the relationship between professional and spatial mobility is ambivalent. Is the change of department due to an opportunity for a promotion? Or, conversely, does a change in residence allow one to come closer to a region where there are more possibilities for being promoted? The question does not appear to receive any clear response, for professional and geographic mobility often go together. One can however hypothesise that the difficulty in accounting for why or how those forms of mobility are concomitant may be put down to the fact that these studies are based on econometric models. Their efficiency rests on their ability to convincingly show either correlations or that it is simply one variable among others. That is also the major drawback of econometric models, since interpretation is delicate, and often a matter of conjecture.

Aside from the link between the two sorts of mobility, authors have questioned what the financial gains of geographic mobility might be for men and women. Pailhé and Solaz (2001) show that women are more mobile geographically, and moreover have more to gain financially from it than men. However, such gains are small where professional mobility is

---

[12] France is divided into 96 departments, an administrative division of the territory devised by Napoleon Bonaparte (Translator's note).

concerned. The authors acknowledge the fact that these results do not sufficiently account for the importance of conjugal life. Their study does show nevertheless that living as a couple promotes men's geographic mobility but penalises upward professional mobility for women.

### 3.2. *Spatial mobility choices according to opportunities and requirements of the job market*

Towards the end of 2005, the unemployment rate in France was 9.5 %. Certain regions had higher rates than others. Comparing the unemployment rate according to region with employees' opportunities for mobility is risky. One of the reasons for this is that unemployment is very different according to socio-professional categories which, besides, also spur different forms of mobility. For instance, in 2005, the unemployment rates for managers and middle-ranking occupations were respectively 4.9 % and 5.5 %, as against 12.5 % for workers in industry.

The most mobile persons geographically speaking are regularly to be found among managers and the upper intellectual professions (and to a lesser extent among workers and employees, Insee, 1999 Census). But there is little research directly addressing the relationship between mobility and the job market. This must be compared to the fact that decisions to migrate are usually taken under the combined influence of many factors: economic, professional, family, or yet again residential… The impact of the labour market on professional geographic mobility can be approached in particular through studies more broadly focused on residential mobility[13]. Thus Gobillon (2001) analyzed people's motivations to move[14]. He showed that though migrations are related to employment opportunities, the latter are not the only factor that must be taken into consideration, especially when the migration involves short distances. Reasons for short-distance residential mobility are mainly connected to housing, professional reasons being clearly associated with long-distance mobility. Age too must be taken into account: geographic migrations for professional reasons are less prevalent after age 45, more frequent among younger people aged 25 to 29. Besides, as the author also notes, the effect of unemployment remains ambiguous: the probability of migrating towards another town (mobility is here understood as taking place within a region or between regions …) is less among unemployed heads of household than among those who are employed. Educational levels also influence the likelihood of migration: college educated household heads (B.A. or over) are more likely to

---

[13] Cf. axis 1, motility
[14] from a study bearing on the European Households Panel (1994-1996)

migrate than those with lower levels of education.

Debrand and Taffin (2005) also looked at residential mobility as a factor that might explain migration. That research allows us to deduce a few elements concerning the link between geographic mobility and the labour market. They used Insee's last five surveys on housing (*Logement*, 1984-2002) and aimed their analysis at two main points: the evolution of residential mobility over more than twenty years and the impact of structural changes in a household and changes in how they relate to the labour market on their residential mobility. Concerning the relationship to the labour market, several points were outstanding (of which several went in the same direction as Gobillon's analysis, 2001). First, one must note that over the last two decades, intra-departmental and intra-regional mobility has increased. Such mobility involving greater distances are associated with professional mobility whereas residential mobility over shorter distances are mainly explained by family reasons (the arrival of a new baby, for example) or by housing preferences. Long-distance mobility is also sensitive to factors such as educational level, age, revenue, number of persons in the household and dual-career couples. Being a dual-career couple thus affects long-distance mobility, in the sense that potential difficulties for an active partner to find a new job may often discourage mobility. That negative correlation between dual-career couples and long-distance mobility may well be compatible with the hypothesis that dual-career couples decide to shuttle but single-career couples decide to move. Pochic (2004) partly addressed that question in a study on managers' unemployment (and particularly female managers' careers). She observed that unemployed male managers living with a partner are sometimes made to give up the idea of geographic mobility when seeking employment, either because the partner is opposed to it or because the financial cost connected to her having to quit her job, if the family moves away, is too high. What is more, most female managers living in couples must sometimes give up the idea of moving, because their partner «does not want to sacrifice his career to hers». It is rare for unemployed male managers to follow their spouse's geographic displacement. Conversely, male managers' geographic mobility and professional investment are sometimes at the root of female managers' loss of activity (this is mostly observed among the more «traditional» couples). Studying geographic mobility can therefore hardly avoid analyzing gender relations at the same time.

The aforementioned works show how important economic and professional resources can be when working and non working employees negotiate their place of residence. In a study which also dealt with employees' residential preferences, Cécile Vignal (2005 a, 2005

b) showed the multidimensional nature of their choices, insisting on the importance of what they tell us of family logics. The author proposed a hypothesis according to which «negotiating residential mobility or non mobility does not only depend on professional and economic obligations, it includes family and residential logics that lend a meaning to the way individuals relate to a territory». The family is thus an active participant in the social changes it must undergo[15]. In her research she shows, that workers had to decide between being transferred or laid off. Finally, 2/3 were laid off, while a third accepted the transfer. Those refusing to transfer and move away were largely: «home owners or in the process of buying their home, members of a family with children, and over 40». Choosing to be laid off was also more frequent among the less skilled and whose partners also worked. The second lesson drawn from this study was, as the author pointed out: migration is made difficult by the unequal prospects of employees as to professional mobility. Moving is made easier for technicians, managers and certain skilled workers (all the more if they do not have small children and do not own their home). Third lesson: «the choice of staying put, migrating or shuttling between residences are in part connected to the way the family is attached to its home territory and to the type of residential arrangement (renting, owning…)». Deciding between being laid off and transferring is thus connected to the degree of attachment to the territory, the home, the kinship network. Sylvie Malsan (2001), in her study on the closing down of an Alcatel electronic factory in Cherbourg also found that most workers refused to transfer.

Vignal's results show the need to study the relationship to mobility and non mobility in a multidimensional perspective (residential, familial and professional), catching the interactions and tensions that preside over people's choices[16]. They also tend to show that as far as choice goes, a majority of employees prefer being laid off rather than transferring to keep a job, which exposes them to unemployment. The impact of unemployment on job-seekers remains uncertain and the research reviewed has not developed that theme to any real extent.

---

[15] Cf. axis 2, family fonctioning.
[16] Cf axis 1, motility. Aside from the work by Vignal relative to the forms of delocalization of employment, Alain Tarrius (2000) describes a study carried out on the migration of 20000 steel workers from the Lorraine region who arrived in the region of Provence in 1973 when a steel works opened at Fos-sur-Mer. The relation between geographic and professional mobility was mainly studied through the way the migrants managed their territorial and identity (re)compositions. This approach was also applied to international professional elites, of whom a certain number were in an upwardly mobile career strategy. Others however considered that being mobile or sedentary « is the ordinary counterpart of doing one's job in one's main place of work ».

### 3.3. Localisation of jobs within each country, spatial distribution of various kinds of jobs

The employment site is important if one wishes to understand working people's geographic mobility, which appears more significant in certain parts of France than others. The poles of attraction correspond in fact to the two main basins of employment:

- The concentration of the service sector and so many company headquarters in *Ile de France* (and not only Paris - the urban zone extends to the surrounding departments), the strong presence of industry in the North of the country. The industrial sector is more dominant in the North and generates in point of fact a greater number of jobs. It is also well represented in the North-East.

- The development of the service sector in some of the large cities in the South of France, such as Lyons, Marseilles, Nice, Toulouse and Bordeaux, which is clearly the case given the large number of managers and middle-ranking professions there ; and of young people, since there are several large universities in those regions. The large regional capitals are highly attractive, as much from the point of view of employment as for their geographic locations (agreeable climate). Departments bordering the Mediterranean benefit from a considerable tourist trade. Geographically, they are much sought after (as are those on the Atlantic coast).

Parallel to those very attractive geographic areas, other large regions look practically deserted as the active population moves away towards other departments or regions. That is the case in several Southern departments, in the Centre and East of France. These areas correspond to rural parts of the country which are less densely populated and whose population is aging, among whom a relatively high proportion of farmers (Hilico and Poulos, 2004). This is particularly true of the departments in the Auvergne (*Massif Central*).

Léon and Godefroy (2006) confirm the low pull factor of some French regions (Center-East and North-East) whatever the age of the persons surveyed. These areas are in the process of industrial or rural decline. The migratory patterns noted among men and women are similar. The most decisive factors to explain their behaviour are age and place (only the three key ages in the life cycle are considered in the analysis: 16-20, 20-30 and 55-65). As one might expect, university-age girls and boys arrive en masse in the employment zones of Paris and the other large university towns in the provinces. Once they finish college, these students migrate towards other areas to look for work. The industrial zones in the suburbs

typically show a loss of population at the time of studies and a gain of young working householders (aged 25 to 40). The small urban centres, especially because they have few jobs to offer, show a gain of population towards retirement age …

Brutel et al., (2000) analyzed the relationship between professional and geographic mobility, taking into account the size of the urban area from which the persons left and that of their place of destination[17]. The authors showed that the connection between the two sorts of mobility exists whatever the size of the urban areas but that it tended to weaken between 1968 and 1990. Moving from region to region became the main vector of professional mobility (changing urban areas then loses some of its influence). Besides, the probability of obtaining a promotion is twice as high when going from a small to a large urban zone. Since 1975, mobility from a small urban zone towards Paris has increased the chances of promotion, especially among the middle-ranking occupations. Unskilled workers also saw their chances for a promotion increase as they left for larger urban areas.

Mobility between small urban zones of various sizes is also positive for professional advancement. This is particularly true for skilled workers and employees obtained more promotions than those who remained in the «large urban» zones. All these different trends however seem to diminish with time, a fact which the authors interpret as being due to the standardisation of the labour markets within the different urban areas.

### 3.4. Alternating Migrations in France

In 1999, 3 out of 5 active individuals were working outside of their residential community (Talbot, 2001). Alternating migrants are ever more numerous: from 46.1 % in 1982 to 60.9 % in 1999, and the distance they must cover to go to work ever greater, on the average 15.1 kms as the crow flies.

The increase in the number of alternating migrations concerns mainly those populations living outside the urban centres. They also vary according to the region, being more frequent in the North and North-East (*Nord-Pas-de-Calais, Lorraine, Alsace, Picardie, Haute-Normandie*) and less so in the Southern parts of the country (particularly *Corsica, Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur* and *Limousin* where the proportion of people working in their

---

[17] The study only took into consideration salaried men and mobility between urban areas with fewer than 400.000 inhabitants. That choice may be explained by the fact that mobility towards urban areas of that size is more often associated with a promotion.

place of residence is the highest).

*Ile de France* with Paris and the Rhone Valley department are by far the most attractive from the point of view of employment. The Paris urban area contributes very significantly to the demographic growth of the department, but other large provincial cities are also strongly dynamic demographically. In 1999, Paris, Toulouse and Lyons were the three urban areas that had grown the most, followed in 4th place by Montpellier (Julien, 2001). There is a high concentration of population in the most dynamic cities. At the same time, these cities constantly expand and are thus marked by suburbanisation. Thus, though the labour force is mainly concentrated in the urban poles, people live further and further away from them. That is mainly true of the younger people and families in need of space.

Census data (Insee, 2004) show that 45 % only of those migrating between provincial regions cross one regional border (Baccaïni, 2005). Inter-regional exchanges seem to reveal a certain harmony or affinity between neighbouring regions.

### 3.5. The Centralisation of employment and career management

Though *Ile de France* constitutes one of the most attractive regions in terms of employment, it is also the most affected by the departure of working populations for other places in France. A study of the migratory balance (Baccaïni, 2005) over the entire territory shows that this region (as well as those in the North and North-East) sees more people moving out than moving in. It is mainly attractive for young adults (between 20 and 30 years of age) at the time of their studies or when looking for a first job. After 30, there are more departures than arrivals. Families with young children and retired folk leave, seeking a more agreeable lifestyle.

Population shifts concern employees in the private as well as the public sector. For the latter, *Ile de France* is the region most affected by the mobility of civil servants (Pauron, 2003). They are especially attracted by the Mediterranean and to a lesser degree the South-West. But *Ile de France* is also a pole of attraction for civil servants from the rest of France, particularly young people, men and managers. Paris and its region can be a first appointment, followed after a few years by a move to the provinces (towards a more attractive zone geographically or towards the region one came from). The chances to move, given the centralisation of so many services, are good and encourage the mobility of civil servants.

### *3.6. Mobility between France and abroad*

As to French working populations abroad, Switzerland and Germany are undeniably the most attractive destinations in terms of salary and employment, compared to other border States such as Italy and Spain. Luxemburg and to a lesser degree, Belgium, also concentrate a large number of French workers. There too, salaries are very attractive.

The departments bordering on these countries are in fact those most affected by emigration, which often takes the form of daily shuttling between home and work. For many other departments not bordering France, one supposes the trips are more on a weekly than daily basis, though we have no precise data on that. It is the case e.g. of Paris and the Rhone Valley (Lyons) which are the two non-border departments with the highest rate of migrations towards the rest of Europe (PUCA, 2006).

## 4. Social integration, social capital

### *4.1. Social capital and mobility types*

The themes known as «social capital, social support and social networks» are dealt with in sociology (of the family, of kinship relations, of social networks, and by socio-economy) as well as in economics, using the concepts of mutual assistance (family and/or relations), public solidarity, and intergenerational transfers. In this research, the link with mobility is rarely mentioned, except implicitly or as background information.

The employment problem and the problem of social protection that accompanies it have made sociological, socio-economic and economic research on family solidarity and exchanges outside the immediate family (with other kin) a totally contemporaneous preoccupation. Work on this began in France about thirty years ago with the research done by A. Pitrou (1978). C. Attias-Donfut (1996) shows that exchanges between generations can be very diversified and that they vary according to the life cycle and specific needs. But family solidarity also depends on resources and the norms proper to each social group.

### *4.2. Social support, social networks and social capital: Help through the financial support and the social security*

J. H. Déchaux (1994) wonders what the effects of family solidarity on social inequalities might be. He concludes that the effects on the three sorts of exchanges examined (domestic, reticular and financial) are systematically unequal. Kin appears to be a «*factor that conserves and even amplifies social cleavages*» (p. 89). The question and answer were reset

and completed in 2004 by the author and N. Herpin, and do not uphold the optimistic French interpretation of mutual aid. According to them, statistical surveys indicate that, on the contrary, it takes place on a relatively modest scale and they note an «*absence of redistribution of wealth among social milieus*» (p. 3)[18].

Family mutual aid between households is studied under two angles. The first concerns services rendered (Attias Donfut 2000), the second concerns support in the form of money (gifts, financial assistance... that fall outside inheritance laws[19]). Whatever the social class, financial mutual aid is at its maximum when the children leave home (Paugam and Zoyem, 1997), especially if they are under 25 (20 % of them are helped by their family, sometimes their family-in-law, for over 40 % of their consumer's budget (Herpin, Déchaux, 2004, p. 12). However, these authors wonder if such an amount should still be considered mutual aid or if the beneficiaries should not be considered as dependents. Overall, the results of the survey covering all cases show that financial aid coming from the family does not significantly contribute to improving a household's standard of living «*when compared to the amounts granted by welfare*» (2004).

Mutual aid relations differ greatly according to social class. Among well-to-do families, mutual aid is more a part of sociability, with an eye to protecting the standard of living to which they are accustomed. The key issues of mutual aid are the children's education and help for setting up house when they leave the family nest (Paugam and Zoyem, 1997; Herpin, Déchaux, 2004). Nothing is said about where these children set up house. They do not become independent very quickly among the middle-ranking professions whereas among the well-to-do, helping out is «part of their sociability». The authors conclude therefore that «*rather than correcting social differences, family assistance accentuates them*» (Herpin, Déchaux, 2004, p. 3). Among poorer households, mutual aid concentrates more particularly on cohabiting within the «extended family», in the anthropological sense of «kinship». These milieus, which are the ones that mainly benefit from public assistance and social protection, are also those where such exchanges are the least frequent. «Family solidarity is visible more in the fact they cohabit and in the sorts of domestic organisation typical of 'extended

---

[18] To account for this, they worked on three statistical surveys: « Budget famille » (Bdf, 2000-2001) bearing on the household's expenses and resources ; « Kin Networks and Mutual Assistance » (Réseau de parenté et entraide) to analyze sociability (Insee, 1997) ; and "Daily life relations and isolation" (Relations de la vie quotidienne et isolement, Insee 1997).

[19] Financial mutual aid remains a transfer, i.e. different from inheritance which is controlled by law. We could hypothesize that services rendered are more feasible within a spatial proximity than financial assistance, potentially further removed from the family geographically.

families'». The research carried out by Paugam and Zoyem is mainly concerned with the financial support that has currency in poorer milieus. It distinguishes the assistance that people may eventually be given (2/3 of the sample) and the assistance they actually receive (10 %). On the whole, the shorter the period of unemployment, the higher the amount of mutual aid: 25 % of the short-term unemployed (less than one year), 17 % of the long-term and 10 % whose jobs were of uncertain duration, were being helped. This is all the more true when the persons concerned are young. There is no major difference between men and women. The poorest of the poor are not those who receive the most help. Indeed, the «*persons receiving high amounts from welfare and those who do not get anything at all are those who receive the least financial assistance from their families. That does not allow us to verify the hypothesis (...) that private assistance replaces public funds. (...) The less well-off families also have the least possibility of receiving financial assistance from their kin. Reducing social inequalities thanks to family support, thus appears highly improbable*» (p. 194). After examining the situation of people receiving the RMI[20] (a State allowance), the authors report that it has not radically suspended family solidarity: 53 % of the persons helped by their families before being awarded the RMI are no longer being helped by them. Isolated RMI beneficiaries (bachelors, childless, living alone) are the persons least assisted by their families. Paugam and Zoyem stress the fact that the RMI «relieved a certain number of modest families, but hasn't altogether dissolved family solidarity» (p. 209).

### *4.3. The roles of the family and State in the transfers between generations*

French research in the 2000s often approaches the question of transfers between generations by differentiating between family assistance and State aid, as well as by envisaging their potential displacements or articulations. The question of mobility is only a background feature here. C. Attias-Donfut (2000) thus deals with the question of "public and private transfers between generations, looking at who gives and who receives in a family by separating private help, i.e. what comes from the family, from public aid." It is a matter of seeing, on one hand, if there are interactions between the public transfers (welfare) and private ones (family assistance), and on the other hand, of measuring their impact on social protection and social inequalities. The survey carried out by the CNAV[21], indicates that public aid and private solidarity are complementary and effective in reducing social inequalities. All public policy must uphold the family in the important role it plays in redistributing resources

---

[20] Revenu Minimum d'Insertion, created in France in 1989.
[21] Social Security agency in charge of retirement plans (Translator's Note)

among the generations, so that it can also be effective for employment, training and social protection.

From their study on «the impact of intergenerational transfers on real-estate options» Wolff and Attias-Donfut (2005) deduce that intergenerational transfers received from the parents (momentary assistance, donations, inheritance) have a significant influence on the beneficiaries' standard of living. The gift of money to the children usually translates as an investment in human relations; donations belong rather to the logics of patrimonial transmission. That is the perspective adopted by the authors to measure the consequences of transfers on young adults' residential choices. Transfers considerably increase the chances that at a given age they will become home-owners. Educational level, which reduces the length of time one can save up, has no particular effect on the children's residential choices.

### 4.4. Composition of networks

The collective volume due to Bonvalet, Gotman and Grafmeyer (1999) is important to mention here. It allows studying family spaces (familial and residential) along with the dynamics of preferential relations. The research started by an analysis of the «Close relatives» survey («*Proches parents*») and of 99 interviews. The notion of space has two sides to it: the space of the family and its organisation and that space in conjunction with residential trajectories and their symbolic connotations.

C. Bonvalet shows that a high degree of proximity between relatives exists: 1 person out of 5 inhabits the same town as their mother and one out of two the same department. Relations between primary relatives are the most central. Geographic mobility and urbanisation have thus not caused kinship groups to break up spatially. But, except for the mother-daughter connection, the closeness between relatives does not depend on geographic proximity but rather on how often they see each other.

In the same volume, C. Bonvalet and D. Maison[22] constructed a typology of «family-entourage» for which the main criteria were: declared affinity, seeing each other at least once a week and mutual assistance. According to that definition, 46.5 % of the persons interviewed belonged to a «family-entourage». The authors next introduced the idea of the «local family-entourage» for which they provided an operational definition: a type of family functioning marked by spatial and subjective proximity but also by the intensity of contacts and the

---

[22] see article C. Bonvalet (2003).

existence of bonafide mutual assistance between members of the same family who do not live together. This «local family-entourage» (living in the same or a neighbouring town) covered 30 % of the persons interviewed. There was a sub-category, the «semi-cohabiting» local family-entourage (i.e. who are in daily touch, 15.1 %). The «dispersed family-entourage» pools persons who do not live very near each other (16.7 %). Thus 53.3 % live in different configurations, 7% among them do not mention any relatives among their close acquaintances. The «local family-entourage» is more common among the poorer households who are not very mobile geographically. Women more often than men organise their relatives along this pattern. Whereas cohabitation *stricto sensu* between generations has become quite marginal in France, living close by and keeping up regularly concerns 15 % of the persons interrogated in the "Close relatives" survey (…) Such a family life-style is likened to «cohabitating at a distance» (2003, p. 16).

The general review proposed by Bonvalet in 2003 aims to show that functioning as a «family-entourage» may mean repeating the previous generation's experience but that it is not always the case. The situation may have been decided and accepted by the individuals, or imposed for lack of an alternative. Also interesting in this research is the fact that family history and residential itineraries were used to explain the «family-entourages». Extended families exist in many forms that change over time: «*The way a family organises itself on a territory, by concentrating on one place or on the contrary, by spreading out, is one of the factors that reveal the ties between relatives and the strategies applied in order to tighten or loosen them*» (2003, p. 11).

In «Being put up by relatives or close acquaintances», Grafmeyer (1999) indicated that one-third of the people interviewed have at one time or another been put up by a relative. This concerned mainly persons living alone or without children, who when young had experienced a very stable family life in a permanent home and who have become very mobile geographically and professionally, obliged to move around between regions. This is most widespread among people working in industry and in agriculture, and in «local family-entourage» configurations. «*Being put up by a relative or a friend is one of the possible ways of responding quickly to an unforeseen and critical situation*» (p. 169). Also, «*it is perhaps a way of adjusting temporarily unsynchronised schedules*» (p. 170). Besides, geographic proximity encourages two-way mutual aid: parents helping their children and children helping their old parents (Herpin, Déchaux (2004).

## 4.5. *Spatial distribution of personal networks*

However, concerning the question of the greater or lesser mobility or non-mobility of these populations, there is no information forthcoming in the aforementioned research in terms of spatial distance, commuting time or the differences in geographic milieus («urbanity», «rurality») that might provide explicit indications as to the role of mutual assistance, solidarity or social networks. M. Grosetti (2006) gives us an opportunity to touch on these subjects thanks to a real case of urban space, the city of Toulouse. The author sums up his question in the following way: «are we (spatially) close to our (sentimental) relations? What are the effects of urban change on relational structures?» (p. 83). He replies that personal networks are spatially structured, since 83 % of the Toulouse interviewees' relations live less than one hour away. The levels of «neighbourhood (district)» (less than 5 minutes) are termed neighbourhood relations; «sector» (ten minutes) and «city» (less than one hour) result in relations based on weak ties (colleagues, friends, acquaintances). National and international levels typically represent strong ties (family, close friends). What is more, «it is as if the fact of living somewhere, even for only a few years, translated into local relations in various circles (job, associations), through the neighbourhood or by socializing (evenings out, etc…) Only strong relations (family, close friends) stand up to distance» (pp. 86-87). As far as relational networks go, managers have the largest number of relations and long-distance connections and therefore a window open on wider horizons. It is they too who use the TIC the most. All these factors go into producing more social affinities, thus more segregated relations. In the end, the author confirms the local character (on a city scale) of social relations. «Mobility has a real albeit limited impact on the spatial structure of networks: what most counts is not to have moved around more or less during one's lifetime, but the number of years spent in the city or rural town one is presently living in. (...) The weakening of spatial borders in no way prevents the reinforcing of social barriers» (p. 89).

Kinship networks and social acquaintances are important in accessing employment. They may also promote mobility where the upper categories are concerned. Not so among the lower ones. In the poorer circles, relational and social networks are less dense and contribute to local integration and thus a more non-mobile outlook.[23]

---

[23] see axis 1, relational competences and socialization.

## 5.  Quality of Life

Here again, it is not easy to find research on the connection between spatial mobility and life-styles. This is doubtless due to the polysemous nature of the concept (Beaufils, 2005). Yet, local studies carried out by INSEE foregrounded the search for better lifestyles, to explain the arrival of secondary residents in Auvergne for example, or the fact that working populations quit the inner city for the periphery in Lorraine (INSEE, 2005). Debrant and Taffin (op. cit. 2005) also show that the quality of life was one of the indicators determining the quality of housing helping to explain residential and professional mobility. The search for a better lifestyle might then explain geographic mobility and conversely, a satisfactory lifestyle might dampen the desire for mobility.

But as we are reminded by Debroux (2005), in her analysis of the migratory processes of certain «workers» towards a «rural and isolated» space, positing the quality of life as promoting mobility means that «implicitly, the departure and arrival spaces are spontaneously perceived as being structurally different, the qualities and good points of one balancing out the drawbacks of the other» (p. 15). As her analysis shows, the migratory process may begin with a loss of stability in the profession, the couple or the family. For the author, the attraction of the new place is in large part due to the migrants' personal and family history. The place of arrival is thus a «referential space» for migrants when it represents their ancestors and family's history. It is also perceived as a «founding space» «because [he] lived there as an adult, the important biographical events of his life (together with a partner, separation, birth of the children …)» (p. 22). It is quite often such a biographical link that explains the desire to leave. One may then wonder about the role of the quality of life in migratory itineraries. Josette Debroux's analysis gives the impression that she is exclusively concerned with the premises of mobility, contributing to launch the process when one's present situation begins to break down.

Sencebé's research (2004) on the Diois deals with the diversity of forms of membership and of the territorial dynamics produced by the fact that populations who live there for different reasons and do not share the same representations and were or were not previously involved in migratory processes, meet in the same space . To deal with this, the author devises «membership configurations» that help us understand the implicit or explicit relationship between mobile and non-mobile populations and the concept of quality of life. For certain populations, the question of the quality of life is not raised as such, while for others it is one of their expectations and thus an object of choice and strategy. Seen from this

angle, the figure of «immersion» is a relation to space defining a type of membership called attached, implying a non-reciprocal dependence on place and personal ties (the country person who rejects the neo-rurals). The figure of «distancing» is a form of belonging to a space called engaged, it involves persons in the process of migration who have chosen to live on this territory. That figure rests on the bridge between "here and elsewhere." The figure of «dissociation» constitutes a relationship with space that translates into a form of belonging as a tension between being engaged in social places (family and occupation) built up elsewhere and one's attachment to the place one was born. Finally, the author presents the figure of «exteriority» as being a relationship to space that carries with it a form of belonging that is unstable (all this is only an elsewhere in limbo) (pp. 24, 25, 28).

From a psychological perspective, Rascle's work (2001) can also contribute to thinking in terms of quality of life. Inspired by the transactional theory of stress, she shows that adjusting individually to professional change depends on various factors among which «social resources» (perceived social support) are all-important. With this, we are thrown back to elements presented earlier through the work of Robin on one hand and Lefloch on the other[24]. Though this analysis excludes persons having experienced geographic mobility, it underlines the need to take into account the various «individual resources» in order to grasp the meaning of quality of life.

---

[24] See family functioning, family structure, family development

**Silvia Ruppenthal, Ruth Limmer, and Wolfgang Bonß**

# V. Literature on Job Mobility in Germany

# 1. Job Mobility in Germany

This section addresses general aspects of occupational mobility in Germany. These aspects include political structures, the actual job market-related mobility, the extent of mobile living arrangements, the necessity for mobility based on economic conditions as well as the mobility culture in Germany.

## 1.1. Basic political conditions: Demand for more mobility

When we look at political and societal development, it appears that the mobility demands on workers have increased. This increase is visible worldwide and especially in Europe and consequently in Germany as well. From a political point of view, the barriers to mobility should be decreased on the international level in the course of European unity and social cohesion as well as international migration should be enhanced[25]. Increased job mobility would essentially help contribute to cultural integration, competitiveness on the world market and the dismantling of social inequality. Employees should follow the flow of money, goods and other transfers to allow for an optimal allocation of workers (for the legal basis of the European job market see Berthold & Neumann, 2004). Highly-qualified workers and management personnel as carriers of knowledge and specific cultures are to strengthen the economy in a knowledge based society on a European level. Concomitant problems, for instance the differences in educational degrees, will thus become an ever more important topic and must be reduced (about inequality and non-transparency of educational degrees in the European Union see, for example, List, 1996 or the anthology of Mytzek & Schömann, 2004).

As on the European level, German politics likewise tries to support job market mobility. For the most part, the debate about the necessity for more mobility in the job market substantially focuses on the process of equalisation between east and west and the problem of unemployment[26]. The current opinion is that we can fight unemployment in particular by changing jobs (Zühlke, 2000) and by increased inter-regional mobility (Büchel, Frick, & Witte, 2002). Instead, for instance, the basic conditions for the unemployed were altered. To

---

[25] For example, in 2002 the program *Skills and Mobility* was created European wide.
[26] Of importance are the factors: geographic mobility, change of occupation, change of employer.

achieve this goal, the sum of 180 million Euro allocated to unemployment offices for "mobility assistance" in 2003 has almost doubled compared to 2001. Comparing these two years, we find that the number of persons, who used this support has also increased by about 75% to 290,000. This increased use of support is also related to the changed criteria of burden. According to the new guidelines, unemployed persons can basically be required to either move, have dual households or commute up to 2.5 hours daily (for full time positions) when starting a new job. Exceptions can only be made for the care of children or other family members.

A special issue with respect to the basic economic conditions of job mobility is the travel expense tax write-off[27]. This so called 'Pendlerpauschale' compensates for travel expenses between home and regular place of work and can be claimed on tax returns. For each full kilometre driven, employees can claim 0.30 Euro on their tax returns. Starting in 2007, however, this tax break will only be granted for travel distances over 20 kilometres. National savings are the goal of this change. An additional regulation that provides financial compensation for expenses with respect to certain living arrangements is the tax reduction for dual households. A result of this reduction is relief for people who live, for instance, in a long distance relationship.

Despite these attempts to enhance mobility, specific barriers to mobility are disappearing only very slowly in Germany. One barrier is rooted in the educational system of the states of the Federal Republic of Germany. During university studies, it is, for example, difficult for students to change from one state university system to another because of different curriculum and examination requirements; teachers, in particular, are strongly limited in their mobility because of different degree requirements and educational systems.

Whether occupational mobility has actually increased in West Germany is debatable at least based on empirical data (see Büchel, Frick, & Witte, 2002). Whereas Haas sees a clear rise in regional mobility between 1980 and 1995 (2000), Erlinghagen failed to see an increase in job market mobility based on his study of IAB workers panel (2002)[28]. With respect to the European job market Berthold and Neumann also conclude that occupational mobility in

---

[27] The write off is regulated by Article 9 Sec 1 Para 3 No 4 of the German Tax Code (Einkommenssteuergesetz (EStG) § 9 Abs. 1 Satz 3 Nr. 4)

[28] To compare these studies, we must distinguish between the different forms of occupational mobility. Haas examines interregional job fluctuation, whereas Erlinghagen looks at the fluctuation between business, job security and frequency of individual redundancy.

Europe has remained on the same low level (2002). Only 2% of European workers work in another EU country (Tassinopoulos & Werner, 1999, p. 6 cited in Berthold & Neumann, 2004).

Little is known about the extent and the different types of mobility in Germany. Based on the results of the Microcensus and the German Socio-Economic Panel (SOEP) Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel assume that every sixth worker between the age of 20 and 59 is occupationally mobile either as a long distance commuter, or vari-mobile person[29], or residentially mobile worker or shuttle or lives in a long distance relationship. This number corresponds to 16% of the working population in this age (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b, p. 55ff.). Within this group, long distance relationships make up 5%, the most frequent life style followed by long distance commuting (4%) the second most frequent. The portion of the vari-mobiles is 3% and shuttles and residentially mobile 2% each. In contrast, 45% of immobile persons have lived in the same place or region since birth.

Social science research has also focused special attention on cross-border mobility. This mobility behaviour has been analyzed from the perspective of transportation studies as well as in the context of migration research (see Kreutzer & Roth, 2006; Verwiebe & Mueller, 2006; Weiß, 2005). In the last few years, commuter streams and obstacles for commuters along inner European national borders have been investigated within the project "Cross-Border Commuting in the EU: Obstacles and Barriers" (CROBOCOB)[30]. In Germany, 9 % of all workers are foreign nationals, the largest portion of whom originates however from none-EU or none-EU associated countries, the so-called Drittstaaten. In Germany, workers from European Union countries comprise 3 % of the domestic work force (Janssen, 2002, p. 26). With its 78,000 EU workers, Germany is thus the second most important host country for cross-border commuters that pay into the social welfare system, preceded only by Switzerland. Although this cross-border exchange activity is substantial in the border regions, it is nevertheless insignificant for Germany as a whole even after the opening of national borders. As in the rest of Europe, the job market in Germany continues to be dominated by native workers. Mobility barriers noted in the research include: differences in the social welfare systems (for example different types of health insurance coverage, unemployment

---

[29] Vario mobile are people with varying job related mobility demands. The duration of absence form home and their place of work change constantly. They are for example consultants, stewards, stewardesses or truckers. Shuttles have a second residence near work and return home on weekends.

[30] The six borders investigated are Finland/Sweden, Sweden/Denmark, Denmark/Germany, Germany/Netherlands, the Netherlands/Belgium and Italy/France.

benefits as well as pension rights); differences in tax systems and assessment practices; differences in educational systems, making comparisons between educational degrees problematical; inadequate knowledge of the language of the host country; inadequate and inaccessible information about cross-border job markets, cultural differences and prejudices as well as mental barriers ("border in the heads") to name just a few (Janssen & van the Velde, 2003, p. 31ff.).

## 1.2. Economic basic conditions: Increased demand for mobile workers

The transition from an industrial to a service society has had far-reaching consequences on the demand for workers by individual companies. Highly complex production processes and research areas that require specific know-how, increasing technological innovation and shorter product life cycles have all led to a continuous demand for highly qualified skilled workers. Less qualified and older workers are increasingly required to undergo additional training. Other workers are forced to switch jobs because of the pressures of quickly evolving occupational fields (Kraemer & Bittlingmayer, 2001). Increasing globalisation reinforce this process of change in the workplace. In particular, companies that operate globally look for competencies that are linked to mobility such as language skills or knowledge of foreign markets and cultures (Winkelmann, 2002).

According to a 2002 study by the management consultant firm Pricewaterhouse Coopers, 47% of the European business enterprises interviewed indicate that their demand for mobile workers will rise and 22% even expect a strong increase (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2002). In qualitative interviews, personnel managers of the Deutsche Bank AG stress the essentiality of the mobility experience for their employees, in order to shape business culture and to train their workers to be flexible and farsighted. Here we are not simply dealing with work-related travel. Employees are not simply sent back and forth from the main company office. Instead their movement has a "multi-lateral" dimension, as workers carry out responsibilities in several sequential stations along their career path. In particular, these mobility requirements are addressed to highly-qualified specialists and management personnel and directed towards mobile workers within Germany (Paulu, 2001, p. 4)[31].

The increased demand of the German economy for mobile workers can also be seen in

---

[31] Overall, the banking sector exhibits a lesser tendency towards global mobility. International markets are predominantly managed by local employees. This point is underscored by the study of Beaverstock, which examined the 20 largest London banks with international operations (according to Paulu 2001, p. 4).

the debate about the "Green Card" in Germany. Due to a striking lack of IT specialists, many business enterprises tried to bring workers from countries outside the European Union into the job market. The German Green Card regulations, a far more rigid regulatory measure than its namesake, the American Green Card, went into effect in August 2001. At the end of September 2001, nearly 10,000 workers from outside the European Union had started jobs in Germany (Werner, 2002).

To determine the number of internationally mobile and highly qualified skilled workers in firms, the IZA International Employer Survey 2000 was conducted[32]. These data reveal that 39% of the firms in Germany employ highly qualified foreign workers. The portion of these workers with respect to the total number of all highly qualified workers is 9%[33]. Two different hypotheses build the foundation for an analysis of reasons to employ foreign workers. According to the substitution hypothesis, companies need foreign workers because there is a lack of skilled workers in the area and personnel has to be found elsewhere. According to the complementary hypothesis, companies seek foreign workers because they add special skills. The reasons for hiring highly skilled foreign workers as stated by the companies speak for the complementary hypothesis. As the companies themselves claim, they hire foreign workers because of their good English language skills or their knowledge of foreign markets (Winkelmann, 2002, p. 290 f.).

Wolters regards the migration of highly-qualified workers in a somewhat different perspective. One goal of his studies is to compare the relation of production factors of "high-skilled labour" to the production factor of capital. One result of the study is that the direct investments in Germany are a regulating factor for the migration of highly-qualified workers into Germany (Wolter, 1997, p. 246). In a later essay entitled "From the enterprise-internal to the enterprise-induced migration of high skilled workers in Europe," Wolters ends with the statement that the current view of business enterprises contributing to mobility through internal job markets is outdated. Rather migration is no longer bound to a single firm and its branch offices. "High-skilled labour" is consequentially developing into a production factor independent of location, since it no longer depends on the branch system of its own employer

---

[32] This project was carried out in cooperation with the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung) as well as the IZA. The survey included 850 companies, 340 companies headquartered in Germany, 170 in France with a corresponding number in both Great Britain and the Netherlands (Winkelmann 2002, p. 287).

[33] The rounded portions for other countries are: France 34% and 11%; Great Britain 50% and 11%, Netherlands 33% and 17%) (Winkelmann 2002, p. 289)

(Wolter, 1997, p. 53).

### *1.3. Mobility culture in Germany*

Mobility culture is understood here as the sum of attitudes towards and the collectively shared experiences regarding mobility. These attitudes are formed, among others, by generally accepted norms, Leitbilder of mobility, structures that favour or hinder mobility, existent phenomenology of mobile living arrangements, the spread and the dynamic of mobility and the demands to become mobile. These experiences can be, on the one hand, characteristic for the whole society. On the other hand, it is assumed that, in different environments, occupational groups, generations and regions, there is a specific mobility culture, which leads to different evaluations of mobility. These different mobility cultures can in turn influence the decision for different mobile and/or immobile ways of life.

A systematic analysis of the interrelations between mobility culture and mobility in Germany is for the most part lacking. Within the context of research on traffic mobility, however, studies do attempt to come to an explicit understanding of 'mobility culture'. They examine, for instance, attitudes towards using different means of transportation, environmental awareness, the socialisation process by parents and the influence of road safety training in schools and kindergartens (see Kohler, 2002; Mobiplan-Projektkonsortium, 2002; Schulz, 2003; Tully, 1999).

Nevertheless, we can derive certain assumptions about mobility culture in Germany from numerous studies on mobility and mobility acceptance. A recent survey conducted in the job market section of the internet site meinestadt.de in spring 2006 reveals details about the willingness of job seekers to move or to commute. Approximately 10,000 job seekers were interviewed. Only about 28% of them were willing to move to get a new job. The willingness to commute is also low. Of those interviewed, 25% would commute up to 50 km and 10% farther than 70 km. (allesklar.com AG, 2006)

The German Ageing Survey (Deutscher Alterssurvey) gives us an impression of the degree to which Germans feel bound to their hometowns. Of the 40 to 54 year-olds, 48% live in the same place as their parents and only 17% live more than two hours away from their parents (Kohli, Kühnemund, Motel, & Szydlik, 2000, p. 186). Furthermore, only every sixth person of this generation has made a long distance move at least once. The German Socio-Economic Panel supplies similar data. According to their own information, 45% of the 20 to

59 year-olds have lived in the same place and/or in the same region as their parents since birth (Schneider, 2005, p. 118). A study by the research institute for regulatory policy (Forschungsinstitut für Ordnungspolitik) (FIO)) reflects the same attitude to stay within a familiar social and spatial environment. Mobility and job rotations within a region are acceptable; mobility beyond the borders of one's own region is, however, rejected. These findings seem to be the result of and proof for a "mobility culture," which is more in line with immovability than change. The familiar circle of friends and acquaintances, the well-known paths, club memberships, leisure-time facilities, etc. ought to remain the same. "In Germany, the sense of departure means to be able to come home again," whereas in the USA, for example, leaving home is based on the idea of a new beginning and adventure (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b, p. 21).

The unwillingness to accept mobility can also be detected in an evaluation of personal life style by the mobile persons themselves. Data suggest that job-related spatial mobility is not the norm and does not set the standard for everyday actions and personal conduct. Mobile persons themselves consider their way of life as deviation from the norm. This personal assessment applies in particular to residentially mobile workers and to shuttles (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a, p. 240ff.). The fact that mobility itself is actually not positively evaluated or honored as an individual achievement becomes clear from the reactions of the social environment of mobile persons. According to their personal experience, mobile persons meet with a lack of understanding, pity, or even reproaches about their way of life. These expressions are a reaction to the failure (or inability) of mobile individuals to fulfill their required roles as friends, and family or community members (see ibid, p. 246ff.).

This rather negative connotation of mobility and the strong hometown roots could offer an explanation for the fact that, even in the case of unemployment, mobility is only understood to a limited extent as a necessary option. Thus, in a 1995 survey by the Allensbach institute for demographics (Institut für Demoskopie Allensbach), only 31% of those interviewed agreed to the following statement: "which changes are reasonable for unemployed persons in order to get a job? Reasonable changes are, [...] that the person changes his/her residence" (Meier, 1998, p. 21)[34]. Also in a recent interview of unemployed persons by the Institute for Employment Research of the Federal Employment Agency

---

[34] In 1998, according to a survey by the Institute for German Economics (Institut der deutschen Wirtschaft (IW)), only 35% of employed persons were willing to work for a short period of time in a foreign country (Meier 1998, 48).

(Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung der Bundesanstalt für Arbeit (IAB)), a change of residence in order to reenter the workforce was considered the worst of all alternatives. In all, 66% of East German workers and 61% of West German rejected the idea of change of residence (Brixy & Christensen, 2002). In contrast, more acceptable alternatives included: change of profession, flexible work schedules, employment in jobs below workers' actual technical skill level and longer distances to work (ibid).

Freisl conducted a more comprehensive study about the causes for certain mobility cultures. His primary consideration was the "analytic question, how societal, economic and social orders … affect the mobility behavior of workers" (Freisl, 1994, p. 8). He compared the USA to the European Union. As the results of this study are not exclusive to Germany, it is difficult to develop a differentiated model that allows for a comparison between Germany and other European countries, yet they do allow us to draw tentative conclusions about basic socio-political conditions that promote or restrain mobility. Basically different value systems and orientations have developed in Europe and the USA as a result of different historical developments. In the USA, the dominant basic human values of freedom and equality have promoted mobility. In Europe however, property ownership and education have been the dominant values. These values have led to emotional ties to one's hometown and a hierarchical understanding of authority, which have hindered mobility (Freisl, 1994, p. 65f). At the same time, Freisl assumes that other values systems and norms restrict mobility as well, such as current post materialistic values, different education systems in the German states, language barriers as well as the non-transparent and incongruent structure of the job market. A highly regulated job market, for example dismissal protection, the well-established social safety net and the strong position of the European worker's union, contribute to a lower acceptance of mobility in Europe.

Who is how mobile? Since 1994, annual data on mobility frequency and the mobility behavior of the population has been collected in the German Mobility Panel (Deutsche Mobilitätspanel (MOP)). The survey includes, for example, information about when, why, and how people in Germany travel. Based on the data, Germans made on average 3.44 trips daily in 2004 - 1.93 of these trips were with privately owned motorised vehicles. On average, they traveled 38.1 km and spent 77.1 minutes on traveling. Long distance travel is rare and makes up only 1.3% of all trips in the MOP. Therefore, the mobility panel for long distance travel "IVERMO" (InterMOdale VERnetzung) under the direction of Dirk Zumkeller was added to the MOP, which, however, excludes long distance commuters. The data from 2001

to 2003 show that only 86% of the German population over 14 years are active in long distance travel (trips over 100 km one way except travel between home and work without overnight), 14% of the population never travel long distances in the course of a year (Chlond, Last, Manz, & Zumkeller, 2004). Of those surveyed, 50% are responsible for 90% of all long distance trips. An average German goes on 1.3 business trips, 1.5 holiday trips and 4.6 other private trips a year. In addition, Germans take 1.3 long distance commuting trips per capita per year. For the most part, 84% of all travel is within Germany and 74% of the trips are made by car.

## 2. Who is mobile? General factors of influence on mobility acceptance and mobility

Despite gaps in the current state of German research, a few fundamental statements about the factors that influence mobility behavior can be made. Both recent and older studies refer to those factors that either favour or hinder mobility. Among these factors are socio-demographic characteristics, hometown solidarity, mobility culture as well as existing partnerships and family concepts, all of which affect the form and range of spatial mobility and/or the choice of a certain mobile living arrangement (see Limmer, 2005). Most studies, mentioned in the following, limit their scope to relocation and commuting.

*Gender*: If we look at gender as an isolated dimension in a model of the effects on mobility and mobility acceptance, we can see that women are less frequently occupationally mobile than men (Limmer, 2004; Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel 2002a). They also show a lower mobility acceptance (see Allerklar.com AG, 2006). These results can be explained better by integrating intervening variables such as family condition and/or partnership and the presence and the age of children into the model. In particular for women, these factors restrain mobility (Beck-Gernsheim, 1995; Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b). Jürges confirms these results as well. Based on his analysis that uses the data of the German Socio-Economic Panel, there are no fundamental differences with respect to interregional mobility between single men and single women (Jürges, 2005, p. 27). Other studies even document a higher mobility of single women compared to men. The results of Jahr et al. point in a similar direction. While women are even more mobile than men, before and during their university studies, this situation reverses itself once women enter the workforce (Jahr, Schomburg, & Teichler, 2003, p. 60). The results of Hagemann- White et al, who examine the motives for long distance and regional moves in their study, refer to gender typical mobility patterns based on partnership and children. There are no numerical differences between the genders in

terms of moving frequency; however, men and women differ in their reasons for moving. Women move for private reasons, men primarily for career ones. A substantial part of family moving is motivated by the occupation of the man, for example women move because their husbands' jobs require it (Hagemann-White, Hantsche, & Westerburg, 1996). On the contrary women can rarely count on their partners to move with them when confronted with job related demands for mobility (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a). Beck-Gernsheim problematised this relationship in the term "one and a half-person job." The organisation of a career in its present form presupposes "tacitly" that the person working can fall back on a support system of other individuals. Today this support service is usually still furnished by women (1995, p. 167). In the future such support services will become increasingly important as the demand for mobility grows. Examples of these services are the organisation of moving or raising a family alone while a partner is absent for long periods of time, a situation that already exists in the case of long distance commuters and will continue to increase in the case of shuttles, job nomads, seasonal workers or vari-mobiles. Beck-Gernsheim, therefore, speaks of the "mobility resource woman" "in the male career program" and sees women as those, who comprise the majority of the "social infrastructure of modern times" (ibid). Preißner and Hunnecke (2002) confirm these special mobility requirements for women and see the combination of several activities in a chain of short trips as a typically female characteristic of day-to-day mobility. These trips result from a number of duties imposed on women, who are still mainly responsible for household and family. Especially the demands on women to accompany children or the elderly have increased. Women must coordinate these duties in time and space. In this context, Best and Lanzendorf have studied the gender specific nature of mobility with respect to the division of work and point out the difference between men and women concerning the use of a car (Best & Lanzendorf, 2005).

*Family status and partnership*: In general, married couples and individuals in a long term partnerships in one household are less willing to move than divorcees and singles. The willingness to commute is likewise higher among single persons than other groups (Allerklar.com AG 2006). Actual mobility behavior also reflects this finding: persons, who live in a partnership in a common household, are usually substantially less willing to move than single persons (Kalter, 1997; Paulu, 2001). This effect is even stronger if both partners work. Dual earner couples are less mobile than single earner couples (Jürges, 2005)[35]. This

---

[35] Jürges points out that, in dual-earner households, traditional and equalitarian gender ideologies influence the decision to move. Within traditional partnerships, neither the career of the wife nor her level of education

phenomenon is usually explained by the utility theory; the move must be advantageous for both partners, a situation that is made particularly difficult if both partners work (Kalter 1997; Jürges 2005; see also Collmer, 2005). Apart from monetary incentives for migration, social aspects, such as existing social networks and specific knowledge of the area, play a role in influencing the decision of both partners as they weigh the advantages and disadvantages of mobility (Kalter, 1997). According to Kalter, low mobility rates of couples can be explained relatively well based on these explanations as well as on additional variables such as children, age or residential property ownership. However, one aspect of this willingness to move still remains unclear. Kalter assumes that a partnership contains its own influential dynamics independent of these variables (1998, p. 286). He explains the influence of partnerships on decision making by pointing out that a decision to move is made on the basis of a negotiation process within the partnership. These negotiations are often difficult, cause expenses and also create a certain risk. In anticipation of the difficulties involved in this decision, the wish to move is not even discussed at all (ibid, p. 306). In an earlier model, Mincer (1978) assumes that separation is the final alternative, if partners cannot balance their needs and obligations. Newer studies show, however, that couples fall back on other mobility strategies as an alternative to moving, such as long distance commuting or living in a long distance relationship (Jürges 2005, p. 25; Collmer 2005). On the basis of the data of the Socio-Economic Panel, evidence supports the thesis that commuting increasingly becomes a replacement for migration and moving (Kalter, 1994).

*Children*: Children, and in particular the presence of smaller children, have a substantial influence on mobility acceptance and the selected form of mobility. According to the survey conducted in the job market section of the internet site meinestadt.de, 67.2% of people with children are not willing to move for job reasons. Persons, who live with children, are less mobile than those without children (Paulu, 2001; Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b). They are not completely immobile; however, if they move, they predominantly stay in regional proximity (Hagemann-White, Hantsche, & Westerburg, 1996). Wagner also comes to the conclusion that founding a family hinders mobility, but people move regionally in order to improve their living situation (1989). When children are present and families do not want to burden them by changing their customary surroundings, the answer to the demand for mobility is found in an alternative to moving, such as long distance or weekend commuting

---

influences the decision to move. In egalitarian partnerships, the educational level of both partners has a mutual influence on the decision to move.

(see also previous section). Heine and Mautz examined both automobility as an integral part of family life as well as the balancing act of women, confronted by a gender specific division of work, who are torn between family life and work (Heine & Mautz, 1999, 2000, 2001). Additionally, the 'working group sustainable transport' led by Martin Lanzendorf is conducting a research project entitled "Mobility Biographies: An explorative study on travel behaviour in the life course of parents with small children." The results of this study should be available in the near future.

*Age*: With respect to moving, age is a crucial characteristic according to Wagner (1989). Generally younger persons are more mobile than older ones[36]. The findings about age selective behaviour with respect to mobility can also be integrated into more general findings of family sociology. In the debate about the plurality of lifestyles, it is assumed that younger people live more frequently in non-conventional lifestyles, such as long distance relationships or living apart together. The portion of these lifestyles decreases in older generations. Approximately at the age of 30, individuals, who formerly lived non-conventional lifestyles, approach "normal biographies" (Schneider, 2002). Having established a professional career by that age, individuals establish a family and acquire property. This pattern seems to apply likewise to the observed mobility behavior of over 30 year-olds. A further explanation for age selectivity views decisions to pursue new career goals and the accompanying long distance move as an investment, which only pays off in the future (see Speare, 1971; cited in Kalter 1998, p. 286). The shorter the period in which this investment is likely to pay off, the less likely the decision to migrate. Another aspect concerning the current development of the job market should further enhance the degree of mobility of younger people. In Germany, changing jobs during your working life has been rare compared to other countries till now. In the future, however, the increased number of temporary positions and increased problems of entering the workforce and of establishing a career will lead to increasing occupational mobility among young people (see Blossfeld et al., 2005; Rolfes, 1996). A study conducted by Emnid in 1999 also verifies this tendency. According to the statements of personnel managers and headhunters interviewed, people who are just starting out in their career will switch jobs six times on average and in some fields up to eight times[37].

*Residential property*: Residential property restricts mobility at least with regard to

---

[36] A recent evaluation of the employment statistics in Germany shows that in particular the regional vocational mobility of the 25 to 34 year olds is high (Haas, 2002).
[37] This study was carried out at the request of Immobilien Scout 24.

long distance moves (see Wagner, 1989). However, the desire for better living standards causes regional moves (Jürges, 2005). Since residential property is usually only acquired later in life, we can conclude a close relationship exists between the age effect and residential property effect (see also Knoll et al., 2003). Property ownership, especially in Germany, is likely to be a substantial barrier to mobility. The costs of buying and selling residential property are particularly high in Germany compared to other countries. In addition, residential ownership has high social value, especially in a society whose mobility culture is based on the norms of property ownership and permanence. Residential property is not simply purchased, lived in and then later sold as needed, but rather the acquisition of residential property is seen in itself as a worthwhile final goal in life by many Germans.

*Education and occupational groups*: The disposition for occupational mobility rises with the educational level and the job position (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b) see also Allesklar.com AG, 2006). A set of studies proves that especially highly-qualified workers are occupationally mobile (see Haas, 2000). In West Germany, 3% of the university graduates and only 1% of non-academics move within one year in connection with their jobs (Büchel, Frick, & Witte, 2002, p. 218)[38]. However, highly qualified German workers are considered rather immobile compared to their European colleagues (Jahr, Schomburg, & Teichler, 2002). With respect to specific occupational groups, we can assume that the choice of a certain occupation and the individual disposition for job mobility are interrelated to a considerable degree. Certain occupational groups are characterised by very specific (and usually probably expectable) demands on mobility. Persons, who choose such occupations, are aware of this situation and already have prerequisite skills to meet these demands. Thus, according to the graduation barometer of 2005 (Absolventenbarometer, 2005), the Foreign Office is still the top employer for law school graduates, because it offers both a professional career and an opportunity to experience living and working in foreign countries (trendence, 2005). The research project "Mobility Pioneers" makes clear that free lance journalists appreciate the high degree of independence and responsibility that comes with their job. At the same time, they must have a high level competency to deal with the demands of mobility (Bonß, Kesselring, & Weiss, 2004; Kesselring, 2005). On the other hand, we have to assume that initial job expectations are often revised on account of experiencing actual mobility and

---

[38] An analysis of the data of the socio-economic panel by Büchel et al shows that in the years 1996-1998 academics (15.5%) were more willing to change their residence and move outside of Germany than non-academics (9.8%). These statistics refer to West Germany. In East Germany, the relation is 15.1% to 6.9% (2002, p. 217).

stress. Thus 50.6 % (n = 1442) of surveyed career soldiers indicated in a study by the central institute for marriage and family in society (Zentralinstitut für Ehe und Familie in der Gesellschaft (ZFG)) in co-operation with Catholic military chaplains that they had not imagined the mobility demands of their job in such a way; 44.8 % of those interviewed would not become professional soldiers again (Collmer, 2005)[39]. Likewise we can assume that highly career-oriented persons understand the demands of mobility and willingly accept them at first as a prerequisite for career enhancement. However, personnel managers of a large German bank discovered in interviews that job applicants were frequently dishonest about the questions related to job mobility (Paulu, 2001).

*Ideals of Partnerships and Family*: A mobility decision based on a consideration of partnership and family influences a person's reaction to mobility requirements. People and partnerships that place personal autonomy in the foreground frequently select the mobility forms shuttle or long distance relationship. In these partnerships, in which both partners usually work, career disadvantages can so be avoided (Limmer, 2005). Because their own autonomy is important, these persons consider their mobility options less of a burden than those individuals who are family and/or partnership oriented (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a). For this second group, closeness and sharing of everyday life are very important. Therefore they react to mobility demands by moving or commuting long distances (Limmer, 2005).

*Mobility-Styles*: In the last years, the concept of mobility styles has been applied in several research projects in Germany. Utilizing mobility styles, a relationship is drawn between lifestyles and day-to-day mobility (Götz, Jahn, & Schulz, 1998). This approach combines age and milieu specific variables for the classification of mobility behaviour. A research project directed by Joachim Scheiner on "city life" and "residential selection, urban space and transportation in the context of life style and life situations" has developed a classification to examine the complex interaction between life situation, life style, location demands, residential selection and mobility behaviour (day-to-day mobility). Life style characteristics include: leisure time behaviour, life goals, value systems and common aesthetic norms. By way of factor and cluster analysis, these characteristics were categorised into five different life styles (Scheiner, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c): adventurous (intensity,

---

[39] Increased mobility demands on soldiers stem from the necessity for basic training and advanced schooling, for periodic transfers as part of a career path as well as for travel associated with temporary duty and deployments (Collmer 2005, p. 53).

traditional and self-realisation values); out-of-home sociability (highly developed social network, out-of-home leisure activities, self-realisation); distant (tendency to reject all the items); culturally interested (strong interest in culture, self-realisation, leisure time at home and activities outside the home, but few substantial contacts); and traditional (trivializing, little leisure time outside the home, few contacts, traditional values).The Institute for Socio-Ecological Research (Institut für sozial-ökologische Forschung (ISOE)) has also studied the relationship between lifestyle and mobility for the past 10 years (see Götz & Schubert, 2004). In his speech at the conference "Where does Europe travel?" Götz gives a kind of resume of European lifestyles in seven large lifestyle groups based on current research results (see Götz & Konrad, 2005): traditional (traditional, conventional and lower middle class orientation); modern main stream (traditional milieu, attempts to combine grass root values with a certain degree of individuality); ambitious (success and career oriented groups, imitate models from various successful milieus); experimental (non-conforming, individualistic, egocentric, creative, often trendsetters); intellectuals (social critical groups with higher educational levels, post materialistic value structure, environmental and ecology awareness); underprivileged groups (disintegrated, welfare recipients, low-income single parents, social outcasts, uprooted); established (elitist self-awareness, urbane).

*Mobility culture and homeland solidarity*: It can be assumed that a certain mobility culture promotes or restrains mobility acceptance and the fulfilment of mobility requirements. The mobility culture in Germany is characterised by strong local binding and permanence; mobile persons consider themselves to be outside the social norms and are perceived as such by others (see section 1.3). This culture should act mobility-restraining according to this assumption. Also a strong individual solidarity with the homeland region and a strong family orientation increase the probability that mobility requirements are rejected and/or that long distance commuting is accepted as the only possible mobile lifestyle (Limmer 2005; Kalter 1994). If people succeed in meeting high mobility requirements and at the same time have strong local, social and family bindings, they have high mobility skills. They correspond to a mobile immobile type (Bonß, Kesselring, & Weiss, 2004 p. 268), who has strongly developed capabilities (motility) and strategies, which Kesselring describes as centred mobility management (2005, p. 132).

*Socialisation*: Mobility also depends on socialisation experiences. People, who often moved in their childhood, are probably likewise more mobile in their later life (Hackl, 1992; Wagner, 1989). In the study by Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel, there is evidence that

past mobility experiences affect future mobility decisions. If a previous mobile life style had negative affects on a partnership, the willingness for further mobility is limited (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a).

## 3. The effects of mobility on family functioning, family development, family problems and ways of coping

In Germany few studies explicitly deal with the effects of occupationally caused spatial mobility on the division of labour within the family, family development and mobility-induced stress. The research group led by Schneider (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a) has presented a study based on fully standardised quantitative data and qualitative interviews that allow us first insights into this topic. The work of a group of researchers, under the direction of Wendl (Biehl, Keller, & Tomforde, 2005; Collmer, 2002; Collmer, 2005; Wendl, 2004, 2005a) that carried out a quantitative data survey of career soldiers supplemented by problem-centred interviews, offers hints as well. The qualitative interviews done in the project "Mobility Pioneers" in particular lead to preliminary conclusions regarding individual abilities to master a highly mobile way of life (Bonß, Kesselring, & Weiss, 2004; Kesselring, 2005; Pelizäus-Hoffmeister, 2001). In their studies, Rapp (2003) and Blickle (2005) supply important indications about ways to master burdens directly caused by the mobility of long distance commuters, as well. Since stress research has shown the central importance of individual-centred coping behaviour of stress levels within the family and partnership, relevant findings are also important within the context of this project (see among other Bodenmann, 1995). The findings of the previously mentioned studies are considered in the following section.

### 3.1. Division of housework and professional work

Apart from their role in reproduction, women are also still primarily responsible for housework in the Federal Republic of Germany. Despite a slowly developing change to an egalitarian division of labour, couples revert to traditional division of labour when they have children (Schulz & Blossfeld, 2006; for general research overview on the division of labour in partnerships, see Kassner & Rüling, 2005, pp. 237-242; for a current evaluation of the socio-economic panel, see Jürges, 2005). With respect to job mobility, we can expect to see two different developments against this background of family and children. On the one hand, the mobility of men leads to a traditional division of labour in a partnership and on the other hand, the occupational mobility of women requires an egalitarian division of labour. The results of the quantitative and qualitative data collected by Schneider, Limmer, and

Ruckdeschel (2002a) confirm these theses. The qualitative analysis shows that more than two thirds (70%) of occupationally mobile men live in traditional family arrangements. The female partner assumes the main burden of reproduction and child rearing and puts her own professional career completely, or to a large extent, on hold. Fully employed mobile women are relieved far less from their household activities. None of the occupationally mobile women were released from family work contrary to the men surveyed. If a woman is occupationally mobile, the arrangements can be called egalitarian (83%) when both partners are fully employed and divide the domestic tasks. Some working women (17%) even report that their partner is fully employed, yet that they are solely responsible for family duties. A tendency towards traditional division of labour and traditional gender roles is also detectable within the context of occupational mobility although a process of change towards more equality is clearly taking place (see Limmer, 2004).

Evidence of traditional gender roles can also be found in surveys of career soldiers who are frequently affected by transfers. Usually a transfer takes place every three years. Wives and children normally follow the soldiers to their new duty station. Occupational opportunities for women are of secondary consideration and largely limited to semi-skilled part-time work (Collmer, 2005, p. 60f.). With regard to younger couples in particular, however, a change seems to be taking place. Younger women are increasingly more qualified and have high incomes (ibid, p. 71). Faced with the decision to move, the majority of younger couples strives for an egalitarian or equitable solution (85.1% of the civilian partners indicated this preference.). Equally important, 82.6 % of the soldiers were opposed to their partners having to give up a professional career on account of a transfer. Remarkably soldiers also increasingly select alternatives to moving: long distance or weekend commuting or weekend relationships. About 59% did not move in one to three transfer situations, 26% still more often, only 15% failed to select alternatives to transfers and moved every time (Collmer, 2005, p. 63). Female partners in particular seem to be responsible for such decisions[40]. In addition, the inclination towards these alternative solutions rises with age and time in service in the German Federal Armed Forces.

---

[40] Female spouses give the following reasons for their refusal to move: foremost, a desire to maintain their current job, concern about of the negative impact of moving on children, unwillingness to move into an army Ghetto, unwillingness to move again and the financial burdens associated with a transfer.

### 3.2. Family development

Today many people, especially women, are challenged by the need to ensure the compatibility of career, family life, and child rearing responsibility. More often than not, they are confronted with the alternative of pursuing a career or raising a family. It can be assumed that this conflict is further enforced by high mobility requirements. Mobile women will face difficulties when they have children, unless they are supported by a social network or by a very well developed childcare infrastructure (see Pelizäus-Hoffmeister, 2001, p. 141).

This predicament is confirmed by the results of Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel (2002a). The transition to parenthood is strongly related to a mobile way of life on the one hand and to gender on the other. Mobile men establish families just as often as non-mobile men of the same age group. The situation of mobile women, with exception of women willing to move their residence, is different and diverges strongly from a comparative non-mobile group: childless long distance commuters, weekend commuters and shuttles are substantially older, with an average age of 36, than childless moving-mobile or non-mobile women.

In the context of qualitative interviews, they were asked for the reasons for their childlessness. A majority (73%) give their job situation as a reason (100%: n = 60). Every third gives other reasons, such as a desire not to have child at the moment or biological reasons preventing pregnancy. However, the majority of those who are childless because of their job assume that they will still be able to realise their dream of having children some time in the future. This dream seems realistic for occupationally mobile men in light of their age structure, yet doubtful for occupationally mobile women, whether they are long distance commuters, weekend or shuttle commuters. This group of women who are faced with the biological clock sees no occupational alternatives and cannot imagine having children in their present situation. Thus, the either/or decision between career and family greatly influences the daily reality of occupationally mobile women.

### 3.3. Family problems and ways of coping from the mobile persons' point of view

The following pages deal with mobility-induced problems on the level of the family and partnership as well as strategies that families and individuals develop to cope with these exigencies. It can be assumed that the individual mastering abilities of occupationally mobile persons moderate the extent of mobility-induced problems, which arise for the family and/or couple.

Problems: In the study by Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel (2002a) about half of the persons questioned indicated familial problems caused by a mobile way of life. The form and the extent of the problems vary depending on the concrete form of mobility. While 75% of the weekend commuters are confronted with problems in this context, only few moving mobile describe corresponding difficulties. The occupationally mobile most frequently see a problem in their inability to spend more time with their families. They notice a certain alienation from their own family. This problem affects weekend commuters in particular, who for example report that their parental authority over their children decreases due to absences during the week. Interviewees see an additional problem in the mobility of one parent which leads to direct stress for the children. Families that move their place of residence report that their children have problems adapting to new surroundings and weekend commuters describe that their children suffer because of separation. Indication for stress due to relocation also comes from a study by Paul J. Boyle et al. (2006). The study finds that a single long-distance relocation tends to stabilise partnerships, whereas a career of multiple moves increases the risk of dissolution.

Approximately a third of all interviewees have problems in their relationships caused by a mobile way of life (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a). Here too, the type and extent of the problems vary depending on the concrete form of mobile lifestyles. Persons in long distance and shuttle relationships clearly report problems more frequently, than individuals who move or commute long distances to work. Similar to the problems affecting family life, occupationally mobile individuals see an analogous problem in their relationships with their partners. For the most part they have too little time to invest in their relationship and thus partners increasingly go their separate ways. Partners also complain about the lack of spontaneity in their relationship; their mobile life style allows them little time to share spontaneous adventures. Partner conflicts that are directly related to mobility are rarely mentioned. The qualitative data rather refer to spill-over effects, where the job stress of the mobile persons leads to conflicts and quarrels between the partners

The survey of German soldiers further indicates a functional relationship between stress factors and a specific mobile way of life. Commuters and partners in weekend relationships often feel as a "guest in their own home." To take advantage of their weekends at home with the family, they work more during the week. This situation leads to increased stress. At the same time, the weekend is often overloaded with leisure activities which cause additional leisure stress. The children in such relations orient themselves towards one partner.

This fixation can lead to alienation from the other parent or a glorification of the frequently absent parent (Wendl, 2005a, p. 123f.). Soldiers and their families are exposed to a very special form of occupational mobility. In addition to the times absent due to official travel or training, come longer spans of time on duty in foreign countries, which usually last six months. Since these duties are often performed under difficult and dangerous conditions, they are often connected with substantial stress for the families. Children, soldiers and partners suffer from the separation; spouses miss the closeness of family and sexual intimacy and develop a substantial fear of loss (Biehl, Keller, & Tomforde, 2005, p. 89ff.). In particular, younger couples predominantly fear that their relationship might fail (ibid. p. 98).

Coping strategies: The results of Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel (2002a) indicate that occupationally mobile individuals primarily attempt to find relief from stress by developing strategies to adapt themselves and their family to their situation in life. Mastering strategies that aim at alleviating work related issues and their underlining conditions are rarely presented. In particular, it can be shown that a successful partnership significantly depends on the ability of partners to communicate, to negotiate and to reflect. Strategies must be developed that take into account the interests of all family members. Recurring mobile fathers in particular must become involved in raising children, accept their role as a parent and find time for their children despite long absences from home. For example, some fathers telephone with their children before going to sleep each evening.

Studies by Rapp (2003) and Blickle (2005) refer to another kind of coping. They show that long distance commuters can reduce travel-related stress by employing certain strategies, for example finding meaningful ways to occupy time (see section 5).

Modern forms of communication technology can become an important replacement for direct physical proximity to a partner. They allow partners to exchange everyday concerns and to become part of each others' lives. The German Federal Armed Forces encourages soldiers to stay in contact with home to ensure the psychological well-being and performance level of the troops. In rank of importance, communication media include: the army postal service[41], regular telephone service, mobile telephones, E-mail and the Internet (Biehl, Keller,

---

[41] Letters from home are for different reasons important to soldiers: They are something special and personal. They can be read over and over again, "you can see the partner's handwriting, and perhaps even smell the scent of her perfume." Conflicts at home are closer and easier to deal with. Writing letters offers soldiers a chance to reflect upon their experiences and to share their thoughts with their spouses more easily (Biehl, Keller, & Tomforde, 2005, p. 101).

& Tomforde, 2005, p. 100). Based on survey results of soldiers, Wendl recently published a how-to-guide to long distance relationships (Wendl, 2005b). It provides a helpful overview for partners as well as tips and rules for managing a successful long distance relationship.

The results of the project "Mobility Pioneers" provide a further hint regarding strategies for dealing with the demands of a mobile lifestyle. Ensuring long lasting compatibility of an occupationally mobile life and a family requires competencies in many areas. These include: dealing with public transportation and optimal use of infrastructures; the ability to make use of new media, such as the internet, - in fact, virtual mobility can be a substitute for various forms of spatial mobility (see Kesselring, 2005); organisational talents, for example proper scheduling would allow for job related travel to be used as an opportunity to maintain friendships (see also Pelizäus- Hoffmeister, 2001).

Within the last years in Germany several studies which analyse stress within mobile living arrangements and coping strategies of mobile people were accomplished. Nevertheless there is a deficit of studies that systematically examine the data on mobility-induced problems to determine their effect on families and the ways in which families develop mastering strategies to cope with the demands of mobility. Available findings point out that in families of occupationally mobile individuals certain problem situations are intensified. For example, quality time with the family or a partner is limited in families of occupationally mobile individuals compared to families, in which the partners live together and work in the area. The types of problems and the extent of their severity are considerably affected by the concrete form of mobility (see section 5). Individual-centred mastering strategies can reduce the burden of travelling times. However, few studies address the issue of how families effectively deal with mobility-induced problems.

### *3.4. Family problems and support systems from the perspective of businesses*

Section 1.2 already pointed out that business enterprises have an increased need for mobile workers. Sending workers to branches in foreign countries is extremely costly; therefore, businesses are interested in avoiding problems and job terminations (for an overview of the state of research concerning costs and termination of foreign assignments see Lindner, 1999). For this reason, companies with expertise in managing foreign assignments and in advising companies, invest in studies that examine the factors conducive to successful foreign assignments. The results of two of these studies are briefly presented here. The first study, conducted by Management Mobility Consulting, surveyed 44 large companies from

different branches of the economy, which assigned workers from Germany abroad (Meinhold, 2002). This Consulting firm is a so-called "relocation agency" that helps employees abroad file official paperwork and deal with everyday problems. The second study, conducted by the management consultants PricewaterhouseCoopers, compares the opinion of employees and employers concerning foreign assignments (2005).

Problems that arise in foreign countries include: intercultural difficulties, language problems, integration into the new company, skill deficits, search for accommodations, locating a new school for the children and above all family problems. Foreign assignments often end in failure because accompanying partners have problems integrating themselves into the new environment. Due to these problems, a new trend is visible, "Euro Commuting." The employee becomes a weekend commuter and the family remains at home (Meinhold, 2002, p. 16). The surveyed firms offer their workers numerous monetary incentives to take a job in a foreign country: for example moving expenses or rent is reimbursed[42]. The results of the PricewaterhouseCoopers study indicate that companies overrate the financial incentives of foreign assignments. Employees worry less about financial compensation for the accompanying partner's loss of income and desire more practical support with the integration of children and partners into the new environment (PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2005, p. 7). For businesses themselves, the return of their workers from foreign countries is a crucial phase; in many cases, workers can not be sufficiently reintegrated into the company. Yet, competencies, which employees have acquired in an expensive process for the company, make it easier for them to switch companies. Thus companies lose both workers and these competencies. PricewaterhouseCoopers believes, therefore, that managing this "career wobble" is essential (2005, p. 4). Employees assume foreign assignments with the clear goal of improving their career situation; companies often fail to present the whole range of career options to their employees. Although the actual career options are less favourable than employees had anticipated, 58% of employees remained in the same or similar job situation after an international transfer and 9 % were even demoted (ibid p. 18).

This situation is also an indication of the changing status of occupationally mobility in itself. Occupationally successful persons are usually mobile; however, highly mobile persons are no longer automatically successful in their jobs (see Collmer, 2005). Human resource managers at the Deutsche Bank AG point out that an occupationally mobile employee, within

---

[42] Additional support includes: assistance locating accommodations, language courses, Look & See (a trip to the country to become familiar with it), intercultural training, cost of living allowance, and assignment bonuses.

the firm, can not expect career advancement through mobility (Paulu, 2001).

## 4.  Social integration and social networks

There are only few empirical studies in Germany that examine the connection between occupation-induced spatial mobility and social integration and/or inclusion within a social network system. Two different hypotheses relate mobility and social networks. First of all, it is to be assumed that through occupational spatial mobility the social networks of mobile persons increase. This relationship could be explained by an increased number of contacts with unknown persons. Secondly it can be inferred that the formation, maintenance and upkeep of social networks is made more difficult by spatial mobility. The social networks become smaller, the intensity of contacts decreases and personal relationships develop a different intensity.

Both hypotheses do not seem to apply, however, on the basis of the few empirical indicators per se, but rather a bundle of different influencing factors seems to take effect here: the form of mobility, the job itself, the extent of perceived external control and/or autonomy and the personal ability to maintain the network.

With respect to their numerous relocations soldiers complain that their mobility causes "victims of mobility" (Collmer, 2005, p. 67; Collmer, 2002, p. 105). Their circle of friends cannot be maintained after relocation. Comrades at their new assignments offer fleeting contacts; more intensive friendships usually do not develop. Contacts outside the job are often only possible through spouses. If alternatives to moving are selected, as for instance weekend commuting, there is likewise little time for new acquaintances outside the close circle of family. The feeling of sacrifice and of the need to begin "at point zero" at each new duty station is intensified by the impression of being externally driven by others (Collmer, 2005, p. 67). Of those surveyed, 86.5% believe that the transfer practice hinders an independent lifestyle. In the eyes of over half of those interviewed transfers take place too often and often seem arbitrary and obscure (ibid, p. 68).

Persons presented as exemplary cases in the project "Mobility Pioneers" experience their professional and private situation quite differently. Here we are dealing with freelance journalists who, at least subjectively, selected their way of life and independency through self-employment. Highly mobile in many different ways, these people are able to maintain an extensive social network due to their job-related contacts with other people who share similar

professional interests. Moreover, by using certain strategies, some journalists maintain relationships with relatives, contacts in the community and with their friends (see Kesselring, 2005). It is likely in this situation that the personal competencies that are a prerequisite for a career in journalism also include the ability to form social networks. The persons surveyed have social skills, which they successfully utilise in their private lives. The first thesis applies to these people. Their social networks become larger due to their mobility.

The thesis about the erosion of social networks seems to apply, however, to the career soldiers as well as to those occupationally mobile persons surveyed by Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel (2002a). Job mobility reduces social integration for a majority of these people. In particular, recurring mobility makes contacts outside of the professional environment exceedingly unlikely. Such contacts are delegated to the immobile partner. Also community engagement, for example voluntary activities, is noticeably affected by the demands of mobility. There is simply no time for these activities. Exceptions here are long distance relationships; within this mobile living arrangement it is generally possible to maintain a close circle of friend.

## 5. Quality of Life

*Psychological and physical health and well-being*: German studies that examine the health of mobile workers refer exclusively to the group of recurring mobile daily commuters. In the 1970s, studies in the fields of occupational medicine and sociology described the health-endangering effects of commuting: on the whole commuters showed an increased frequency of illnesses and consequently an increased number of sick days (Jüttner, 1976; Ott & Gerlinger, 1992). If commuters were unable to compensate for sleep deprivation, the risks of accidents rose (Jüttner, 1976). These findings coincide with international results (see Haefner, Kordy, & Kaechele, 2001; Koslowsky, 1997; Novaco, Stokols, & Milanesi, 1990). Stadler, Fastenmeier, Gstalter & Lau (2000) show in their study that commuters - even before setting off to work - feel more psychologically stressed than non-commuters. A broad survey of employees who take the train to work[43] shows that, compared to the total working population, long distance commuters experience clearly higher psychological stress and significantly more frequent psychosomatic illnesses (Rapp, 2003). These health impairments can be attributed both to the strains of the travel itself as well as to the fact that commuters have less time for active and passive relaxation. As assumed by Rapp (2003), the negative

---

[43] In this study, the travel time of a one way trip to work is on average 88 minutes.

health effects of this mobile life style might only become visible over the course of several years.

In contrast to the time spent on daily commuting, the distance actually travelled has little impact on health risks (Blickle, 2005; Rapp, 2003). A current study of commuters who predominantly drive to work with their own car or participate in car pools essentially confirms Rapp's findings (Blickle, 2005). In addition, this study reveals that passengers in car pools have a higher incidence of health-related problems than those who drive with their own car. The studies of Blickle and Rapp, were one of the first large scale studies, which provides evidence for the importance of individual stress management strategies for the health of commuters. If commuting time by train can be spent on activities, such as reading, working or sleeping, the commuters clearly report fewer negative health effects (Rapp, 2003). Commuters, who drive to work in their own car and experience negative traffic conditions, such as back-ups, as especially stressful, are clearly more affected in their well-being than commuters, who are able to use compensatory strategies in similar situations (Blickle, 2005).

Besides the data on the well-being of long distance commuters, there is also evidence about the well-being of the wives of long distance and weekend commuters (Rodler & Kirchler, 2001). Qualitative diary studies indicate that compared to wives, whose partners are employed locally, the feeling of well-being of wives of long distance commuters is clearly worse.

*Experiencing Stress:* One of the first german studies that describes the situation of long distance commuters in more detail shows that two thirds of these workers experience daily travel times as a strong or unreasonable burden (Ott & Gerlinger, 1992). The broadest survey about mobility-induced stress in Germany was submitted by Schneider, Limmer and Ruckdeschel (2002a). It reveals that mobile workers experience far more stress than employees, whose jobs are in direct proximity to their residence. But the stress experienced by mobile workers significantly depends on the actual form of mobility. Employees, whose daily one way commuting time to work is at least one hour, feel the most strongly stressed. Weekend commuters and persons, whose professional activities require stays of several days in different places (vari-mobile) are likewise clearly more stressed. People in long distance relationships report a slightly higher stress factor, whereas people who moved because of their job are no different from employees who are neither punctually nor recurring mobile with respect to their stress factor. The study proves furthermore that not only the mobile workers

themselves are more stressed but also their partners.

*Life satisfaction of mobile workers*: Based on the surveys of the German Socio-Economic Panel, Stutzer and Frey (2004) examine the effects of daily commuting[44] on subjectively perceived life satisfaction[45]. The analysis points out a close relationship between commuting time and life satisfaction. The measurement of life satisfaction of people, whose daily trip to work is 10 minutes or less, has a statistical mean of 7.24. This value corresponds to the life satisfaction mean of the total German population in 2003 as determined in the context of the European Survey of Quality of Life (see Böhnke, 2005). The life satisfaction of commuters, who have a daily journey of 30 minutes and more, has a statistical mean of 7.0 and is clearly lower. In addition, it has been proven that reduced life satisfaction, which is dependant on daily commuting time, is not only experienced by both male and female commuters themselves, but also by their partners (Stutzer & Frey 2004, p. 14).

The studies discussed above, which examine the quality of life of mobile workers in Germany, focus primarily on descriptive analysis of the quality of life of long distance commuters. Only few studies consider the broader spectrum of occupational mobility. All studies agree that daily commuting is a way of life, which substantially reduces the quality of life of those concerned as well as their partners. Additionally a broader comparative study of mobile and non-mobile ways of life points out that various concrete forms of job mobility have differing effects on the quality of life. Moreover the effects of mobility vary depending on individual ability to cope with stress.

---

[44] Interviewees were asked how much time they spent commuting one way to work, in other words from door to door.
[45] Subjective life satisfaction, which is included in the German Socio-Economic Panel (SEOP) survey, corresponds to the question concerning personal assessment of life satisfaction in the European Quality of Life Survey. "All things considered, how satisfied would you say you are with your life these days? Please tell me on scale of 1 to 10, where 1 means very dissatisfied and 10 means very satisfied."

**Anna Rosińska-Kordasiewicz and Sylwia Urbańska**

# VI. Literature on Job Mobility in Poland

## 1. Premise

### 1.1. Introduction

Before summarising the literature on mobility in Poland, it is crucial to list four key insights necessary to understand the overall situation in the country.

*The historical and cultural background*

Poland has a long tradition of the international migration, and very strong migration networks, some of them coming from XIX century. There are regions in Poland where the majority of inhabitants have more family members abroad than in other regions of Poland (e.g. the small town Nowy Targ has strong family ties with United States of America); in Silesia more than 0.5 million people have both Polish and German citizenship. In result, in many cases, the mobility infrastructure is more available and more efficient for moving abroad than to move inside Poland. Migration was not only accepted, but highly valued life strategy during the period of "iron curtain" (1945 – 1989), especially bearing in mind the black market exchange rate: the average salary in Poland calculated against US dollar was app. 20 "black market" USD. It goes without saying that internal job mobility could not provide such level of economic remittances. And still cannot, especially for people with low skills.

*Mobility and economic transformation in Poland*

Before the 2nd World War, Poland was underdeveloped country, with more than 60% of people employed in agriculture (small and very poor family farms), and weak industrial potential. After the war, under the new socialist government Poland underwent so called "forced industrialisation": masses of people from the villages were encouraged to move to the newly built (or rebuilt) industrial plants. That massive movement continued till seventies, when the demand for "blue collars" and unskilled manual labour went down. Thus, in that period Poland experienced mass job mobility in various forms: (1) moving from the rural to urban areas, linked with acquiring "blue collar" status; (2) commuting to jobs in the nearby town (industrial plant) while still keeping small family farm.

Poland entered 1989 as the industrial society, with 33% of economically active employed in industrial sector of the economy, 38% - in service sector, and still 29% employed (mainly self-employed on the small family farms) in agriculture. With introducing market economy, the country undergoes de-industrialisation, and the modern labour market segment develops. As those who lose jobs in the industry (unskilled and skilled blue collars) and agriculture (closing down the state owned collective farms, "kolchoz" type, collapse of many of the small family farms confronted with market competition) have very low levels of education, the unemployment got very high in Poland. For those people, internal mobility is not an option: the demand is for the "modern," high skilled occupations. In result, the job mobility in Poland is very low. Its main "attractor" is the modern segment of the labour market, and it appears mainly as the part of the strategy of young people from "provincial" regions: they come to big cities (University centres) to study, and then try to find a job and stay. However, the supply of "young educated" is higher than the number of attractive jobs: for many of the young people, international migration is a much better option, both economically (salaries) and as an investment for the future (good language skills and experience abroad is a huge competitive advantage on the Polish labour market).

All in all, Poland is far from the (post) modern type of mobility, staying still in the more traditional mode of economically driven mobility oriented toward "survival," and not toward career or self-development. There are not enough economic incentives to become mobile internally: the levels of salaries and wages do not differ that much, and the well paid segment of the labour market is only opened for the best educated, young people. To the contrary: one may even say there are disincentives to become mobile in Poland. The prices of flats (and for renting the flat) are extremely high; the majority of Poles do not own their flats (in terms of having legal ownership) so they cannot sell them in order to buy another one somewhere else. The transportation system, especially intraregional, has collapsed making commuting difficult. The legal regulations on the Polish labour market do not stimulate job mobility either: employers do not subsidise renting flat (or subsidise for few months only), do not offer help for finding a job for the spouse or for settling down. All these makes internal mobility quite exclusive behaviour in Poland.

### *The "pay offs" of international versus internal job mobility*

Poland is among the poorest countries of the European Union, as measured by GDP at Purchasing Power Parity. The salaries and wages are significantly lower than in the "old" EU

15. The differences in the potential of the economies still encourage international migration, though for two different reasons. For low skilled people, who have major difficulties in finding the permanent job in Poland, seasonal work abroad or other forms of migration (e.g. incomplete, or circular) is the winning option: few months abroad can give more money than the yearly wage in the low paid job in Poland. These are very often "illegal" workers abroad. On the other side of the labour market, for high skilled and young people (medical doctors, information sciences specialist and students) the ratio of local salaries against those offered abroad does not leave much space for doubts.

This makes Poland the country with job mobility being predominantly cross border mobility, and not internal one, as the pay off of the former one is much bigger, and – on top of that, the networks and infrastructure of migration is well developed; may be even better than the infrastructure for the internal mobility.

*The phenomenon of the Polish family*

Poland has just entered the 2nd demographic transition, with typical changes in the demographic behaviour: delaying marriages, which contributes to the decline of the marriage rate, lower birth rate and improvement in the life expectancy at birth. Yet, compared to the developed European countries, Poland is still family-centred: the marriage rate is still high, the divorce rate, though on increase, is still relatively low, the "singles" and modern family life patterns (e.g. Living Apart Together) are marginal. Due to the very low efficiency of the family – oriented service sector and inefficiencies of the state institutions, Polish family has to cope on its own, relying rather on the informal (family) networks than on institutions. This makes Polish family quite strong: it still has to serve a "social unit" to support individuals, rather than the emotional space for individuals to grow. Family – marrying, having a long term close relationship, having children, living quiet life among the closest ones composes the most valued set of values for the Polish society, including young people (e.g. European Value Systems Survey).

Paradoxically, this works in favour of the international job mobility. First, because of the economic reasons (higher pay off), second – because of the well developed norms and culture of migration (it is easier to accept father working in Germany than in another region of Poland), third – because of some cost being lower (including the status deprivation: low status job abroad is not that "visible" as the low status job undertaken in Poland). Moreover, migration is predominantly the family matter: both in terms of the motivation to migrate (to

support family via remittances), and in terms of the family networks utilised.

*To summarise*: the specificity of the Polish history, the shape of the internal labour market, together with the difference in the economic potential of Poland against other EU member states makes Polish job mobility biased toward international migration of various types. This explains also why the migration problems prevail in researches and theory. The very fact that migration is undertaken mainly by people with family status (married, often with children) explains, in turn, why the impact of migratory job mobility is analysed in the frame of the "family disruption."

Internal job mobility was the major topic of sociological examination in the sixties, in the specific period of "forced industrialisation." It is worth mentioning, in this context, that in the main economic survey in Poland (continuous monitoring of the labour market BAEL, i.e. the Survey of the Economic Activity of People) there is no question included concerning the time needed to get to the job (or any other indicator of job mobility). Similarly, research on family life in Poland focuses on the changes of its structure and values and strategies of coping. Apart of the specific occupational groups (e.g. sailors), and outside of the migration context, the question of the impact of mobile living on the quality of family life is not even asked. NB, this shows the importance of "JobMob" project for Poland.

### 1.2. Phenomenology of mobility types in Poland in regard to the project typology.

Let us comment now on the mobility types that are present in Poland against the project typology of 11 forms of mobility (proposal p. 8). The recent situation in Poland is marked be the predominance of international migration, with only small contribution of the internal mobility types like commuting, shuttling and moving. A tentative explanation will be given when discussing infrastructure and social capital issues, as well as culture of migration. Another important characteristic of Polish migrations is their local specificity: there is different intensity of cross border mobility, different cultures, strategies and destinations of migration in various regions: e.g. Silesia is "sending" migrants predominantly to Germany, while Podlasie has strong links to Belgium and United States.

|  | TYPES OF MOBILE LIVING (JobMob) | TYPES OF MOBILE LIVING IN POLAND | AVAILABLE LITERATURE |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Daily commuters | marginal, involves either suburban areas (a) or borderland (b) | scarce |
| 2 | Shuttles | Marginal | none |
| 3 | Long distance relationship | Rare (4%?) | none |
| 4 | Varimobile | pertains to specific vocational groups (c) | some |
| 5 | Seasonal workers | Considerable | yes |
| 6 | Movers | Marginal | none |
| 7 | Migrants | Big | Yes |
| 8 | Foreign delegates | pertains to corporate delegates and scientific migration | scarce |
| 9 | Job nomads | Rare | none |
| 10 | Multi-mobiles | Rare | none |
| 11 | Multi-mobilities | Rare | none |
|  | -- | temporary, circular, "incomplete" migration (d) | Yes |

Due to the differences between Poland and the countries in Western Europe, it is key to describe the mobility types as they appear in Poland, including the ones that are specific for our country (namely, a through d). Without these explanations, one may be easily mislead by the names: e.g. vari-mobile appears in Poland, but for very special occupations only; so it is driven by the necessities of the job and not by the individual choice. Sailor is "vari-mobile" just because he is a sailor, and not because he and his wife (partner) made a specific choice as to their family arrangement.

*Daily commuters. The (a) type* is exactly the very type of commuting defined in the project typology, but the phenomenon itself is very recent and restricted to suburban areas of big Polish cities, thus not massive (Nowak, Sikora 2004).

*The (b) type*, although may seem similar to regular commuting, is a "grey zone" economic activity – thus not regular or legal job. This type of "daily commuting" is a particular form of "trade" - commercial cross-border activity. It consists of the series of cross-border transactions. Taking advantage of the price differential on the two sides of the border

so called mrówki (lit. "ants") circulate daily between two sides of the border buying and selling goods in small quantities to avoid paying customs (Matejko 2006). By definition this type of mobility is locally specific (limited to borderland).

The rural – urban commuting is no longer present as it used to be before 1989 (Okólski 2001). As explained in the Introduction, there are no jobs for the rural (the group with the lowest skills and the lowest levels of education) people in the urban areas: the industry shrinks, and the growing service sector demands much higher qualifications.

*Vari-mobile. The (c) type* is present and studied in the form of impact of sailor job on his family (Janiszewski 1986, Janiszewski 1991, Kaczmarczyk-Sowa 1996). Other varimobile job categories present in Poland ( e.g. stewards/esses, drivers) remain unexplored.

*The (d) type*. The most important and characteristic type of Polish mobility seems to be the (d) type, so-called "incomplete migration" (Jaźwińska, Okólski 2001). It is quite common and seems to be a dominant trait of Polish migrations (Jaźwińska 2001). "Incomplete migration" is a temporary or circular mobility that involves irregularity of stay or work in the host country while maintaining close and steady contacts with migrant's household, without the intention to settle down in the host country. "Seasonal work" can be seen as a type of "incomplete migration." It tends to be a long term strategy (lasting for couple of years), and is mainly undertaken as a survival not advancement strategy. Migrants, recruited from peripheries, work in secondary labour market in receiving societies (dual labour market theory: Piore 1979, Massey 1999). It results in social exclusion of the migrant in receiving as well as sending country (Osipowicz 2001).

### 1.3. Theories

In Polish mobility studies the following theoretic approaches are used: neoclassical economics, new economics of labour migration (Oded Stark), dual labour market theory (Michel Piore), social capital and social networks theory (Bourdieu, Coleman, Massey).

### 1.4. Methods

In Polish mobility studies the classical survey research are applied, as well as mixed methods strategies, mainly ethnosurvey (Massey 1987, Jaźwińska & Okólski 2001, Jończy 2003). Qualitative studies on selected cases (local communities, communities of migrants) are also used quite often.

## 2. Job mobility and motility (incl. infrastructure)

### 2.1. Demands of high mobility of modern life

It should be stressed Poland is still modernizing rather than modern country. With very high unemployment, there are not many local labour markets that would "pull" people from other regions. The shortages of the work supply appear more as the result of the migration than as an outcome of the modern life demands: e.g. there are problems with seasonal workers in the tourist segment, as Poles prefer to work in UK or Ireland than in Polish hotels/restaurants. The demand for really modern jobs – in banking, modern services, is still quite low, and can be easily fulfilled by local people. The "high mobility issue" (call for more flexibility, life long learning etc.) is overshadowed by the extremely difficult situation on Polish labour market; lack of jobs combined with poor transport infrastructure fosters internal mobility, while encouraging certain types of international mobility. As estimated recently (Rzeczpospolita, June 16th 2006), over 2'000'000 Poles has left Poland already to work abroad – mainly in Germany, UK, Ireland, Spain and Italy.

### 2.2. Mobility potential or motility: the access to transport infrastructure

In Poland the transport infrastructure is more an overall barrier against mobility than a facilitating factor. Infrastructure shortcomings form an important obstacle to internal mobility (commuting, shuttling, LDR). At the same time, international transport is being developed (e.g. economic airlines and direct private coach transport between sending and destination areas), which facilitates and encourages the trends toward cross-border mobility.

As far as the road infrastructure is concerned, there are three main barriers against mobility: lack of highways system (only short sections have been built), lack of bypasses/ring roads around big cities, and poor condition of the existing roads. The railroad infrastructure has also a lot of serious problems: it lacks high speed connections between the capital city and other cities, the regional and local (intraregional) connections have collapsed (thus "cutting off" a lot of small towns and villages from the centre of their respective regions), the technical infrastructure is in poor condition: e.g. the system of tracks is so old and underinvested that trains cannot develop higher speed (MTiB 2003). A focused study by Kochańska 2002 showed the crucial role of transport infrastructure in coping with the new reality of the transforming economy. The workers of ex-"PGR" (nationalised collective agriculture units, developed during socialism) - who are generally believed major "losers" of transformation, are "economically imprisoned": after they have lost their jobs in PGR, they can neither

commute to the nearby towns to find a job there (lack of transportation), nor sell their flats and move (they do not own their flats).

The situation inside the cities is not much better: with the rapid growth of the number of inhabitants and even more rapid growth of the number of cars, travelling the same distance takes more and more time (traffic jam). The condition of the public transportation has not improved enough to compensate. Thus commuting is growing more problematic. However, in the biggest cities there is a recent tendency to move into suburbs and commute daily to work (Nowak, Sikora 2004).

Kryńska (2001) lists other barriers against mobility in Poland. Apart from infrastructure condition and general tendency toward immobility, the crucial factors to be taken into account while analysing mobility potential in Poland are housing situation (shortage of flats, prices and lack of legal private ownership) and dysfunctional labour information system (the last factor analysed also in Szewczyk 2004).

## 2.3. Mobility potential or motility: the competences

The major forms of mobility in Poland, incomplete migration and seasonal work, are connected with unskilled labour demand in the host societies. Therefore these are not skills that form the major mobility competence. As far as psychological traits are concerned their meaning is suggested to be marginal (as in the case of risk inclination, Hirszfeld, Kaczmarczyk 1999). The factor that remains important is individual's social capital. Górny and Stola (2001) noticed, however, that it is crucial only in the case of the first trip abroad: after the first step has been made successfully, an individual migrant acquires experience and knowledge of how to cope on his/her own, so the next migrations are undertaken relying on social networks.

As far as seasonal work is concerned a study of migrant woman by Matejko (2004) showed that the migration triggered an entrepreneurial spirit in them and a sense of personal autonomy.

Knowing the language of host society is a basic skill that one would expect from immigrants. Yet, as a study by Koryś (2001) showed, most of the migrants from outside Warsaw and around half of those from Warsaw didn't have any competence of the language before arriving. This lack in cultural capital was made up for by relying on social networks, but the latter at times turns out to be unreliable (Grzymała-Kazłowska 2001). Her study

showed how, with the maturing of Polish migration in Brussels, growing saturation of labour market and the rivalry among compatriots, personal traits like linguistic competence but also interpersonal skills become more and more important in successful career on the labour market, while at the same time enabling one to build independence from social networks (that are no longer functional).

## 2.4. Mobility potential or motility: the appropriation, the culture of mobility

Poland has a long history of being a migrant, sending country. Starting from 19th centaury (e.g. Praszałowicz 2005, Hirszfeld, Kaczmarczyk 2000) migration was a widespread strategy undertaken throughout centuries for economic as well as political reasons. Emigration forms an important part of Polish collective memory. The mobility culture in Poland is a migration culture.

Many researches conclude that the overall acceptance of migration as coping strategy, as a normal part of life is very high in Poland ( Kaczmarczyk, Hirszfeld 1999, Kaczmarczyk 2001, Solga 2002, Romaniszyn 2002). The "inclination, readiness to migrate" remains high among people who have never migrated yet (Slany 1997). The declared intention to migrate among Polish students is as high as 66% of surveyed sample - though more detailed analysis using couple of control questions estimated the real mobility potential on the level of 15% (Sygnowski 2004). However, even if the "real" migration intention is lower than the declared one, the study shows how accepted and high on the agenda of the life choices is migration in Poland. The interesting fact is that the children of migrants – i.e. the children of parents who use to migrate or migrated, are being socialised to migration. They claim they would undertake migration as soon as they leave school (Hirszfeld Kaczmarczyk 2000, Łopacka-Dyjak 2006).

The migration in Poland is usually the group (local community, family) activity: migrants rely on established networks, learn specific competence and go for specific destinations. Thus, migration in Poland is nested in local communities and in result shapes specific, local migration patterns. The existing social networks affect both the type of migration and the destination areas (Jończy 2003, Solga 2002, Jaźwińska & Okólski 2001).

Kupiszewski, Okólski 2004 claim that there is a direct link between the internal migration of the previous period (dual employment: commuting to the job in the city while still keeping small farm) and contemporary international migration, also being circular. There

is a shared general acceptance of migration though also a shared opinion about its drawbacks, which are mainly located in the realm of the family life (Solga 2002, Giza-Poleszczuk).

## 3. Family functioning, family structure, family development

In the recent major family studies ("sociology of the family") the issue of the relation between job mobility and the quality of the family life is not raised or studied (e.g. Tyszka 2004, Slany 2002). The main reason is the very low – although increasing, level of the (internal) job mobility. The impact of the modern labour market demand (flexibility, mobility) is only considered in the frame of the 2nd demographic transition: the job and career demands affect family formation patterns of the young people (delaying marriages, staying single etc. – Slany 2002).

Thus the only information about the impact of job mobility on the family life is available in migration studies. The family under the migration condition, when one of the parents is temporary absent, is seen as a temporary incomplete family and the fact of family "separation" is stressed.

In Polish migration literature the "family as a group/social unit" (versus "family as a set of individuals") perspective is dominant. This approach has a long tradition in social sciences in Poland, started with the classical Thomas and Znaniecki studies, continued e.g. by Chałasiński (1936); Duda-Dziewierz (1938). The first comprehensive studies (famous "Polish Peasant" by Thomas and Znaniecki) that examined the impact of migration onto the family life found migration the disintegrative factor, leading to the decomposition of the family. The tendency to look at the migration from the point of view of the family as the social unit is still prevailing, and, in result, the consequences of migration are examined from the perspective of the family functioning, and not from the point of view of individual stress or the quality of (individual) life. The Polish theoretical tradition is one of the sources of that approach. Another one is the reality of Polish life, with the strong role of the family network compensating for the inefficiencies of the market and state institutions. Yet another impulse to look at the family as the social unit rather than the set of individuals is the high position of "family" in value system of Poles (e.g. CBOS 2005). People in Poland do make "sacrifices" for their families, and take family interests in consideration while making their life choices.

It is no wonder then that contemporary migration research choose the new economics of labour migration (Oded Stark) as one of the main theoretic perspectives (e.g. Jaźwińska,

Okólski 2001). In Stark's theory, the migration decision is taken by the household as a whole, not by an isolated individual; these are the members of the household who designate migrants in such a way as to maximise benefits and minimise costs for the family. The scope of migration is aimed at satisfying the household's needs (e.g. the status position among other households in a given locality), and at diversifying the economic risk by relying - apart from the domestic one, on the foreign labour market.

Interestingly enough, in Poland there is a growing proportion of female migration (due to foreign labour markets' demands), including married women with children. We should not, however, take this tendency as a sign of individualisation or emancipation of Polish women. This is still a family-centred migration, made for the sake of the family here, and not in the name of the personal benefit (Kępińska 2004, Okólski 2001, Kaczmarczyk 2005).

According to the recent studies, migration in Poland is not an individual strategy but rather a family strategy (or family-centred strategy of an individual).

### 3.1. Family structures

Mobility - family relation in Polish literature is analysed in regard to only one type of family: heterosexual (married) couple with or without children. There is no literature examining other family types: cohabiting couples, single parent families, recomposed families, same sex partnership etc. In Poland, however, the process of the pluralisation of family types has only started. For example, there are only 3% of singles in Poland (understood as people 35+ who have never been married), and only 2% of cohabiting couples.

### 3.2. Family functioning: The division of domestic and professional labour within couples

Mobility with a temporary absence of one of the partners obviously affects the division of labour within a household. Most probably, there are few models adopted by "migrant" households. One of them has been captured in Silesia (Opole) (Solga 2002): with the migrant man (father and husband), woman usually quits her job to fully take care of home duties and children.

Obviously, the partner that stays home is generally responsible for more duties then while both partners were present. However, the situation differs for men and women: there is a shared agreement in literature that the strategies of coping depend on who stays home (Giza 1996, Łukowski 2001, Solga 2002, Latuch 1996).

It has been proved that with man migrating, the left behind woman is overburdened with responsibilities and tasks to the point of the role-strain syndrome (Solga 2002). On the positive side, Kukułowicz (2001) points out that woman who has to cope on her own develops new skills and personality traits: becomes more self-sufficient and independent.

When this is a woman who migrates, then according to the research conducted, the left behind man is poorly coping with the domestic responsibilities, and is often prone to pathologies (e.g. heavy drinking); moreover, he seeks assistance of relatives (parents), especially in taking care of children (Łukowski 2001). Łukowski also noticed that the migrant woman tends to coordinate the family life even from distance . Thus, even under migratory condition, families are able to reproduce the traditional division of labour in the household: absent woman still responsible for the domestic sphere, man not able to cope with runnig home and taking care of children on his own, thus assisted by women relatives. It has been also proven, however, the migrating women become more independent – "liberated" (Matejko 2004); sometimes they even treat the temporary absence as a form of retreat from the burdens of everyday life (Korczyńska 2003, Łopacka-Dyjak 2006). The studies suggest also that in the case of mother's migration children get more involved in housework (Łopocka-Dyjak 2006, Solga 2002).

Overall, job mobility (even international one) does not affect strongly the traditional division of duties between partners; however, women can gain through migration more independence and self-confidence.

### 3.3. Family functioning: an autonomous self versus a family as a group

The prevailing approach is in favour of viewing family as a group, with its own "collective" logic. Together with new economic theoretical approach, it results in looking for the cost and benefits of migration – for the family, not for an individual. On the side of the benefits, there are mainly financial values; on the side of cost, family disruption is very often mentioned. The general conclusion of the studies states migration has an overall negative impact of on family, and the migratory decisions are forced by the economic factors "at the cost" of the family values (Giza 1996, Solga 2002, Kaczmarczyk 2005).

Subjective view on migration – produced by migrants themselves, seems to suggest migration is always a trade – off. Migrants and their families appreciate the economic benefits (remittances) of migration, they are aware of its negative aspects, but they tend to accept the

trade-off. The awareness of the negative impact on family is largely shared in migrant communities; it will be discussed in the next paragraph "Family problems."

Thus, migration is triggered by economic benetifs. Remittances from migration are used for the family current consumption, often conspicuous; seldom for investments. The economic aspects of migration are crucial - especially in the case of the incomplete migration. The research prove incomplete migration is survival strategy for the family, not the strategy for investing or for advancement (Hirszfeld, Kaczmarczyk xxxx, Korczyńska 2003, Romaniszyn 2002). It should be stressed benefits from migration are usually analysed from the point of view of household/family; they are not seen as an investment in individual human capital.

There is also, however, a more individualistic type of migration, driven by the personal development plan (or dream). This concerns, in general, certain groups of professionals and specialist (Kaczmarczyk, Okólski 2005), who are motivated to become mobile (migrate) with the perspective of settling in the receiving communities and pursue the personal career. However, these groups are to certain extent "pushed" by their professional situation in Poland. For example, medical doctor is paid in Poland almost ten times less than in Sweden and almost three times less than in Spain, Wyborcza (2006). Another group we can expect individualistic mobility from, are students and graduates (Sygnowski 2004). These are clearly, however, the pioneers of the new trends, that are still weak in Poland. Individualistic mobility, undertaken to find better, more encouraging environment for personal development, is still to come.

### 3.4. Family problems and ways of coping

In literature, various dimensions and aspects of costs/problems caused by mobility are discussed:

The bonds between family members weaken and become more and more superficial, which results in conflicts, parallel relationships and divorces (Łopocka-Dyjak 2006, Kaczmarczyk-Sowa 1996, Grzymała-Kazłowska 2001b, Romaniszyn 2002). It is worth to notice, however, that some studies (Romaniszyn 2002, Matejko 2004, Rosińska-Kordasiewicz 2005) suggest family crisis can be prior to migration, thus becoming a migration push-factor; so that migration is not always a cause of the family crisis, but at times also its symptom.

At the psychological level, the temporary separation from the partner results in stress,

depression, lack of sense of security, sense of loneliness etc.(Korczyńska 2003, Romaniszyn 2002, Solga 2002, Łopocka-Dyjak 2006, in sailors' families Kaczmarczyk-Sowa 1996).

When it comes to the impact on children, it is stated the negative consequences start appearing when the separation is longer than 3 months (Korczyńska 2003). The negative impact shows in worse performance at school and in vulnerability of the child to pathologies (e.g. drug addiction, juvenile criminality Solga 2002). At times the overburdening of the child with domestic tasks results in problems with coping with school tasks (Łopocka-Dyjak 2006).

However, the intensity of the negative consequences varies. There are families where the negative impact is high and vivid, but there are also cases of the families (under migration conditions) that do not suffer any negative consequences, and migration can even become a stimulus for integration of the family members and more involvement into the everyday activities (Łopocka-Dyjak 2006, the integrative function of sailors' absence: Janiszewski 1982).

Families struggle to cope with the prolonged separation, i.e. struggle to keep in touch, mostly by telephone calls (Korczyńska 2003), by buying gifts in order to compensate separation (mainly to the children), by visiting home as frequently as possible, in exceptional cases cooperating with other migrants to "change the shift" abroad in order to come home more frequently (Łukowski 2001). The help of extended family can be also seen as a coping strategy.

In the migrating communities e.g. Silesia (Opole) there are specific psychotherapeutic institutions which provide help for family members to cope with problems caused by mobility.

### 3.5. Family life cycle

Family life cycle affects the mobility patterns in various ways and differently for both genders. The relation between family life cycle and mobility, or more generally - the activity on the labour market and mobility, is stronger for women. The "small children phase" reduces the feasibility of migration to women but not the men (which is shown e.g. in Jaźwińska 1996, Kępińska 2004).

The childless seasonal workers declare different migration motives than migrants with children do (Korczyńska 2003). Jończy (2003) states that childless men undertake short-term,

temporary migrations, while men that have children get involved in long term, more stable work abroad (Jończy 2003). The similar effect is noted in Korczyńska 2003: having children generally motivates men to undertake the seasonal work. Among migrant parents there is a difference between the use that is made of remittances in relation to the age of children: when children are small, the remittances are being used to improve the living conditions, when the children are teenagers most of remittances are invested in their education (Korczyńska 2003).

## 4. Job market

### 4.1. Social mobility and spatial mobility

There is a vast agreement among Polish researchers that spatial mobility isn't necessarily accompanied by social mobility (Jaźwińska 2001, 2004). The types of mobility which do not trigger social advancement are connected with low paid unqualified jobs (without opportunities to become promoted) that form so called "secondary labour market" in post-industrial economies (Piore 1979). These are: seasonal work in agriculture (Korczyńska 2003, Kaczmarczyk, Łukowski 2004), "incomplete migration" in domestic and care service sector (women) (e.g. Grzymała-Kazłowska 2001a, Rosińska-Kordasiewicz 2005) and in constructions (men) (e.g. Hirszfeld, Kaczmarczyk 1999). As far as the above mentioned phenomena are concerned the spatial mobility not only does not promote the mobile individual in society, but to the contrary - it petrifies his or her marginal position on the labour market in sending as well as receiving country.

Social mobility correlates with spatial mobility in case of two professional niches: specialists and professionals on the one side, and qualified workers and office workers on the other side. These are, however, only small part of the overall mobility, additionally blocked by the politics of acknowledgement of the professional titles and certificates in the host countries (Kozek 2006).

### 4.2. Spatial mobility choices according to opportunities and requirements of the job market

The main mobility push factor in Poland is unemployment (currently 17,2% of labour force, April 2006). Its role in triggering mobility - e.g. seasonal work migrations, has grown in nineties (Kępińska 2004). Unemployment is selective: the groups that are most vulnerable to unemployment are women, young population, especially graduate people without work experience (Sygnowski 2004). Unemployment is also unequally distributed across country (Antoniszyn 2004). Women and young people having less opportunity on domestic labour

market are more prone to migrate (Kaczmarczyk 2005).

It was noted that migrant women' in comparison to migrant men' households are in worse economic situation, thus women seem to undertake more imposed migrations (Kępińska 2004).

The chosen types of spatial mobility that produce at the same time upward social mobility are obviously the expatriates – professionals and specialists for whom spatial mobility is the intrinsic part of the career path (Kaczmarczyk Okólski 2005).

### 4.3. Localisation of jobs within each country, spatial distribution of various kinds of jobs

Poland is a country with large interregional differences. For instance, the unemployment rate varies from the lowest 13,4% in Małopolskie Voivodship and 13,5% in Mazowieckie Voivodship to the highest rate in Warmińsko-Mazurskie Voivodship (26,6%) (GUS April 2006).

The rural-urban economic differences are growing. The peripheral regions have poor transport infrastructure (e.g. lack of good connections with central regions) which, apart from national industry collapse after 1989 is one of the factors that make it easier to migrate than to commute or shuttle. During the nineties the tendency to undertake internal mobility has lessen (Kryńska 2001).

The positive factor is the cooperation agreements between regions in different countries and European structural funds, which support improvement of infrastructure and enable local investments (Kaczmarek 2004).

Big cities are economic centres, with the job market changing more and more from an industrial one (in the past, big cities were also the industrial centres) to the service sectors. Thus there are less and less jobs in the big cities for the low skilled, unemployed people from other parts of Poland. Together with the high cost of living in big cities, it blocks the rural – urban job mobility. 40% of the Polish companies are located in big cities – Warsaw (hosts itself 10% of companies), Cracow, Wrocław, Łódź, Poznań, Gdańsk (Parysek 2004).

## 5. Social integration, social capital

### 5.1. Social capital and mobility types

We will show social capital aspects of mobility in regard to three types of mobility (as these only are discussed in Polish literature): seasonal work, migration and incomplete migration, marginally referring to foreign delegates. The most complete data have been collected and analyzed concerning the incomplete migration.

There is a general thesis that legal mobility is undertaken making use of the formal channels, while – to the contrary, illegal mobility takes advantage of the informal ties (Górny Stola 2001). This is definitely the case of "expatriates" (foreign delegates), who are recruited mainly in big the cities (e.g. in Warsaw); the important source of migration information are in this case, apart from the social networks, institutions and corporations that create the demand and initiate recruitment (Koryś 2001). In the case of the other forms of mobility, the crucial role of the social capital is stressed. Social capital is understood in the Polish literature as an access to social migration network (Górny Stola 2001), that is absolutely key to the migration process (Koryś 2001, Kaczmarczyk, Łukowski 2004, Grzymała-Kazłowska 2001, Górny, Stola 2001, Łukowski 2001). Surprisingly, also the allocation of regular "seasonal works," though conditioned by bilateral government agreements, turns out to be dependent on various informal ties (Kaczmarczyk, Łukowski 2004a). It is worth stressing that overall in Poland the majority of people believe informal ties are key to get any job, whether abroad or at place.

The types of mobility that seem rather independent from the social capital, apart from foreign delegations, are types of migration connected with commercial activity: the 1.(b) type of cross-border commerce and commercial migrations (Górny, Stola 2001).

### 5.2. Composition of networks

In the case of these forms of migration that are strongly informal-tie-dependent, mobile individuals have a denser and stronger social network than immobile ones. This is the case of migration and incomplete migration (Górny, Stola 2001, Koryś 2001, Łukowski 2001), seasonal work (Kaczmarczyk, Łukowski 2004). In the case of formally initiated migrations - foreign delegations the social migrant networks turn out to be weaker (Górny, Stola 2001).

There is a hierarchy of the power (potential) of social relations in networks: they go from the strongest close-kin ties, through friendship and neighbour ties to the weakest and

most abstract ties based on shared nationality (Grzymała-Kazłowska 2001b). The case of Polish migration to Belgium analysed in Grzymała-Kazłowska 2001a and 2001b shows the dynamics of social migrant networks: at the beginning of the migration process, the number of Poles involved was limited, and shared nationality was a sufficient reason to cooperate. As soon as the job market have saturated with Polish workers, only close-kin ties provide a reason to cooperate, and the role of individual cultural capital grows.

### 5.3. *Social support, social networks and social capital*

The social support in the case of Polish forms of mobility is analysed mainly as a support provided by family members in rearing children when one or both parents are temporarily absent due to economic migration or seasonal work. Most often these are grandparents, especially grandmothers, who take care of the left-behind children (Hirszfeld, Kaczmarczyk 1999, Korczyńska 2002). This way of coping is supported by the traditional notion of an extended family where not only parents but also other relatives take part in children's upbringing.

### 5.4. *Spatial distribution of personal networks*

There are differences between types of mobility in regard to the way social networks are distributed. Individuals undertaking migration rely more on social networks in the receiving country, people undertaking circular, "incomplete migration" use their social networks available in the sending country, in their local communities. As we observe a general shift from migrations towards incomplete migration after the 1989, we may assume that the significance of the local ties is on growth (Górny, Stola 2001).

Another aspect of the spatial dimension of mobility is the difference between the centre and peripheries. The peripheries, lacking economic and cultural capital, make up for by developing stronger networks (social capital); thus the social networks are relatively more important in the peripheries than in the centre. Relying more heavily on social networks leads to a higher unification of destination countries in the peripheries, whereas in the centre we notice more diversity (Koryś 2001). On the individual level, the lack of cultural capital is made up for by developing social networks. However, it seems social networks gets less reliable with the growing number of migrants. As shown by Grzymała-Kazłowska (2001), Polish migration networks to Belgium turns out to be deceiving, given the non-cooperative tendencies among migrants.

## 6.  Quality of Life

### *6.1. Subjective well-being, health related issues and spatial mobility*

The link between spatial mobility and quality of life seems ambivalent in Polish context. On the one hand, the economic benefits that are produced during job related mobility are invested in house infrastructure which improves material "quality of life." On the other hand, stress connected with the separation from the family and with the burden of coping with problems in receiving society may lower the psychological "quality of life." However there are no in-depth studies probing into this problem. While the mobility as a feature appearing ever more frequently on the labour markets was often discussed in the sociological papers in last years, Polish psychological studies did not deal with this issue. It is even more astonishing taken the fact that the work and organisational psychology was developing very quickly during the last years, also in Poland.

Our review of the Polish (published between 1995 and 2005) as well as foreign psychological literature available in Poland shows that the subject of mobility is, in principle, absent. What we could find were only few remarks and isolated contributions to akin issues.

A qualitative case-study "Job-Life Programmes and the Company Effectiveness" conducted by the Institute of Labour and Social Studies (Berłowski 2003) shows divergence between declarations and actions regarding the attitude of organisations toward family. On the declarative level three of four managers would have a person with family on a managerial position rather than a flexible single. A "family man" is usually regarded as emotionally mature, more loyal and committed to work. However, the policy of promoting and hiring in companies contradicts these statements. In reality, there is a clear preference for people who are disposable, without family obligations (Berłowski 2000b).

One should bear in mind however that company policy and organisational culture can make a world of difference as far as family is concerned. Therefore, we should differentiate between two kinds of companies – firms which rely on young, dynamical and fluctuating team (task-oriented organisations – which typically force overtime and rely on job-oriented workers without family) and others which emphasise attachment of workers to the organisation and offer them and their relatives family-friendly solutions such as child-care assistance or family meals which are to unburden the employees (family-oriented organisations – Berłowski 2000b).

Generally, managers in Poland are starting to appreciate building good relations with workers. Engaging family in the company's undertakings became an element of the marketing strategies (in order to picture organisation as family-friendly). It could be profitable, because family programmes could attach employees to the organisation and result in higher identification with the company objectives. Yet, the effectiveness of family-friendly programmes hasn't been proven. On the other hand such programmes can have "spoiling" impact and strengthen the demanding attitudes among the crew. Furthermore, programmes of this kind are not always welcomed by the employees.

Labourers wish the family to be a separate environment, a "calm harbour" after a hard day at work. Melting down these two orders may be felt as a kind of encirclement. It is good, to have something apart from job to live for. Additionally, numerous groups of employees prefer entertainment benefits (e.g. granting a subsidy for sport clubs) over family meals at work or family picnics, for instance (Berłowski 2000).

The discussion about involving family into motivating programmes is well recapitulated by Balcerzak-Paradowska (2003) who stresses that policies aimed at balancing work and family life are unrealistic in the face of the current situation on the labour market. Employer will not engage in a pricey programme, if the employee overburden with familial obligations can be easily replaced. We are not that far yet – claims Balcerzak-Paradowska (2003).

In magazines for managers ("Personnel and Management") we haven't found any remarks on this issue, apart from one comment, that from the organisational point of view mobility of the family-free employees is cheaper, because the relocation package is in this case less comprehensive (Berłowski 2000b).

The psychological analyses of families affected by mobility are hard to find in the Polish literature. Mobility is not only poorly defined, but it seems to be an uninteresting subject for psychologists as well. The few contributions we could find deal with very special cases of mobility. We will present only two studies. One of them relates to the long-term absence of one parent due to occupational obligations and the other one refers to a very special case of sailors, who are not only separated from their family but are living in a very special conditions of isolation.

## 6.2. *The impact of long-term work related absence of one parent on the family life*

The first paper, by Kukołowicz (2001), sums up the overview of studies on the impact of long-term work related absence of one parent on the family life. Though we are dealing here with incomplete families – claims Kukołowicz (2001: 65), the stability of the everyday life rhythm is not disturbed. The periods between occasional attendances of both parents, are rather stable and settled. However, the consequences of such living arrangements are predominantly negative. The long-term absence of one parent leads to loosening of ties and disengagement. The absent parent does not understand the family situation anymore (especially when teenaged children are growing up), the other one feels overburden with additional obligations. As a result, the spouse-tie get weakened, the spouses are getting more autonomous and self-dependent, which cools the emotional climate of the family. The children are missing the absent parent and are getting more attached to the present one, with whom they share day-to-day experiences.

The absence of one parent is reflected in the disturbed identification with the own gender. Moreover, predominantly economical reasons for mobility lead children to the conclusion that money is what the life is all about. All that may be dangerous for the family – in the short and in the long-term perspective.

## 6.3. *Coping with stress and loneliness under the sea isolation conditions*

Another study on the impact of occupational mobility on the family life was conducted by Plopa (1996a, b) and depicts a very special situation. Plopa describes sailors' coping with loneliness (defined as a subjective feeling of emotional and social isolation, dissatisfaction with actual living conditions). The loneliness may appear as a result of living in permanent stressful conditions, what usually leads to restrained relations with social and physical environment, yields the lack of desired intimacy and may cause depression, anxiety, longing, detachment, helplessness, lack of self-control, boredom and even aggression (Plopa 1996a: 163). Experiencing loneliness is a result of lacking in support from family members and friends.

The effectiveness of coping with loneliness and stress depends on personal and social resources. The former covers such features as interpersonal competence and ego-strength; the latter means most of all social support and contentment with family life.

Plopa (1996 a, b) conducted a series of psychological tests on a group of sailors who revealed symptoms of loneliness. He noticed that some sailors coped with the stressful situation better than others. The group which was satisfactorily coping with the stressful isolation condition (the cruise lasted over half a year) was characterised by features such as: self-sufficiency, independence, proper self-estimation, moderate tolerance, adventurousness, freedom of prejudice, self-efficacy, reliance on intellectual and cognitive abilities, self-confidence, sense of humour, spontaneity, a broad range of interests and social contacts as well as social ability; they also cherished work and effort as values per se (Plopa 1996a: 167). People, who were showing better adjustment to the situation didn't get easily affected by momentary impulses, avoided conflicts, were loyal and self-possessed, showed only a weak tendency to present themselves in a positive light (Plopa 1996a: 171). This group didn't get down easily and tended do look for support when suffering. Sailors who were coping well also had faith in own resources and felt confident about their ability to deal with problems. As a result, they were able to cope with problems more effectively.

This proves that personality features do matter in the respect of coping with loneliness and stress. But also familial variables matter when coping is concerned. The importance of family is enclosed within the concept of social support that helps to struggle with different kinds of stressful events. Moreover, the study reveals that the higher acceptance upon values or actual goals (e.g. occupational activities) among family members, the higher subjectively perceived support and the smaller proneness to stressful events (Plopa 1996b: 90). Thus, effectiveness of coping with problems depends on the quality of the familial system, which in turn is down to the stability, frequency and regularity of the contact, intensity of the relation, reciprocal openness and common activities of all family members. The high quality of the familial relation (i.e. satisfaction, happiness) is a way to protect a person against stress (Plopa 1996b: 90).

Family is then an important reservoir of such resources as feeling of belonging, safety, esteem, love, support that are crucial to cope with everyday life, but it also needs to be "supplied" with regular contact, openness, common affairs which keep family members together.

It shouldn't surprise then, that sailor put the detachment from the closest family on the first place in the ranking of most stressful factors during the cruise. The second place was taken by the lack of regular contact with family, unsatisfied sexual need and the restriction of

the living space. Further classified were: boredom, disturbed diurnal rhythm, living conditions on the ship, noise, crew vulgarity, and unstable atmospheric conditions (Plopa 1996b: 91).

Again, Plopa (1996b) divided the group of tested sailors into those, who coped well and those, who suffered from loneliness. Those who were doing better treated love as a basic value in life, which made their life and the work on the sea meaningful. Their marriage was declared to be grounded on intimacy, openness on partner's needs, sympathy, trust and honesty (Plopa 1006b: 94). Greater immunity to stress was showed by those sailors, who reported to have satisfactory communication in the family, who respected opinions, preferences and interests of other family members as well as their individuality. Also rearing attitudes (directed to read off the children needs instead of "forcing" own views, dominating or keeping on distance) was correlated with satisfactory coping with stress (Plopa 1996b: 98).

The studies by Plopa show then that it is not solely about having family but about its organization, quality and attitudes toward it as well as values. The main problems that families affected by mobility face are connected with stress, alienation and loneliness.

**Luis Ayuso Sánchez and Gerardo Meil Landwerlin**

# VII. Literature on Job Mobility in Spain

A review of the literature on spatial or geographic mobility in Spain shows that the greatest interest and scientific output regarding this subject have been focused on some very specific areas. In general, the studies that stand out are those conducted from an economic perspective, primarily focusing on the mobility of human resources in relation to the labour market and to unemployment[46]. From the standpoint of demography and human geography, this subject has been dealt with by analyzing job mobility as a decisive factor in the spatial and urban planning of metropolitan areas[47]. Finally, and to a lesser extent than the previous ones, existing publications that discuss this phenomenon from an ecological point of view should also be mentioned; these deal with the impact this mobility has on the environment in large cities[48].

An analysis of the sources consulted reveals that there are no studies that differentiate among the different types of job-related mobility, nor are there any regarding the social consequences that it has for the life courses of individuals and their families. Furthermore, a general lack of quantitative data has periodically been observed in Spain as a whole, as well as a significant dearth of qualitative studies that contribute to reflection on the reasons for and effects of this mobility.

## 1. Job mobility and motility (incl. infrastructure)

### 1.1. Demands of high mobility of modern life

The growth in mobility is increasingly significant in developed societies, and this phenomenon may be approached from several scientific perspectives. In the Spanish literature, E. Bericat's reflection (1994) aimed at establishing a "Sociology of spatial

---

[46] See the contributions of: Antolin (1997), Bentolila (1997), Abellán (1998), Antolin (1999), Bentolila (2001), Albert and Toharia (2001), EOI (Escuela de Organización Industrial – Industrial Organization School) (2002), Luis Carnicer et al (2002).

[47] There is an interdisciplinary research group in Spain known as "Territorio y Movilidad" (Territory and Mobility), whose aim is to analyze daily mobility as a key element in the configuration of urban space. See: Gutierrez Puebla (1990), Salom et al (1995), Feria and Susino (1996), Módenes (1998), Castañer et al (2001), Módenes (2002), Módenes and López (2003) or Sánchez Gutierrez's thesis (2005) from an urban economy perspective.

[48] See the annual reports of the Metropolitan Mobility Observatory (Observatorio de la Movilidad Metropolitana) published by the Ministry of the Environment (the latest is from October 2005), which deal with issues relating to mobility and the urban environment (influence of transport on air quality, greenhouse gas emissions and atmospheric pollutants generated by transport, urban mobility plans, etc.).

mobility" ("Sociología de la movilidad espacial") is worthy of note. According to this author, contemporary advanced societies are characterised by the transformations that mobility structures are causing in the social structure. This change includes what is known as "nomadic sedentariness," which is associated with improved infrastructures that make mobility possible without migration. In this society, individual job-related mobility accounts for a considerable share of the total number of journeys. In referring to this travel, the author makes a distinction among three types: mobility to work, mobility in or at work and mobility because of work[49].

From a quantitative standpoint, different studies regarding some of Spain's Autonomous Communities show the increase in the amount of time devoted to daily commutes[50]. The production of statistical data for Spain as a whole is very recent (MOVILIA survey on mobility, 2001; census, 2001; ECVT [Encuesta de calidad de vida en el trabajo - Survey on Quality of Life at Work], 2002-2004). According to De Miguel (2002), regarding the percentage of Spaniards whose one-way commute is over half an hour, Madrid (41%) stands out greatly over two other urbanised regions, the Basque Country (21%) and Catalonia (17%). Madrid's truly exceptional situation is due to the fact that the entire region is, in practice, a metropolitan area. The opposite holds true for more integrated areas, with a smaller urban scale, such as La Rioja (4%), Cantabria (8%) and the Balearic Islands (10%). According to this author, this increase in the overall commute time in Spain is due to the fact that the structure of the housing market is quite rigid, as it is much more heavily weighted towards owning than towards renting. Over 80% of households own their homes (a disproportionate figure by European standards). Other causes include the fact that the population is heavily concentrated in urban communities, even in agricultural areas; the deficient public transport system; the lack of job mobility; and the persistence of the split shift, which in many cases means the number of trips is doubled.

As far as interregional job mobility is concerned, the periodic reports of the Occupational Labour Observatory (Observatorio Ocupacional de Empleo) show a rising trend in the last five years (2000-2005), with commutes between Autonomous Communities

---

[49] The first one refers to round trips that generally take place to go back and forth between the home and the workplace; the second focuses on spatial movements required to perform the functions of or by the content of the job; and finally, mobility because of work is mobility in which the family home stays in the same place while one of the members of the household temporarily changes residence during workdays (Bericat, 1994).
[50] See Artis Ortuño, 1998 for the case of Catalonia; Salom and Delios, 2000, for Valencia; Feria and Susino, 2001, for Andalusia; and Sánchez Gutierrez, 2005, for Madrid.

growing at a faster rate than those between provinces (2005)[51]. Therefore, commutes are longer. In the shared thinking of Spanish workers, there is also a greater awareness of the increased need for job mobility. The study conducted by Alemán Páez (1999) indicates that this type of mobility is considered to be increasingly important in today's society, even essential to coping with the changes taking place in the productive environment. Thus, a growth in this type of mobility is expected in the medium and long term.

This greater predisposition should not disguise the costs that this mobility entails, as these are still being seen as very significant barriers. Issues such as the loss of quality of life (De Miguel, 2002) and the risk of a decrease in elements of social integration between the worker and his environment (EOI, 2002), among others, may explain the resistance found in Spain to this type of mobility. Bericat (1994) listed the following ten types of costs as those generated by a mobile society: expenses relating to road infrastructure, technical infrastructure, energy, parking, accidents, social supervision and organisation, as well as hidden, induced, and derivative expenses.

### 1.2. *Mobility potential or motility: the access to transport infrastructure*

In the area of infrastructures as a whole, those relating to transport are of primary importance for mobility and for the development of any country. Their importance is particularly evident in Spain and its regions because of the imbalance in the geographic distribution of the population and the country's peripheral location in the European Community. In this respect, according to data from the Ministry of Development (2004), Spain has improved its total transport infrastructures significantly compared to the situation that existed prior to joining the EU. The investment in recent years, measured in terms of GDP, has been above the EU average, and this has enabled Spain to narrow and close the gap in the allocation of public capital that existed in comparison to the rest of Europe in the mid 1980s[52].

Despite the improvement in transport infrastructures, some limitations in the transport system still persist and must be corrected. The principal problems include: in road transport,

---

[51] However, the data provided by the ECVT survey on the average territorial mobility in Spain for the period from 1999-2002 show that mobility between provinces, regardless of the Autonomous Community to which the province belongs, is 23.7%, and spatial mobility between Autonomous Communities is 19.7% (Requena, 2005).
[52] European Community funds have contributed significantly to this investment, which indicates how important European cohesion policy is for Spain. As an example, co-financed investments represented 40% of total government outlays in 2004 (Ministry of Development and associated public agencies), and rose to 65% in Objective 1 regions (Ministry of the Presidency, 2005).

the radial structure of the main highway and motorway system, which causes a lack of accessibility in some parts of the country; and in rail transport, the fact that a large part of the rail lines in the national system have a different gauge than the European standard. There are also structural deficiencies in the Spanish rail system, with notable differences in quality and safety from one rail line to another (Ministry of Development, 2004). The demand for transport is also increasing in Spain at a faster pace than that of economic growth, with greater elasticity than in other developed countries. While this elasticity will tend to decrease and to converge with the European average, it is foreseeable that in years to come the greater dynamism of the Spanish economy will be associated with substantial increases in passenger and goods traffic (Ministry of Development).

Studies have been conducted that demonstrate the significant relationship between improvements in infrastructures, economic growth and mobility, such as the one coordinated by Ugoiti (1999). Other more specific studies have focused on the evaluation of transport infrastructures and their effects on regional development, through the use of accessibility indicators (Orellana, 1994); the key role that roads in Spain play in social and economic development (Lobo Gutierrez, 1993)[53]; and the role of the railway system in land use planning and in the mobility of the population (Fundación de Ferrocarriles Españoles [Spanish Railways Foundation], 1997).

### 1.3. Mobility potential or motility: the competences

In the study on the competences that facilitate or impede the mobility of the Spanish population, the ones referring to educational level stand out[54]. Two studies demonstrate this relationship: the one carried out by De Miguel (2002) using information from the Survey on Quality of Life at Work (ECVT), and the Bancaja Report (2005) prepared from data from the census (2001).

Both show that there is a positive relationship between the educational level of the employed and daily commutes to a municipality other than the one of residence. In the case of workers who have completed no more than primary education, this percentage does not

---

[53] It should be recalled that road transport has a disproportionately high share in the modal split in Spain at this time, both for passengers, where it represents 91% of all journeys (in terms of passenger-kilometres), and for goods, where road transport accounts for 84% of total tonne-kilometres. (Ministry of Development, 2004).
[54] The EU's Report (2004) on the Implementation of the Action Plan for Skills and Mobility places special emphasis on raising education and training levels in EU countries, as a key competence in increasing mobility in years to come.

exceed 25 %, while for those with university studies it is over 35%. Specifically, 39 % of those who have completed three-year degrees, 39 % of university graduates and 36 % of PhDs work outside of their place of residence. Similarly, it has also been observed that the workers with the longest commutes are generally those with higher educational levels (Bancaja, 2005)[55].

The explanation provided by De Miguel (2002) is that people with higher education probably live in large cities, where travel takes longer. Furthermore, university graduates usually prefer to live in suburbs or outlying areas; in other words, they exchange nature or peace and quiet for increased travel time. In a congested area like Madrid, where there are more cars than households, driving every day does not save much time. As far as job mobility involving residential changes is concerned, the Occupational Labour Observatory (2005) believes that there is a polarisation of the highest rates at both ends of the educational spectrum, i.e., those with university studies on the one hand and those with lower than Compulsory Secondary Education (Spanish acronym ESO) on the other.

Despite having educational levels similar to or even higher than men's, women show lower mobility rates in general. This may be due to a significant lack of motility. Nevertheless, according to the detailed study on gender differences in daily work-related journeys conducted by Casado (2000-2003), in which the Community of Valencia is taken as a reference, these differences should take several nuances into consideration, such as occupational categories[56] and the highest level of education achieved[57].

### 1.4. Mobility potential or motility: the appropriation, the culture of mobility

According to Bericat (1994), advanced developed societies create a culture of mobility that becomes woven into the fabric of our lives, resulting in a lifestyle and a set of customs and practices different from other types of societies. Today's citizens form part of society through mobility and tend towards mobility in a world of dramatic changes. However, this general ethos towards movement does not eliminate cultural differences between countries

---

[55] People whose commute is half an hour or less have completed around 10 years of study or less, while those whose commute is more than half an hour have completed around 11 years of study (Bancaja, 2005).
[56] Mobility among women is higher than among men in several groups that represent a large number of workers: professionals, teachers and healthcare workers. In these occupations, characterized by high educational requirements and high average income, female mobility is over 38% compared to the overall mean among women, which is 22.34%, in other words, 70% higher (Casado: 2003:9).
[57] The gap between men and women narrows as the educational level increases, and for those with university studies, the trend is reversed: in these groups, female mobility is higher than male mobility (Casado: 2003:10).

and regions whose citizens are more predisposed to mobility in some places than in others.

Spain has traditionally been characterised by low levels of mobility among its population, a fact that has often been discussed by economists and demographers (Bentolila, 1997 and 2001, and Gutierrez Puebla, 1990); most of them have explained this greater lack of mobility through demographic, economic and institutional factors (Llano and Gómez, 2005)[58]. There are few studies that focus on the cultural variable (although some allude to it). Among the research that places greater emphasis on this facet, the investigation conducted with workers by Alemán Paéz (1999) from a qualitative perspective is worthy of note.

This author believes that understanding Spanish culture is essential to understanding the fact that workers are less predisposed to mobility. This culture is, in turn, expressed in a series of obstacle-forming subcultures. The first of these is the subculture of "home ownership" to the detriment of a "rental" culture[59]; second, the presence of a strong family culture[60] that would place great importance on community factors in deciding whether or not to migrate (the spouse's chances of finding work would be evaluated, as well as the age of the children and their educational opportunities); and finally, idiosyncratic characteristics typical of some regions of Spain that would hinder mobility would also have to be taken into consideration, such as, for example, the existence of an own language (Catalan, Basque or Galician), customs and specific forms of integration into the new social environment. If this type of culture had less of an influence, it would facilitate mobility; this is, in fact, what happens in the case of immigrants[61].

---

[58] Among demographic factors, variables such as the following are mentioned: family structure, educational level, the presence of cultural barriers and the ageing of the population. Factors of an economic nature include: economic capacity, expectations for the evolution of the labour market and the cost of housing and transport. Institutional factors include: the degree of political decentralization, the generosity of the social welfare system and unemployment benefits, the mechanisms for redistributing income and the scope of collective bargaining in the national labour market (Llano and Gómez, 2005).

[59] See the study by Módenes and López (2004) on residential mobility, work and housing in Europe. In this study, the authors speculate on whether countries with a more rigid residential system, such as Spain, also have more limited job mobility. In other words, it would not be so much that those who change jobs do not move around much, but that only those who do not need to change their place of residence change jobs.

[60] With regard to impediments to mobility of a family nature, EOI's qualitative research (2002) indicates that the presence of family values plays a very important role in the life courses of workers. As far as age is concerned, "older people assume that the family is the essential and sometimes only cause, while young people give greater priority to other relationships that help them increase their awareness of identity and belonging. Family loyalty is set against job loyalty. Preferring work is seen as synonymous with not loving the family" (2002: 82)

[61] According to Llano and Gómez (2005), there is an extensive group of factors that suggest that immigrants have greater job mobility compared to the citizens of the country, alluding to the fact that immigrants are less attached to their place of residence, have a greater tendency to rent than to own, have, on average, a lighter burden of family responsibilities, etc.

## 2. Family functioning, family structure, family development

### 2.1. Family structures

In recent years, different studies have been undertaken from the perspective of family sociology, designed to learn about the changes taking place in family structures in Spain. A general norm in these studies has been that the unusual thing about these structural changes is not their direction (as they tend towards uniformity with other European countries) but the speed at which they have occurred (Iglesias de Ussel, 1998).

Different studies have analyzed some of the consequences of the "post-modernisation of the family" (Meil, 1999) and of the pluralisation of family forms[62]; these changes have been shaping the "new Spanish family" (Alberdi, 1999). Studies have also been carried out on new family forms, such as single-parent families (Fernández Cordón and Tobío, 1999; Arrollo, 2005), cohabitation (Meil, 2003), and dual-earner couples (Dema, 2005). Another phenomenon that has captured the interest of researchers is the introduction of the process of individualisation into the family and its influence on paternal (Flaquer, 1999) and maternal roles (Tobío, 2005), as well as on the couple's intimate relations (Díaz et al, 2004) and on the new "flexible" family lifestyles (Alberdi and Escario, 2003).

Despite the fact that all of these studies analyze the changing functioning of Spanish families, our review of the literature found very few studies containing references to the relationships between family structures and mobility. The only investigations that come close to the purpose of our study are those conducted on "weekend marriages" in Spain by Ruiz Becerril (2003) and Rodrigo Soriano (2005), using qualitative methodology.

### 2.2. Family functioning

In the absence of studies that link family relationships to mobility, one resource that can be used to shed light on this phenomenon is to take advantage of different socio-demographic variables in surveys in which variables relating to mobility have been included, such as, for example, the time it takes to get to work. In the study conducted by Alemán Páez (1999), in which data from the 1998 Working Population Survey (Encuesta de Población Activa) are used, a greater willingness to move around is seen in those who are single,

---

[62] See: 5th FOESSA Report (Fomento de Estudios Sociales y de Sociología Aplicada – Promotion of Social Studies and Applied Sociology) (1995), Pérez Díaz et al (2000), Del Campo and Brioso (2002) and Del Campo (2003).

separated and divorced, with the trend being reversed among those who are married or widowed. In other words, a greater resistance is seen to mobility once family responsibilities have been taken on, and after the death of a spouse, the latter perhaps due to a greater attachment to the immediate personal context when this type of loss is suffered.

The data from the Survey on Quality of Life at Work (2002-2004) also makes it possible to learn about different mobility-related characteristics of the Spanish population. A larger proportion of daily commuters feel that their work is stressful, and in general terms, they are more satisfied with their salaries, although not with household income. With regard to their daily lives, they claim to be more dissatisfied with the amount of free time they have and with their lives, but not unhappier than others. With respect to those who are less mobile, they have a greater desire to change jobs, and if they had a choice, they would devote more time to being with their families and friends and to leisure pursuits and relaxation (in that order). As far as the family variable is concerned, it usually takes those who are married or have a partner longer to get home from work, on average, than it does those who are unmarried or do not have partners.

## 2.3. *Familiy functioning: The division of domestic and professional labour within couples*

From a quantitative standpoint, and despite the lack of specific studies on this dimension, some relevant results can be obtained on a national level from the data provided by the ECVT (2004). The division of routine tasks by type of marriage (traditional, collaborative and egalitarian[63]) shows that males whose commute to work takes longer (one hour or more) have traits most closely resembling those of a "traditional" marriage (77% compared to 69% of those whose commute is less than one hour). For women who spend more time commuting, the "traditional marriage" category predominates (57%), although a greater presence of collaborative (21%) and egalitarian (21%) marriages are seen. Something similar occurs with child care, in that the most mobile men are the least collaborative (69% traditional marriage). Women who have the greatest mobility and have small children are usually in collaborative (63%) and egalitarian (25%) relationships. Thus, an analysis of these

---

[63] Traditional marriages would be those in which chores are not shared and all of the housework is performed by the woman, while the man does not take part or collaborate in any household task. In a collaborative marriage, the woman does most of the housework, while the husband collaborates in it. The tasks are not divided equally, because the man only collaborates when the woman asks him to. In egalitarian marriages, the division of labour between the man and the woman is fairly balanced. The housework is shared between the two, and both collaborate as much as they can.

data shows significant differences by gender, revealing that increased mobility may contribute to maintaining traditional family models in the case of men, and to an evolution towards more egalitarian forms in the case of women.

Existing qualitative studies only focus on long-distance marriages or "weekend marriages," and the results obtained yield disparate conclusions. Ruiz Becerril (2003) defends the idea that in these marriages, a very fair division of tasks takes place during the time the couple are together. This issue is not negotiable; the need is assumed and does not have to be formally and explicitly expressed. In this more symmetrical situation, it is the male who makes a greater effort to be equal to the woman in work-related separations.

Rodrigo Soriano (2005) believes that many variables relating to the marriage must be taken into consideration (such as the division of tasks before the separation; after the separation; according to the reason for the separation; according to the stage of the marriage, the couple's ages and academic background; or according to the type of reunification). The author concludes that a separation of residence hinders rather than favours equality in the division of tasks, because the small amount of participation by the male in these tasks disappears almost entirely when he spends most of his time away from home; thus, the woman is, once again, almost solely responsible for all household chores. In marriages where both the husband and wife work, the fact that they live apart has an impact on the division of household tasks; those who have two homes are affected because the work is multiplied, and those who travel are affected, because it is the woman who performs all of the chores, with the increased stress that this can cause.

Although no definitive conclusion can be reached about either of these theories, the classic literature has shown a significant relationship between the division of domestic tasks and mobility, according to Casado (2000-2003). Female workers devote more time to the care of their children and to household chores than men do, and therefore choose jobs that are nearer to their places of residence than those chosen by men, because their lower salaries and shorter working hours reduce the cost-effectiveness of their commutes. Another reason is that their responsibilities at home increase the cost of longer commutes. This is consistent with a fact observed in a study conducted in the Community of Valencia, according to which working women have greater mobility levels than those of male workers in several occupational categories associated with higher income: specialised industrial workers, architects, engineers, teachers, etc.

### *2.4. Family functioning: an autonomous self versus a family as a group*

Despite the studies conducted on processes of individualisation in family life (Meil, 1999; Alberdi and Escario, 2003; and Diaz et al, 2004), the relationship between this phenomenon and mobility has not been confirmed. Only Ruiz Becerril (2003: 181) states, with regard to weekend marriages, that "this type of marriage could be seen as an extension of the individualism and the supremacy of the person over the couple, a fact that we do not share; we believe that, in Spain at least, couples place a high value on their marriages and have a high opinion of the family. If they had to choose between the couple or the family and work, they would give up the latter. We would agree that this family form could be considered the epitome of the separation between workplace and family, at least for one of the members."

The conclusion reached by the author also needs to be qualified. There are different types of weekend marriages that should be differentiated according to several characteristics. Ruiz Becerril himself (2003) eventually acknowledges two ideal types. One of these involves young couples under the age of 45, childless, whose separation for work-related reasons lasts around a year. The situation has arisen because of an opportunity for a new job, and the personal fulfilment of each member of the couple carries significant weight in the motives for this separation. The other ideal type refers to older couples, over the age of 45, with children in their care (typically two). Their period of separation is longer, around eight years on average, and the situation is motivated by the promotion of one of the members of the couple rather than a new job.

### *2.5. Family functioning: Family problems and ways of coping*

From the standpoint of problems arising because of mobility, commuters in Spain – according to the data from the ECVT (2002-2004), as mentioned earlier – are more likely to feel that their jobs are stressful than those who are less mobile, even though they are more satisfied with their salaries. Mobility has a greater impact on family life in weekend marriages, and the studies of Rodrigo Soriano (2005) and Ruiz Becerril (2003) practically coincide in this regard. The latter states that one of the main inconveniences is having to modify the pace of one's daily life to adjust to living alone, and the feeling of a loss of time and place because of having to change location at least twice a week. From a health perspective, the effects are primarily measured in psychological terms, because of the loneliness and stress resulting from the circumstances themselves.

Rodrigo Soriano (2005) takes special pains to point out the distress caused by loneliness, expressed in the harsh fact of having to make decisions alone and bring up the children on one's own. This author also underlines the lack of dialogue and loss of intimacy in the relationship. This type of marriage runs a greater risk of disturbances in the marital relationship, caused by the absence of conversation, social isolation, emotional distancing, sole parenting, an overload of domestic tasks, changeable feelings or infidelity.

## 2.6. Family life cycle

The family life cycle is closely linked to the family's capacity for mobility. This can be seen through an analysis of the age variable, the time it takes to get to work by type of family, or the residential changes characteristic of the life cycle. With regard to age, Alemán Páez (1999), De Miguel (2002) and Requena (2005) corroborate the fact that younger people (aged 16 to 24 and 25 to 34) with fewer family responsibilities and greater expectations of integration into the labour market and of finding better opportunities are the ones who show the most willingness towards geographic mobility. After these ages, the trend steadily declines, because these individuals have taken on family commitments and become established in their jobs.

As far as daily commuters are concerned, according to the type of family to which they belong (using the 2004 data from the ECVT), the ones who spend more time in commuting to work are those whose family structure is "couple with children" or "mother with children." This is no doubt motivated by the fact that they live in lower-cost homes in more remote areas, as they have a higher burden of family-related expenses. The ones with the shortest commute are those who belong to a single-parent, male-headed family, and "childless couples."

Mobility, family life cycle and economic position are three factors that should be taken into account when analyzing residential changes. Módenes' studies (2000) on residential mobility and the family dynamics of urban youths in the 1980s, or the one conducted by the same author in 2004, demonstrate this. When a certain degree of job stability is attained, individuals and their households may undergo certain residential changes. The achievement of residential aspirations often depends on a successful career path. This factor is increasingly important. When only one of the couple works, mobility rates are higher, as it is not easy to make the transition from renting to owning. Dual-earner couples have less mobility because the percentage of those who own their homes increases. The

differences between the mobility rates for couples with one member or both members working are not great, but they are consistent in most EU countries: around one or two percentage points higher for the former. In this respect, Susino's study (2006) on demographic processes and family strategies relating to residential mobility is also interesting.

## 3.  Job market

### 3.1. *Social mobility and spatial mobility*

Although there are no specific studies in Spain dealing with the influence that spatial mobility has on social mobility, it is possible to arrive at interesting conclusions through the analysis of certain sources. For example, through the data provided by the Occupational Labour Observatory (2005), the most dynamic sectors in this respect can be identified, as well as the occupations with the highest mobility rates. The highest percentages in mobility rates occur in agriculture and construction, which account for more than half of the contracts involving inter-provincial travel.

Furthermore, if the ten most representative occupations in terms of mobility are analyzed, it can be seen that four of them account for one third of the contracts involving interprovincial travel (bricklayers, farm labourers, labourers in the manufacturing industry and shop assistants). There is a logical correspondence between the occupations that have high mobility rates and the economic activities that also have high rates. Thus, occupations relating to agriculture and construction have a higher-than-average level of interprovincial mobility, while the rate in other occupations is lower.

Requena's study (2005) on people who migrate, which directly links the variables under study, is much more exact and enlightening. This author, using data from the ECVT (1999-2002), shows that spatially mobile workers generally achieve a higher status. The main conclusion that can be reached from this is that migrants have much higher levels of occupational achievement, as well as greater opportunities for upward mobility. In fact, migrants have higher intergenerational mobility rates than those who have never moved away from their place of birth. This situation is further accentuated among women who leave the place where they were born and go to another province to work. In general, leaving one's birthplace is related to a higher socioeconomic status.

The author explains this relationship between migration and upward mobility through a varied set of causes and circumstances. First of all, emigration means breaking with a series

of traditional ties, pressures and social commitments, giving the emigrant greater freedom of time and resources. In addition, emigration involves a significant psychological cost, which implies the selection of the most capable. In fact, as De Miguel pointed out as far back as 1965, businesspeople from outside have greater possibilities for advancement than local ones.

### 3.2. *Spatial mobility choices according to opportunities and requirements of the job market*

As argued throughout this bibliographic review, mobility rates in Spain are lower than those of other countries in its sphere. From an economic perspective, the requirements of the job market in relation to mobility are variables that have traditionally been studied[64]. Bentolila's studies (1997 and 2001) are among the most significant ones. According to this author (1997), a singular trait of the Spanish economy in the last 25 years has been the low level of interregional migration[65], which he sees as a very negative factor for dealing with future economic disturbances within the EU. He explains the causes for this lack of mobility among Spaniards from the standpoint of the economy: the national unemployment rate has meant a drastic reduction in job opportunities in all of Spain, which has negatively affected migration. Secondly, major institutional changes (political decentralisation, regional redistribution of income, the expansion of the welfare state and trade union activity) reduce incentives for migration.

From the perspective of residential mobility in relation to job markets, the study by Módenes and López (2004) concludes that in countries characterised by early home ownership, such as Spain, the mobility of individuals with few and uncertain resources is limited in comparison to the rest of the population because they can make few residential adjustments, whether these are desired or brought on by family, economic or job circumstances. However, this lack of mobility in difficult employment circumstances leads to the conclusion that, in part, these individuals can use a strategy of low mobility and an emphasis on stability, which also makes it possible to maintain proximity-based social relations. Therefore, one must conclude that low mobility is a restriction (for example, in the loss of job opportunities, and not only those that involve long-distance migration), but it may

---

[64] See: Bentolila and Doblado (1991), Ródenas (1994), Bover and Velilla (1997), Antolín and Bover (1997), De la Fuente (1999), Bover et al (2000), and Barceló (2001).

[65] As an example, the author cites the case of Andalusia and its behaviour during the last major economic recession suffered by the Spanish economy in 1994. This region, which had the highest unemployment rate in its recent history (34%) and which remained the area with the second-lowest per capita income in Spain, had no emigration at all. In 1994, Andalusia had a net influx of population from the rest of Spain (although this was minimal: 2,327 people).

also be a strategy that is consciously sought.

### 3.3. Localisation of jobs within each country, spatial distribution of various kinds of jobs

The distribution of job markets in Spain and the mobility of workers in relation to these markets have evolved significantly in recent years. According to Bentolila (2001), the flows were one-way from poor regions to richer ones in the 1960s, giving rise to high net migration balances; however, the situation changed in the 1980s, creating a paradoxical situation in which the regions that had had net losses now had net gains and vice-versa, resulting in "very small net flows" (Puyol and García, 1997).

At this time, according to data from the Occupational Labour Observatory (2005), which analyzes worker inflow and outflow rates[66] for Spain's Autonomous Communities:

a) La Rioja is the autonomous community which has both the highest inflow and outflow rates, and these rates are similar. Castile-La Mancha, Navarre, Murcia and Aragón have similar characteristics, but to a lesser degree. These are autonomous communities with an open job market and with strong, balanced exchanges with other regions in Spain.

b) There is another group of communities in which the outflow rate is high and the inflow rate is low. These usually send workers out and seldom receive any. The ones where this situation is the most pronounced are Extremadura and Asturias.

c) At the opposite extreme are those that have a high inflow rate and a low outflow rate. These are autonomous communities that mainly receive workers, with a small proportion of workers who go out to other communities. This is the case of Madrid and the Balearic Islands (the latter because of their insular character), and to a lesser degree, Catalonia and the Canary Islands.

With regard to inter-provincial flows[67], the ones that experienced the greatest increase in 2005 in absolute terms were the ones from Alicante to Murcia, from Barcelona to Tarragona, from Madrid to Guadalajara and Toledo and from Valencia to Castellón.

---

[66] A high rate of outflow from an autonomous community indicates that a substantial number of workers residing in that community have been hired to work in another one.

[67] In terms of mobility, "flow" is considered to be the number of employment contracts that involved a commute from workers' homes to their workplaces, as long as the latter are in a different province, during a specific period of time.

Conversely, the ones that experienced the greatest decrease were those going from Seville to Cádiz, Córdoba, Málaga, Jaén and Madrid, from Barcelona and Madrid to La Coruña, from Cádiz to Málaga and from Valencia to Vizcaya.

## 4. Social integration, social capital

### 4.1. Composition of networks

In general, the Mediterranean countries in southern Europe have been characterised by the existence of an informal network (primarily made up of relatives and friends), and the high value placed on it. This network is used in a variety of ways in everyday life. In Spain, despite the changes that have taken place in recent years, the culture of values continues to be dominated by the high level of consensus about the importance of the family[68] (Camarero, 2003). This high value is evidenced to a large degree by the development of what Meil (2000) has called "relational solidarity," i.e., the set of relationships that are formed in the primary groups (relatives, friends, neighbours) which enable mutual support functions to be developed and provide material and subjective assistance among its members.

According to Meil (2000), Spaniards use a variety of strategies to organise and maintain this relational solidarity:

a) The geographic proximity of different generations. During the initial or middle stages of the family life cycle, most nuclear families live in the same town or city as at least one of their parents (the bigger the size of the municipality, the more this probability is reduced).

b) The high frequency of contact, primarily due to geographic proximity. Childless individuals see their neighbours and friends somewhat more frequently than those with children (however, there does not seem to be a greater relational density with a higher number of children).

c) Intergenerational leisure practices. Leisure, recreation and relaxation time takes place within the framework of heavily structured relationships. Families usually prefer to use

---

[68] Camarero's study (2003) based on Eurobarometer survey data shows that: 98.6% of Spaniards affirm that their family is the most important thing in their lives; 96.2% say that they would be willing to sacrifice everything for their family; 82.8% feel that their family's opinions matter a lot or quite a lot when they have to make important life decisions; 99.5% feel that the family is important, and 79% say the same thing about marriage (a significant difference); and 91.4% believe that it would be a good thing if more importance were given to family life in the future.

leisure time as a family.

However, an analysis of this relational structure should not hide the alterations and equilibriums in the different stages of the family life cycle. Meil's study (2001) regarding the Community of Madrid reveals the different uses of leisure time relating to family and friends according to the stage of the family life cycle of those interviewed. The use of free/leisure time primarily for family activities, compared to with friends, tends to increase as the family life cycle advances: as long as individuals have no partner (but do have residential independence), or no children, leisure time is spent mostly with friends. However, when children come along, this time tends to be more focused on family members, especially parents. As the children get older, this emphasis on the family is reinforced, although this does not mean that there is no longer contact with friends at greater or lesser intervals. Thus, family ties are reproduced and reinforced over the generations, with children as the primary mediators in the family.

With regard to the influence of social networks in relation to mobile persons, there are only references to weekend marriages in Spain though the studies mentioned earlier. Ruiz Becerril's research (2003) shows that couples in this situation usually have very good relationships with their parents and even very good close relationships with their in-laws. As far as friendships are concerned, a certain distancing takes place because of a lack of time, as weekends are devoted to spouses or partners. However, these networks remain intact and are even expanded with new friends.

Rodrigo Soriano's study (2005) on the maintenance of friendships shows that as a general rule, these relationships become weaker for several reasons. Some married couples find that the intensity of the relationships diminishes because there is less available time, as part of this time is taken up by commuting; this significantly reduces opportunities to be with old friends. These friendships might also be weakened because couples prefer to spend the little time they have together by themselves. Nevertheless, there are cases in which old friendships are not only maintained, but the network is expanded in the new workplace. According to the author, this especially takes place when the woman is the one who works outside of the home environment.

### *4.2. Social support, social networks and social capital*

The establishment and maintenance of informal networks through family solidarity has given rise to the formation of what some authors have called a "Mediterranean family system" (Flaquer, 2004 and 2005). The family network acts as reserve "relational capital" which, depending on needs and circumstances, can be activated to resolve problems which must be faced in the course of one's life. The type of help that can be obtained from the family network is very extensive, ranging from a feeling of belonging to a community, which operates on the basis of ascriptive and particularist values, to benefits with no direct compensation in return in the form of money or services, including the inheritance of means of subsistence. Meil (2001) has summarised these forms of assistance as belonging to several groups: a) Those relating to the care and nurture of children, especially when they are or were small, of pre-school age; b) Staying at a relative's home; c) The flow of money or property within the family network; and d) Help in the routine running of the household.

Different studies have established the importance of these family networks in maintaining well-being in Spain[69]. Among the most significant of these is the one conducted by Pérez Díaz et al (1998), which demonstrates the contributions of this network in areas such as education, unemployment, health care and pensions. Its development also makes it possible to take advantage of substantial intergenerational services (Pérez, 2004) and economic support from elders (Trinidad, 2005); it is even the best avenue for finding work (Requena, 1991 and 1996). This has given rise to the fact that different authors look upon these networks, on a micro level, as a "domestic social security system" (Meil, 2003), and on a macro level, as the real Ministry of Labour and Social Affairs in Spain (Iglesias de Ussel, 1998).

## 5. Quality of Life

### *5.1. Subjective well-being, health related issues and spatial mobility*

Different studies conducted on quality of life for both a Spanish (La Caixa, 2004; Sastre, 2003) and European context (EU Report, 2005) demonstrate the demand for and high value that these citizens place on obtaining more free time and maintaining family or community relationships. The greater spatial mobility in today's societies goes against both principles, because a more mobile life reduces free time, which on many occasions is meant

---

[69] See: Sarasa and Moreno (1995), FOESSA (1995), González Seara (1999), Simón Alfonso and Rejado (2000) and Rodríguez Cabrero (2002).

to be enjoyed as a family.

In the Spanish bibliography on this subject, there are no studies that have specifically discussed the effects of mobility on quality of life (despite the fact that some studies have used a large number of indicators). However, references located in some works indicate the increased level of general dissatisfaction that this practice causes. For example, the results (mentioned earlier) from the ECVT (2004) show that commuters consider themselves to be more dissatisfied with the amount of free time they have and with their lives, but not unhappier than others. Nevertheless, if they could, they would like to change jobs in order to be able to spend more time with their families and friends.

De Miguel's (2002) analysis on quality of working life views the time required to travel to work as a major disturbance in the living conditions of individuals, as it is time that must be added to the workday, is not gratifying in the least, and has increased in recent years as part of an urban lifestyle. However, Módenas and López (2004) point out that in most countries, dissatisfaction with the distance travelled in the daily commute to work is not a decisive factor for residential mobility[70].

In some countries, such as Spain and Greece, for example, the less satisfaction there is with the distance of the daily commute, the more residential mobility is reduced. In countries like Spain, dissatisfaction with the distance between one's home and work is linked to the difficulty of introducing mobility into one's residential history. Even with a change of residence, the first thing to suffer is the relationship with the workplace. Spain is the country with the highest percentage of individuals who say that their satisfaction with the distance they travel to work declined after they changed residence (nearly 40% compared to the typical figure of 30%).

---

[70] The expected relationship (more satisfaction, more mobility) only appears in some countries, such as France and Austria, for example. For most of the population, it is difficult to make residential adjustments when the relationship between the location of the home and that of the workplace is not satisfactory, or such a change is not worthwhile if this dissatisfaction is linked to a lack of security of continuity, as so often happens.

**Gil Viry, Vincent Kaufmann, and Eric Widmer**

# VIII. Literature on Job Mobility in Switzerland

## 1. Overview

Despite the ever-increasing importance of the phenomenon of spatial mobility, few scientific studies about mobility were carried out in Switzerland and are even less about the link between mobility and family life or social capital. This Swiss literature review will then essentially be based on some studies of a handful of authors. In the first section we focus on studies about mobility in a general way and motility, the potential of mobility. The second section reviews studies linking the family topic with geographical mobility, in particular the spatial aspects of the family life. The third section treats the issues about the interaction between the job market and mobility. Finally, in the forth and last section, we will present the outputs concerning spatial capital, social integration and mobility.

## 2. Job mobility and motility (incl. infrastructure)

### 2.1. Demands of high mobility of modern life

The potential of mobility, or "motility," is an essential aspect of social integration in highly advanced societies, which have experienced a multiplication of the ways in which people can travel through time and space (Urry, 2000a; Kaufmann, 2002). Spatial restrictions of the recent past have been replaced by strategic choices and differentiation between types of mobility. In addition, technological and social innovations are continually widening the realm of possibilities for mobility, with the result that individuals and social groups are constantly expected to adapt to these changes. This requires competences.

The combination of transportation modes (car, airplane, walking) and forms of mobility (physical, virtual, telephone, SMS…) has become essential in a context where the activity spheres within a single day have increased in number and have spread farther apart. Flamm (2004) has shown that such a combination is used as a resource to ward off the spatial and temporal incompatibilities that actors must contend with. For Larsen et al. (2005) juggling between different means of transport and mobility forms (physical, virtual, phone…) becomes central in a context of multiplication and spatial separation of the spheres of activity during the day.

### *2.2. Mobility potential or motility: the access to transport infrastructure*

A first dimension of motility is *accessibility* to different forms and degrees of mobility. Generally speaking, it means the conditions (in terms of price, schedule, etc.) under which the available supply can be used. Therefore, accessibility concerns service. It deals with all the financial and spatial-temporal conditions necessary for available means of transportation and communication to be used.

According to Kaufmann et al. (2004), access refers to the range of possible mobilities according to place, time and other contextual constraints, which may be influenced by networks and dynamics within territories. Access is constrained by options and conditions. The options refer to the entire range of means of transportation and communication available, and the entire range of services and equipment accessible at a given time. The conditions refer to the accessibility of the options in terms of location-specific cost, logistics and other constraints. Obviously, access depends on the spatial distribution of the population and infrastructure (e.g. towns and cities provide a different range of choices of goods and services), sedimentation of spatial policies (e.g. transportation and accessibility), and socio-economic position (e.g. purchasing power, position in a hierarchy, or social network).

Differences in the access of transport can lead to new forms of space segregation. Multi-residentiality, multi-occupationality, or bridging relatively large distances between the place of occupation and residence is far more likely among certain categories of the population (e.g. certain households, specific household members, regions of residence, occupational groups). Suburban ghettoisation and dependence on cars are some of the consequences (Kaufmann, 2002) which lead to yet further social differentiation.

An important issue is the impact of the urban context on motility, in particular on the accessibility to means of transportation, and the consequences for family life. Many families in Europe are attracted to neighbourhoods on the outskirts rather than in the city centre. This is why ownership of a detached house is a strong desire among individuals due to the reasons of space appropriation and forms of socialisation. Such a home symbolises a certain degree of success for the family and is often perceived as being necessary for a child's development (e.g., the garden allows a young child a degree of independence that would never be possible in a multiple-family residence). In many countries, this desire is often materialised by a residence in the outer suburbs. This leads to a "suburbanisation," an increased "spatial fragmentation of the urban surfaces" (Schuler et al. 1997) and the emergence of new public

spaces built around places of consumption (Mangin, 2004). These new locations are characterised by accessibility that is mainly based on the automobile and by few amenities in general. The desire to live outside the city does indeed affect the daily mobility of families. Many pre-teens and teenagers in the suburbs depend heavily on their parents to get around (Ascher, 1998; Kaufmann, 2001). As a consequence, there is a reduction of the leisure time of women in particular (Klöckner, 1998).

Families living in the city also have their share of problems when it comes to daily mobility, but they are mostly related to the dangers of the street (Chombart de Lauwe, 1977; Hillman, 1993). This situation also leads to adults regularly accompanying their children to the park, to school, and to extra-curricular activities. Teens, on the other hand, have greater spatial independence in city centres (Kaufmann & Flamm, 2003).

The two types of contexts, urban and suburban, have different implications for a child's mobility. They result in the reshuffling of some of the stages punctuating the acquisition of motility. The right to go to school alone and play in the street is replaced by having to be accompanied and not being allowed to play outside without adult supervision. As a result, the process of the child being given and assuming independence is transferred from childhood to adolescence, and is much less gradual (Hillman, 1993). These situations indicate an interruption in the process of the acquisition of independence in growing children, which leads to a lack of socialisation in the urban milieu that may prove to be dangerous when 13-14 year-olds do finally and suddenly obtain greater independence. Ttheir perception of the dangers is inaccurate (Rosenbaum, 1993). Context is therefore a key element in the acquisition of motility and the steps leading up to it.

The importance of context increases when the residential location does not entirely correspond to the family's aspirations, when it is the result of choices generally conditioned by the housing market, with the result that it is often not possible to live where one would ideally like. What happens, for example, in the case of family members who appreciate independence and openness, and who live in an outer suburban area devoid of public spaces, nearby amenities, or access to public transport? The few pieces of research dealing with such cases suggest that tensions are generated among the household members that are related to the constraints of space and time dependence (Kaufmann et al., 2001).

### *2.3. Mobility potential or motility: the competences*

A second factor of motility is the *competences* to recognise and make use of access to mobility. According to Kaufmann et al. (2004), there are three particularly important aspects of competences: physical ability, e.g. the ability to transfer an entity from one place to another within given constraints; acquired know-how relating to rules and regulations of movement, e.g. licenses, permits, specific knowledge of the terrain or codes and organisational skills, such as the organisation of activities in time and in space and how they are planned (ahead of time, by reaction, etc.). Competence is multifaceted and interdependent with access and appropriation.

Competences are related to socialisation and the issue of how a child acquires motility is central. Different studies (Bozon & Villeneuve-Gokalp, 1994; Kegerreis, 1993; Klöckner, 1993) have shown that this acquisition develops in stages rather than in a straight line. The process begins when the child is learning to walk, then continues when permission is given to play unaccompanied at a friend's house. It goes on with travelling alone in the daytime, and then in the evening. At each stage, there is the potential for negotiation (de Singly, 2001; Depras, 2001), but the terms often differ according to the sex of the child. The process of acquiring spatial autonomy, which leads to motility, illustrates the systemic nature linking its three dimensions.

Travelling alone implies access to means of transport. However, although motorised means of transportation are very much in the forefront of children's minds as a symbol of freedom, children can only use such means of transport as passengers. Their appropriation therefore takes place through play. Concerning the choice of various means of transport, the social representations play an important part. While the automobile is highly prized (Perchanchon et al., 1991), as is the motorcycle, public transportation retains an undesirable social representation because of the restrictions imposed by its routes and schedules. It also involves travelling with other people (Kaufmann, 2000). These social representations can condition children's demands in the area of transportation and will be the focus of negotiations between them and their parents over acquiring the skills that will allow them to master a motorised vehicle, and subsequently the purchase or availability of a vehicle. For that matter, in terms of appropriation, learning to drive is a unique time in the relationship between young adults and their parents. On the one hand, driving lessons restore parental authority and on the other, they foster a relationship of mutual trust (Perchanchon, 2002). Using transportation unaccompanied as a teenager involves transgressions of societal rules with varying degrees of

parental approval, tolerance, or tacit encouragement, depending on the mode of family functioning (Kaufmann & Widmer, 2006). These transgressions range from tampering with the engines of mopeds or scooters, to speeding in a car, reckless behaviour on a motorcycle, and riding on public transport without paying.

### *2.4. Mobility potential or motility: the appropriation, the culture of mobility*

The third and last dimension of motility is *appropriation*. For Kaufmann et al. (2004), it refers to how agents (including individuals, groups, networks, or institutions) interpret and act upon perceived or real access and skills. It describes how agents consider, deem appropriate, and select specific options. Appropriation is also the means by which skills and decisions are evaluated. Therefore it is shaped by needs, plans, aspirations and understandings of agents, related to strategies, motives, values and habits and strongly correlated to the culture of mobility.

On the basis of a national study, Bassand et al. (1985) showed that the Swiss population is very divided about the opposing values of residential mobility and sedentary lifestyle. Responding to the question about national identity against mobility/broaden one's horizons, 52% of the population choose a sedentary lifestyle and a rooting in a locality against 47% for mobility. Among the last-mentioned are over-represented the foreigners, the less than 35-year-old people, the high education group and the professionally active medium social stratum. They are also the categories the most mobile. Those who privilege the sedentary lifestyle are mainly the oldest, the low educated people, the small self-employed workers, the working class and the inhabitants of the peripheral regions. Contrary to the former categories, for several of them, the experienced mobility is sometimes quite high, like in the peripheral regions. In the suburban areas, the population is in favour of mobility without having a high mobility rate.

In the beginning of the eighties, Bassand et al. (1985) observed that the attitude and plans related to the professional activity of the Swiss population did not lead much to mobility. Only a male minority, rather high managers or university graduates, already familiar to a certain mobility and with good chances of promotion, took a stand on being ready to move to another region for professional reasons.

### *2.5. Mobility potential or motility: a resource*

Depending on context, individual actors, groups and institutions differ in access, competence and appropriation, and therefore have at their disposal different motility options, which constitute a resource. Kaufmann et al. (2004) consider motility as a form of capital, in the sense that it forms theoretical and empirical links with, and can be exchanged for, other types of capital (i.e. economic, cultural and social capital). According to these authors, beyond the vertical or hierarchical quality that all forms of capital share (i.e. a distribution from low to high), motility has an additional horizontal quality in that spatial constraints and other contexts impose a more differentiated perspective on this form of capital. Motility then refers to both vertical and horizontal dimensions of social position. When motility becomes mobility, it can do so in a variety of ways. These forms are interlinked and related to specific social temporal realities, for example the day and the week for daily mobility, the month and year for trips, the year and life cycle for residential mobility, and life history for migration. They also involve intermediate temporal realities, as is the case for the hybrid forms of mobility currently in formation, such as multiple residences (Kaufmann, 2002). These different forms of mobility have reciprocal effects on one another.

## 3. Family functioning, family structure, family development

Beyond the above observations, relatively little is known about how people acquire motility. Contrary to the dominant tendency in research to consider motility as an individual trait that depends mainly on innate strategies or skills (Le Breton, 2002), one perspective of research is to examine how the various competences and resources required to be (potentially) mobile may be related with the way families function, notably through negotiation and the transfer of these resources between parents and children.

### *3.1. Family functioning*

Starting from the assumption that motility depends on the day-to-day functioning of the family, Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) propose three dimensions of family functioning (Widmer, Kellerhals & Levy, 2003, 2006), which may be related to the acquisition of specific forms of motility:

- *Autonomy/fusion* refers to the amount of individual resources that are controlled by the family as a whole. It refers to the degree to which these resources are shared, but also the extent to which the members of the family unit allow their use to be put under the control of

the family as a group. In its extremes, this area defines two very different methods of cohesion, the first based on the values of consensus and similarity, and strongly opposes differences and divergences among family members, while the second by contrast emphasises the values of maintaining individual specificities. In that case, a good family is one where dialogue and exchange occur over these particularities rather than concern over resemblance (Kellerhals, 1987; Kellerhals et al., 1984; Widmer et al., 2003; Widmer, Kellerhals, Levy, 2004a).

- *Openness/closure* with respect to the outside world refers to how the family unit seeks or restricts contact with the outside (Reiss, 1971). The end cases identified in this respect are on one side, extreme openness (i.e., the external world is perceived as a key component of the internal functioning without the family unit being threatened with suffocation), and on the other side, extreme withdrawal (i.e., restricting contact with the outside world is seen by the family as being absolutely necessary to maintain internal models) (Kantor & Lehr, 1975; Widmer et al., 2004a). In the latter case, the outside world is perceived as a threat to the unit, either because it fosters a kind of ideological competition (different ideologies and doing things), or because it causes rash emotional or material expenditure.

- *Regulation* deals with how the family members coordinate. At one extreme, regulation is mainly prescriptive with general rules, sometimes followed ritualistically, mark out everyday life. Roles of spouses or partners are clearly split: Men are centred on work-related activities and women on the home and children. Open conflicts are avoided as much as possible, even at the expense of self-expression. At the other end of the continuum, family regulation is based essentially on open communication. The family members seek to agree on the significance of an event or situation by adapting their reactions quite varied and strongly negotiated to each case (Kellerhals et al., 1984). The negotiation process appears to be more important than the result. The main family goal is therefore dialogue rather than consensus. The emphasis on the rights and duties corresponding to a status (wife, husband, child, oldest, youngest, boy, or girl, etc.) is cast aside. A great deal of flexibility is required for the arrangements of daily life.

According to Kaufmann and Widmer (2006), these family dynamics may generate accessibilities, skills, and appropriations that are specific and unequal in terms of mobility.

In families that give priority to individuals over the group, developing the children's capacity for self-regulation is considered of primary importance (Kellerhals & Montandon,

1991). Children must very quickly learn to make choices, build individual strategies, and take responsibility if they fail in all areas of daily life. In this case, there is a lot of latitude for negotiation, which is encouraged by the parents. According to Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) this attitude may then be reflected in how mobility is managed. Families oriented towards independence place greater value in the fact of a child being able to travel on his own without the need for family resources. They tend to allow their children more independence in their choice of destinations and trips, and control their schedules less. Some research on family socialisation, which includes spatial skills indicators, tend to suggest that these children learn to develop individual skills to manage the space outside the immediate family sphere faster. Therefore, families who adopt a contractual style of socialisation, where independence is valued, promote higher scores among preteens for individual competence in managing space (Kellerhals, Montandon, & Ritschard, 1992). By contrast, those families who give priority to the group and to the collective dynamic seek to make their children dependent on the family means of mobility. Their intention is to make travel time into collective time that the family will share. They are also more involved in the process of selecting the destinations and routes of their children. The mobility skills developed here therefore have much more to do with the family than the individual; a mobility that some people, in referring to individuals in precarious situations, have called *dependent* (Le Breton, 2002). From a different perspective, Olson and his colleagues have underlined that moderate levels of togetherness and separateness between family members are correlated with a higher level of autonomy of children, while keeping their closeness with parents (Olson, 1986; Peterson, Hann, 1999).

For Kaufmann and Widmer (2006), the family's relationship to the outside world may also be closely related to motility. In families that are relatively isolated, the mobility of individual members is regarded with suspicion, as it is seen as a real threat for both the child and the family dynamics as a whole. External activities implying new friends, or classmates unknown to the parents, are all perceived with mistrust (Kellerhals et al., 1984). In such cases, outside trips are limited, visits to friends, classmates, and others are carefully controlled, and the child is allowed to visit only certain places with very specific instructions as to the routes to take. In this context, Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) hypothesise that the preferred residential location will be suburban, which will allow for such control since the child's mobility independence is de facto not an issue. Similarly, according to the same hypothesis, certain means of transport, such as the automobile will be given preference. In fact, those means will precisely allow the family to maintain a fence even beyond the walls of their home. By contrast, families who value communication with their environment will push their

children and teenagers to actively occupy space, to appropriate places, and to develop the skills that will allow them to make the most of their relationship with space. Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) hypothesise that these families will choose residential locations with a wealth of nearby amenities, allowing their children to integrate into their surroundings and to socially appropriate the city.

Finally, valuing a prescriptive type of regulation is associated with control over all of the child's daily activities that belongs to a style of socialisation referred to as "authoritarian," according to Baumrind's classical typology (1971). This case involves very tight control over all of the child's activities, notably those that involve doing things outside the family. Outings are limited and strict curfews are imposed, with the territorial limits of outings are monitored and restricted. Moreover, in this style, the degree of independence permitted depends heavily on the child's status. The external activities of girls, for example, are monitored more closely than those of boys (de Singly, 2001, Buffet, 2002). Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) therefore assume that the inequality of accessibilities, skills, and appropriations of space between the sexes and among different age groups will affect these aspects more than in other cases. Motility in such families, supposedly, then becomes a power game, where a child or teenager must, under no circumstances, be allowed to escape from parental authority. However, the terms "control" and "monitoring" must be distinguished from one another, with the latter referring more to the "support" aspect of socialisation that is expressed through attention, interest, and regular communication between parents and children, especially with respect to mobility. A great deal of the research, especially in the Anglo-Saxon world, has shown that monitoring is an important aspect of life course development (Bogenschneider, Small, Tsay, 1997; Lamborn et al., 1991)[71].

In families based on contractual regulation, the independence of children and teenagers is seen more as an object that must be negotiated to account for the interests, desires, and sometimes contradictory activities of each person. The idea of openness to reflexive opportunities that is increasingly becoming a part of everyday life in progressively modern societies surfaces here again (Flamm, 2004). The influence of a child's sex or age is weakened, and the issue is rather to try to match projects that sometimes conflict with one another, for instance when parents want to go to the cinema and their child is invited to a

---

[71] Parental monitoring implies active communication between parents and children or teenagers. It is characterised by items such as: "When I go out at night, my parents know where I am" (Small & Kerns, 1993) and "If my child will be coming home late, he lets me know" (Bogenschneider, Small, & Tsay, 1997).

birthday party some distance away. In order to resolve such complex situations, each person is encouraged to develop mobility skills that allow him or her to sit at the negotiating table with a card in hand. While negotiation is at the heart of the process of acquiring motility, as emphasised above, motility may assume very distinct forms and unequal intensity depending on the importance attributed within the family environment to individual independence or collective integration (Widmer et al., 2003).

Research shows that these dimensions ("autonomy/fusion," "openness/closure," and "negotiation/status") are relatively orthogonal with respect to one another (Widmer et al., 2004a). Their presence in specific styles of family interaction may therefore further increase the effect on motility described above according to Kaufmann and Widmer (2006). The two researchers assume that the children in a family that is simultaneously closed, fusional, and status oriented (a type known as a "Bastion") would have more restricted motility than those in an open family where independence is prized and the level of statutory regulation is relatively low. Unfortunately, there are no studies that analyse the combined effects of these aspects of family functioning on motility.

Finally, an important point is that these aspects are quite closely linked to the family's financial and cultural resources. When these are plentiful, independence, openness to the outside world, and negotiated regulation are given priority whereas few external resources result in family closure, priority of the group, and a more traditional regulation (Widmer et al., 2004a). The style of family interactions therefore undoubtedly explains in part the variations in the social distribution of motility, which is more concentrated at the top than at the bottom of the social scale, especially regarding the differences in motility with respect to content (Kaufmann, 2002).

### 3.2. Family structures

Family structures, in addition to family functioning, affect motility, with certain structures producing higher mobility potential. In many cases, having divorced parents creates the necessity for a child to navigate between two households (Antony, 1987; Kaufmann & Flamm, 2003). A structural incentive to be mobile therefore exists in this type of family (Fagnani 2000), which expresses itself in different practices. The research carried out on this subject shows that children in shared custody situations have more freedom with respect to going out (Decup-Pannier, 2000). Nevertheless, two substantially different family situations exist following a divorce (Le Gall, 1996; Martin, 1997). In the first, which is over-represented

in the working class, divorce leads to a complete rupture, with the woman and children on one side, and the man on the other. In case of remarriage, the new husband meets the majority of needs previously met by the former spouse. In the second case, which is the most common occurrence in families with a high level of cultural and financial resources, divorce does not lead to a break-down of the relationship between the former spouses. Instead, the relationship between the children and the parent without custody remains relatively active, with the spouse of the custodial parent playing much more of a complementary role rather than that of a substitute. In this second case, the former spouses often choose their residential locations to facilitate access of both "homes" to the children. The individuals then acquire mobility skills that allow them to manage this more complex family space, in a way that combines more or less harmoniously individual incentives with collective motivations. Divorce and reconstituted families therefore affect the acquisition of motility differently, depending on the social and cultural resources at the disposal of the family. Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) assume that these structures reinforce the trend among poorer families towards non-motility and the trend among wealthy families towards motility.

### *3.3. Family life cycle*

In their study about mobile and sedentary living in Switzerland, Bassand et al. (1985) showed that in spite of a residential mobility disposition, people seem to share values of sedentary lifestyle and stability. In general terms, the more people progress in their life cycle (i.e. getting married, living in a household with children and aged 35 and more), the less they long to live new mobile experiences and the more they dream of sedentary lifestyle and local integration. This disposition for residential mobility is also linked with the self-evaluation of the commune of residence. The older an individual, the more positively the person evaluates their commune whereas the younger a person is, the more critical he/she becomes. The immobility is then maximal if a long duration of residence in the commune creates a familiar feeling to be part of the locality. The influence of life cycle on mobility acceptance is however smaller for particular categories, such as low education groups or people who are not living in their region of socialisation. Among the latter, many are living in the locality for a short amount of time and have the project to leave in their region of origin.

### *3.4. Family and spatial context*

The possibilities offered by the local job market are an important factor to explain differences of family dynamics according to the spatial context (Dümmler, 2004; Bühler, 2002, Bühlmann et al. 2005) (see next section).

In Switzerland the spatial context of a family plays an important part also by the fact that family policy comes under the authority of the cantonal level (family allocation) or communal (day-care centre for children) according to the principle of subsidiarity. Studies showed that these local family policies intervene as additional mechanism between the labour market and the functioning of the household (Dafflon, 2003, Fux, 2002, forthcoming). Another effect can be related on the equipment and the infrastructure, which is present in certain contexts and is able to influence the housework sharing. Thus a residential context, well equipped in parks, in shops, in public transport and considered to be sure, could further the spatial independence of the children and limit the tasks of accompaniment for the parents. Such independence could reduce the tasks to be shared and in this way favours a certain egalitarianism between men and women. On the contrary, the opposite situation could further an unequal division of housework, especially when the woman is more often at the house (Kaufmann & Widmer, 2006).

In their study on the influence of the context of residence on the division of housework within couples, Bühlmann et al. show that there is no spatial standardisation of marital lifestyles in Switzerland. Particularly, between metropolitan centres, suburban communities and peripheral communities major differences prevail in the functioning within the couples. Contrary to the assumption of a broad homogenisation and urbanisation of Switzerland by the improvement of accessibilities of the transport networks (Bassand et al. 1988), the family functioning in the periphery remains more traditional than in the metropolitan centres. Moreover, the suburban communes are characterised by a family functioning more traditional and unequal in comparison with the metropolitan centres. The suburban context, at the same time close to natural areas and to services and jobs of the city, presents a marital lifestyle, which is more conservative.

A first explication given by the authors is the differences of the demographic composition according to the spatial context. The metropolitan centres are characterised by the strong presence of young couples on the one hand and of old couples on the other hand. This is probably due to the offer of schooling in the case of the youth and of health institutions in the case of retired couples. By these couples not having yet children or being in their phase of post-children, the absence of child reduces the volume of housework. This can contribute to a more equal division, especially because the absence of children in the household coincides by these couples with a phase of professional non-activity. The suburban communes are characterised by an over-representation of couples, who have children and are

in a professionally active period of life. Kaufmann et al. (2001) hypothesise that the suburban context corresponds to a privileged destination of young families of the middle class, in the search of a favourable environment to bring up their children.

A second explication can be related to the socio-occupational composition of the contexts. The metropolitan centres are over-represented by well-to-do social groups, endowed with a better education level and also by the most destitute social category (skilled and unskilled workers). Thus, Bühlmann et al. hypothesise that equal cultural patterns of common life by the first groups and the insufficiency of only one income to ensure the needs of the household among the second group contribute to the over-representation of egalitarian couples in the metropolitan centres. In the periphery, people with a high education level are strongly under-represented. The social structure of this context is characterised by a large proportion of small self-employed workers, either peasants or craftsmen, whose material base is directly or indirectly related to the agricultural economy. The authors conclude from it that the economic functioning of this type of household requires in the majority of the cases a full-time job of the man. Even if the woman probably also takes part in the exploitation, the traditional division of work is very present.

Stassen (2002) studied the influence of the "sexuation" of the spatial context, in terms of the division of the family roles, the schooling rate of women, the proportion of female employment and the results of vote for a lower inequality between men and women, on family dynamics. He showed that the dimension of the participation of women in the labour market exerts the most influence on the marital functioning. In contexts where the women are the most integrated into the labour market, the marital functioning is more characterised by closure and autonomy. However, this family form is also identified as the most related with conjugal conflicts (Widmer et al., 2003). This output suggests that a context favourable to the insertion of women in the labour market makes more difficult their family insertion, in particular marital. In the most gendered contexts, on the opposite, the couples characterised by both openness and fusion are over-represented, i.e. also those which have the best functional assets to succeed in marital life.

Stassen (2002) observed that more than the family functioning, it is the self-evaluation of the quality of conjugal life which is more influenced by the "sexuation" of the spatial context, and more precisely by the most significant of its dimension: the employment rate of women. He showed the tendency that this self-evaluation is more positive in regions where

the female employment rate is low, and this whatever the regional instruction rate.

In their empirical model, Bassand et al. (2005) showed that the dimension centre-periphery is a relevant dimension orienting the occupational mobility practices and dispositions. The probability to move is higher in the peripheral regions than in the central ones, because, on the one hand, the social success is linked with the migration to the centres and, on the other hand, this travel involves often a migration back to the country of origin. Although the inhabitants of big centres have a lower migration rate, which can be explained by better job opportunities and amenities, their disposition for occupational mobility remains generally stronger. This tendency is intensified by the presence of foreigners in the metropolitan centres. However, these authors showed that the parallelism between realised mobility and attitude towards mobility are not tenuous at all. The regions where the valorisation of mobility is the strongest are the suburban regions and the medium centres. Yet there are not the regions where the mobile behaviours are the more frequent. Quite the opposite, the wish to be rooted in a locality is the strongest in the peripheral (industrial, agro-tertiary sector) regions where the mobility practices are higher than average. This dissymmetry could results from a constrained mobility, which seems characterise the higher mobility in the peripheral regions.

Bassand et al. (2005) measured interestingly that central regions are associated with the absence of opinion about carrier plans and mobility. The dynamism of carrier plans is more specific to inhabitants of small and medium centres and of the peripheral regions. However, the considered travels, in order to realise them, depends on the life cycle and less on the localisation.

## 4. Job market

### *4.1. Social mobility and spatial mobility*

Following other research on the subject (Lévy, 2000, Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002), Kaufmann et al. (2004) have demonstrated that in the job market where flexibility is a prized asset, motility is a key resource for the career of anyone aspiring to upward mobility. It is through the concept of motility that these authors propose to study the links between spatial and social mobility, their antecedents, and their consequences on a micro, a meso and a macro-level of analysis. On a meso-level of analysis for example, access to, and appropriation of, the means of spatial mobility may strongly depend on household arrangements, which will create different opportunities and constraints for social mobility

across household members.

On a macro-level of analysis, social mobilities and space could be studied in relation to business corporations. The migration of a business could be compared with a social elevator. Wealth or poverty, jobs, infrastructure, etc., were created or destroyed according to the geographical origin and destination of the corporate move (Bassand et al., 1985). Geographic change went hand-in-hand with changes of occupation, employment status and social position. Nowadays, the situation is more complicated due in part to the capacity to act remotely, to be here and there at the same time (Ascher, 2000), as well as the relative mobility of households to follow jobs. According to Kaufmann et al. (2004) we have passed from a mode of territorialised spatialisation to a dynamic reticular mode. The capacity to act remotely, a particular focus of motility, goes hand-in-hand with the development of technical networks of communication and transport, which makes this possible.

Lévy et al. (1997) analysed the impact of the spatial context on professional trajectories and on social mobility. They observed firstly that in the peripheral regions, women are distinctly more numerous to have a discontinuous professional trajectory, which constitutes the evidence of a stronger gender division of work. Moreover, the ascending mobility (vertical mobility between the parent and the person questioned) is clearly stronger in the small and medium centres. On the contrary, the descending mobility is more frequent in the peripheral regions and in the big centres. The regional variations are accentuated in the course of professional career and persons living in the periphery have particularly difficulties to rise socially. Concerning the horizontal mobility (changes of economic branches), it is greater in the regions of big and medium centres than in the regions of small centres and the periphery. The horizontal mobility favours in all spatial contexts a vertical mobility, but this one is much more often descending in the most peripheral regions. The tendency is reversed in the most central areas.

The study of Lévy et al. (1997) showed also a large homogeneity of the "ways" of social mobility in the regions of big and medium centres. This result seems to confirm that the commuters flux between big cities and cities of medium size reach such an importance that they widen the work basin (Schuler, Kaufmann, 1996).

Lévy et al. (1997) analysed also the links between the national and international migration and the professional trajectories. They noticed that the social mobility is quite differentiated according to the migration type. With regarding to the vertical mobility between

the parent and the person questioned aged 25 years old, there are no significant differences according to the spatial mobility type (national, international, and no migration). For the mobility between the parent and the person questioned aged 45 years old, the descending mobility is stronger in case of national migration, but above all of international. The migrants have difficulties to realise a social rise. However the analyse of the professional trajectories between 25 and 45 years old show an exception to this difficulty encountered by the migrants. The horizontal mobility combined with national migration allows a social rise very clearly. This output corroborates the observations of Bassand et al. (1985), showing that the social mobility of the inhabitants of the peripheral regions is linked with a migration to a centre, and then a return to the region of origin.

### 4.2. *Spatial mobility choices according to opportunities and requirements of the job market*

Bühlmann et al. (2005) showed that the division of housework in the couple depends strongly on the participation of the two partners in the labour market. The situations where the man has a higher activity rate lead to a strong inequality in the housework sharing. Only when the two partners have a full-time job or the two have a part-time job is there a substantial equality of the housework.

The participation of the two partners in the labour market is mediated by contextual mechanisms dependent on the local employment structure. The urban and metropolitan areas concentrate the particularly "feminised" economic branches (teaching, heath and social sector), which offer a larger variety of jobs and full-time jobs by women and part-time job by men, consequently creating a more equal division of housework. On the contrary, the predominant economic sectors in the peripheral areas (agriculture, craft industry, small trade) are characterised by a less variety of jobs and are only seldom favourable to part-time jobs of men and full-time jobs of women.

Finally, in the suburban context, commuting is particularly frequent. While the urban centres (all types of centres) have an outgoing commuting from only 20%, this of the suburban centres comes to almost 70% according to data of the Swiss census (OFS, 2004). The localisation of the residence according to the place of work, as well as the means of transport at disposal and the time necessary to reach it, play a decisive part for the housework sharing. If the time of travel to go to work is important and if one of the partners does not return at midday or leaves early in the morning and return late in the evening, there are

chances that the other partner carries out a larger part of the housework and child care. In a suburban context where the women take part particularly little in the labour market, Bühlmann et al. (2005) hypothesise firstly that this localisation reinforces the inequality in the division of housework since the man does not go back at midday and comes home only late in the evening. Secondly, the absence of the man limits the access of the woman to the labour market.

The participation of the couples with children in the labour market is also mediated by the possibilities to take charge of the children during the working hours. Thus, the density of the infrastructures of child care (for very young children but also for children going to school) is a capital factor for the division of housework. Since no precise data exist at the national level, Bühlmann et al. (2005) carried out an exploratory analysis in the canton of Zurich, which showed that the suburban communes have a low quality of the infrastructures of child care. While extrapolating from this result, the authors hypothesise that on a national scale, the difference between rural and urban areas are even larger and contribute to the production of gender inequalities.

## 5.  Social integration, social capital

### 5.1. *Social capital and mobility types, Composition of networks*

As family networks shape motility, motility shapes interpersonal ties among adults. The study of Pitrou (1978) and more recently that of Coenen-Huther et al. (1994) about the solidarity network in the family has showed that couples or individuals with low residential motility belong to networks that are focused on family ties. There is a strong human density of relations in this type of network since the majority of its members are interconnected (Bott, 1957). Ties tend to be strong rather than weak (Granovetter, 2000), i.e. characterised by duration, emotional intensity, and multiplexity. By contrast, individuals with strong residential mobility have networks that are more open, more varied, less dense (all members of one's networks do not necessarily know one another), and less centred on the family. To summarise, residential mobility and immobility are related to belonging to different interpersonal relationship networks. A lack of spatial mobility therefore may create chain-like social capital characterised by homophily and strong ties, while motility can lead to bridge-like social capital, characterised by heterophilia and weak ties (Granovetter, 2000; Kaufmann & Widmer, 2006). These are two very different forms of social capital that are made available to individuals through their networks.

These forms of social capital in turn have varying effects on individual life courses. It has been shown that the absence of a network comprising relatives within close proximity increases the risk of marital problems and personal dissatisfaction, as well as difficulties with the children. However, a network of relatives that is too present also has negative effects on the couple and the individual (Widmer, Kellerhals, Levy, 2004). Motility therefore may backfire on family dynamics in a looping effect that shapes individual life courses, while also affecting the urban environment, with extended families sometimes making their mark on the "neighbourhoods" (Blöss, 1987). Each type of social capital has potentially positive and negative effects.

The two forms of social capital could be also related to different relation to space. Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) hypothesise that the multi-residentials or the long-distance commuters (logic of spatial reversibility) could develop chain-like social capital, while migrants (logic of spatial irreversibility) could develop bridge-like social capital (Larsen, 2005). Different authors (Donnovan et al. 2002, Putnam, 2000) suggest that the social capital is related to the capital of mobility. Putnam (2000), for example, states that the capital of mobility can shape the social capital, when by showing that a large time devoted to travel in case of commuters impoverishes the social capital.

### 5.2. *Social support, social networks and social capital*

Localism, which is typified by a family belonging to a neighbourhood or district, where many relatives are present, facilitates childcare and other kinds of help (Dandurand & Ouellette, 1995). Grandparents often play an important role in synchronising family temporalities and mobilities (Attias-Donfut & Segalen, 1998), and are of invaluable assistance when it comes to accompanying and looking after children in countries where child care structures are insufficient or when parents work different hours (Messant-Laurent et al., 1993). On the other hand, they also increase the probability of interference on the part of relatives in the couple's or family's life, which has an extremely negative effect on the family. This is when family quarrels affect the mobility space of individuals. The term "grieving area" has been used to describe a place which, in the mind of an individual, has become a dark area, off-limits, somewhere to be skirted and avoided, and which a family quarrel has removed from their realm of physical mobility (Le Breton, 2002). Conversely, the network of relatives and friends, which is part of a family's biography, plays a significant role in the future mobility strategies of individuals, such as in their ability to react to a job loss by moving (Vignal, 2002).

In conclusion, while spatial mobility definitely has an impact on the social network to which an individual belongs, social networks are also a decisive factor in explaining individual mobility. It can therefore be said that the two realms are structurally interrelated during the biographical lifespan of a family.

## 5.3. *Spatial distribution of personal networks*

Different research works (Pooley, Turnbull, 1998) bring out a new relation with space, characterised by the reversibility: The irreversible forms of mobility (migration, removal) are substituted by more reversible forms (daily mobility, trips). This substitution leads to a transformation of space-time temporalities of the long term into the short term. It also corresponds to a modification of the impact of mobility on the social networks. When individuals travel rather than migrate, commute rather than move, the social networks and attachments can be more maintained easier (Larsen et al. 2005).

**Heather Hofmeister**

# IX. Literature on Job Mobility in the United States

This paper will describe the state of research on spatial mobility in the United States, focusing on research published roughly between 1995 and 2006, drawing on earlier research as space allows. I[72] organise the text into three main sections. First, I describe the mobility requirements and phenomenon of mobility in the United States (Main Research Area 1). Second, I describe research that reveals individual's mobility decisions and the barriers and triggers to mobility (Main Research Area 2). This is research that focuses on the antecedents or predictors of both commuting and relocation. This work is subdivided into research that focuses on employment-related antecedents, on family or household predictors, and on community or neighborhood predictors. Within each type, I describe what is known about commuting and then relocation. The third section focuses on consequences of commuting or relocation for family and individual well-being and quality of life (Main Research Area 3).

## 1. Mobility requirements, phenomenology of realised spatial job mobility

A century ago, the journey to work in the United States typically happened on public transportation or on foot. With the invention of the combustion engine, automation of manufacturing, and the removal of train and trolley lines in cities by the oil, tire, and automobile companies in the 1920s and 1930s, private conveyance to work has changed the way Americans commute and the options surrounding it. What was once a public activity is now largely a private one. The household average commuting time in the U.S. has been increasing over the past quarter century, partly caused by increased suburbanisation and partly by the rise in dual-earner families. By 1990 American workers spent, on average, 20 minutes traveling each way to and from work every day, which amounts to nearly a week of 24-hour days per year per worker (Howell and Bronson 1996; Levinson and Kumar 1997). This average has increased to 23 minutes each way by 2000.

Increasingly, two workers commute from each household (Green 1997; Rouwendal and Rietveld 1994). But the existing literature on commuting views the journey to work patterns of American workers as phenomena of *individuals*, varying by gender, geographic location, and social class as well as structural limitations in the community and job market (but seeHofmeister 2002; Hofmeister 2003). This research viewpoint is lacking because

---

[72] Dr. Heather Hofmeister, Otto-Friedrich-Universität Bamberg

commutes are very likely to be influenced by the needs of others in the household, especially the needs of children and spouses. And yet the individual level perception of commuting is strong in the United States literature. Worksites, employee relocation policies, school locations, road-building, and community infrastructure tend to assume a single (male) earner per household, despite the emergence of women as workers for a longer duration of their adult lives and the emergence of dual-earner couples as the most prevalent family type.

As described by Zax (1991), workers whose workplace is relocating have three options: they can quit, they can move to follow their old jobs, or they can quit their old jobs but also move to find new jobs. The utility of each decision depends on the relative costs of housing, commuting, finding a new job; gasoline costs, the availability of inexpensive automobiles or subways, and other transit options together with housing price differences across a metropolitan area all have an influence on the decisions to commute or to quit. Zax's study uses data from the 1970s at one particular company to estimate the relative costs and advantages of each option (Zax 1991).

One phenomenon that deeply affects commuting in the United States and has been the focus of a sizeable body of research is the shift of people and businesses from inner cities to suburbs. Research shows that, in the course of this shift in the 1980s, workers with less education had not been able to relocate to keep up with these shifts, a problem disproportionately carried by racial minorities and resulting in lower wages for minorities (Dworak-Fisher 2004). Another study of a plant relocation from the central city to the suburbs showed racial differences in the ability of the plant's existing workers to keep their jobs afterwards – white workers who had longer commutes after the relocation did not quit their jobs compared to those who had shorter commutes, but black workers with newly lengthened commutes were more likely to quit compared to black workers who had shorter commutes. Both groups had members who relocated, but the racial disadvantage resulting from the move was unmistakable (Zax and Kain 1996). Similarly, relocation intentions of blacks, regardless of income, were harder to realise than relocation intentions of whites (Crowder 2001). Contrary evidence comes from a study of low-income welfare (TANF) recipients (Sanchez et al. 2004). They find "virtually no association" between the employment rates of welfare recipients in six different metropolitan areas and either the job concentrations or their access to reliable public transit. Note that employees and welfare recipients have different starting-point relationships to the labour market.

In conclusion, research evidence from the United States indicates that geographic location matters for mobility patterns, and that the available resources of individuals mediate its significance. Geographic factors of relevance include presence of public transit, population density, and jobs-housing mixes.

I now turn to the theories and results of studies about American spatial mobility.

## 2. Mobility decisions of individuals and families

The existing literature on commuting time[73] typically focuses on the commutes of individuals and how their commutes are likely to vary by gender or socioeconomic status, with the primary question being between whether job characteristics or household characteristics are the primary determinants of commuting times. Patterns of commuting between husbands and wives, though less often studied, are primarily assumed to be due to gender differences in work preferences, abilities, or human capital investments, not household-level factors such as timing or spouses' relative income. Even recently published articles about couples' commuting patterns use data that were collected largely in the 1970s and 1980s (Assadian and Ondrich 1993; Green 1997; Howell and Bronson 1996; Johnston-Anumonwo 1992; Madden 1981; Preston et al. 1993; Rouwendal and Rietveld 1994; van Ommeren 1998; van Ommeren et al. 1997). Considering the rapid changes in the extent and quality of women's labour force participation, such data may not be as useful in understanding current-day patterns and future trends. This section summarises existing research on spatial mobility for individuals and for the differences between spouses into the following divisions:

1. Literature on external mobility demands such as the links between geographic structure and spatial mobility.

2. Explanations for spatial mobility that stem from external demands related to employment, such as job hours, prestige, income, or the qualities that are linked to these

---

[73] There is some question in the literature and in common sense as to what length is the ideal commute. A shorter commute seems the obvious preference and is the perspective that economic models take for commuting preferences. Few people seek to live in New York City and commute to Wyoming; many people move to be closer to work, whether in the same town or across state or national boundaries. A short commute saves time, money, and the stress of transit. Commuting can be tiresome and expensive in terms of actual time, fuel and transportation costs. But some individuals prefer a longer commute, either to avoid housework or home responsibilities, to relax at the end of a workday, to switch gears from home to work or vice versa, or to give an excuse for being unable to stay later at work. Many public transit commuters use the journey to and from work to read the paper, nap, have a cup of coffee, or catch up with friends. Typically, long commutes indicate a preference for a certain kind of residence that makes the hassles of the commute worthwhile.

factors such as education.

3. Explanations for spatial mobility that are linked with household issues, such as the presence of children, spousal role relationships, and life stage issues.

## *2.1. External Demands: Neighborhood and Community contexts*

There is a great deal of macro-level research on the linkage between neighborhood or community and spatial mobility, such as census information comparing commute times in various metropolitan areas or looking at changes in commuting or relocation over time (FHA 1994; Fulton 1983; Giuliano and Small 1993; Levinson and Kumar 1997; Lowe 1998; McLafferty and Preston 1997).

### *Geography and Rational Action*

Several studies in the United States examine the expansion of work-related travel time. Levinson and Wu (2005) test the "rational locator" thesis: that the possibility of faster travel times via high-speed motorways will encourage people to live farther from work. By this logic, workers attempt to keep travel time consistent. If a relocation does not change the travel time, even if it changes the distance, the rational locator handles the two alternatives as equivalent. Whether suburban expansion in the United States increases commuting times in Washington DC and Minneapolis, Minnesota was tested and the "rational locator" thesis was supported. The authors conclude, based on the differences between the two locations, that geography and urban planning have a significant effect on the commuting times of residents (Levinson and Wu 2005).

The length of spouses' commutes relative to each other may be a strategy couples use to maximise the family's utility" function (Becker 1981). If each spouse is a rational actor and both are employed, both will want their preferred commute, the most ideal place to live, and the best job. But couples' desires will often come into conflict. When a higher value is placed on keeping the relationship together over getting their individual preferences, spouses may seek the family's best interest and choose to stay together by making personal sacrifices and constraining their own behavior, rather than risking the relationship. The locale of home is chosen to maximise utility to both spouses' jobs within the constraints of finding a neighborhood that meets family and children's needs (affordable, quality schools, safety, and moderately centrally located between the two jobs). In an imperfect decision-making situation, such as the housing market, sometimes couples will make housing decisions based

on limited information, including not knowing where both jobs will be in the future, whether and how many children will be in the household, whether school quality will decline or improve over time, and whether caregiving for elderly relatives will be part of the equation, any of which could affect the housing decision. Lives change over time, with needs changing over time as well. The commutes resulting from earlier housing decisions are a function of the imperfect decision-making process (choice within constraints) at the time of the move and home acquisition and may bear no reflection on the relative job values for each spouse. In fact, research indicates that couples try to minimise their collective commutes, not their individual ones, showing that the best models of commuting will consider the commutes of both spouses, not of individuals (Badoe 2002). It is also likely that the timing of job attainment relative to the current home attainment will matter for commute times. Specifically, the spouse whose job was obtained after the current home will work closer to home and therefore will have a shorter commute than the spouse whose job has been in place longer (Hofmeister 2002).

### *Geographic Placement of Jobs*

Another relationship exists between the geographic location and the commuting options of individuals. In a study comparing Chicago, Los Angeles, and San Francisco, researchers determined that low residential density and few public transit options (in addition to higher household income and bigger family size) increased the likelihood of individual automobile ownership (Holtzclaw et al. 2002). One can conclude that geographic factors of density and transit options are likely to have a strong effect on an individual's choices to commute or to relocate for jobs.

Homes and workplaces are not equally scattered across the landscape, nor does everyone have perfect decision-making information when they select jobs and homes to minimise the distance between them. Several studies in the United States focus on the "jobs-housing" mismatch (Arnott 1998). One study of Los Angeles' geographic placement of homes and workplaces (using 1980 CMSA data on 10.6 million people and 4.6 million jobs) found that, if people selected their residences to be as close to work as possible, the average commute in Los Angeles should be 8.4 minutes (Giuliano and Small 1993). In reality, the average commute time in Los Angeles was 23 minutes in 1980, nearly three times the distance that would be explained by a purely rational job-to-housing selection based solely on commute time. Recent efforts to model jobs-housing imbalance using Atlanta data shows that

the redistribution of homes, rather than of jobs, would be a better strategy to rectify the imbalance and resulting inequalities of the spread of homes and jobs (Horner and Murray 2003). While Los Angeles and Atlanta may be extreme cases of inefficient jobs-housing balance, with their sprawling highways and expensive real estate, most cities' residents don't select their jobs and homes only to minimise the distance between the two. Rather, couples select housing with only some regard for the job locations of both individuals. In fact, jobs may be chosen or changed after the residential location is established, although no research to date has systematically examined the timing of jobs and moves to determine which came first (although scholars have called for such research; (see Madden 1981). Thus couples do not necessarily try to minimise commute times to the exclusion of other factors. Often journey to work distance will be unequal between spouses for the following reasons (Giuliano and Small 1993):

1) Job turnover and moving costs may cause people to live near or far from a variety of jobs, rather than select their housing based on only one job.

2) Dual earner couples have difficulty finding housing perfectly equidistant from both jobs: one of the partners will have a job farther from home than the other out of sheer practical spatial and housing availability limitations.

3) Non-work factors account for some choice of housing location: people choose to live closer to other desirable amenities, such as parks, shopping, and quality schools.

4) Transportation may be less important than housing to some families, who are more willing to make a long commute in exchange for their ideal (or affordable) home.

5) Racial discrimination may limit the ability of some people to choose their housing freely.

Another factor, which hasn't often been considered as a cause of commute distances, is that longer commutes may actually be desirable and preferred to create a psychological buffer between home and work (Nippert-Eng 1995; Schneider 1999).

In fact, residential location has been linked to household type. An early study using 1977 Baltimore Travel Demand research on 787 people indicates that dual-earner households are much less likely to live in the central city than are single-earner households (54.6 percent versus 69.1 percent; from Baltimore Travel Demand research on 484 men and 303 women ages 16 and older collected in 1977) (Johnston-Anumonwo 1992). Despite the age of the data,

such a finding points to one strategy of dual-earner households for balancing residential location between two jobs. But their residence outside the central city may not actually be closer to either or both workplaces.

*Person-environment Fit*

Some theoretical models have suggested the concept of a person-environment fit (Caplan and Harrison 1993; French et al. 1974). This concept suggests that people will seek an environment that matches resources with their particular needs, or else suffer poor adjustment. When families have a good person-environment fit, their life quality will be higher, they will stay in the job or residence longer, and their overall effectiveness will be higher. The literature mostly applies the P-E fit to the workplace, though the concept can certainly be applied outside the workplace, to the neighborhood, or even the marriage. The concept suggests that couples will actually seek to live among those who are like themselves (the same way people seek friends who are similar to them), or among those who have complementary qualities: for example, young families living among older, retired couples in order to have neighbors with more experience and free time to help educate and supervise their children. Most evidence indicates that people tend to live near those more similar to themselves, rather than near people who are different, even if complementary. A literature on reference groups supports this contention (Merton 1968).

Going beyond the residence and the family, several questions related to commuting can also be addressed at the firm level. Companies are increasingly aware of the impact of their location on their current and prospective workforce (Kleiman 2001). And, given that workers at the same firm in the same financial strata are likely to be attracted to the same sort of housing (based on price range and proximity), workers at the same company should tend to have similar commutes, particularly if the firm is located in an area with only selective residential options nearby. Specifically, firms located in metropolitan areas will have workforces that locate in specific places in the metro area; firms located in non-metropolitan areas will have workforces more diversely residing in small adjacent cities, towns, and in the rural areas.

Couples' choice of housing and route from home to work is somewhat predictable, in that workers are likely to prefer to live closer to work if doing so does not compromise any amenities, and workers are also likely to want to travel the shortest, fastest, or most reliable routes to work. Consequently, a firm with desirable housing nearby or with a rapid transit

interstate highway linking residential areas to the workplace is likely to have a shorter-commuting workforce than other firms.

## *2.2. External Demands: Employment contexts*

Work hours, income, job prestige, career commitment, and education are part of the employment contexts of commuting that appear in existing literature. Though much of the empirical research on commuting is atheoretical, I organise the existing findings by framing the existing evidence in terms of what are (usually implicit) theoretical orientations underlying extant studies.

### *Rational Action: Time, Income, and Job Prestige*

Local travel takes place primarily in relation to the activity being traveled for, rather than as an end in itself. Commuting is the very definition of the relationship between space and time in physical activities: "space must be traversed in time to engage in activities" (Levinson 1999: 141).

As part of the relationship between activity duration and the travel to get to the activity, one general principle is that the longer an activity lasts, the longer people are willing to travel to get there. Not only is the longer trip an indication that the activity is more valuable, but also people have an interest in doing multiple activities while they are in a place to make it worth the drive. Levinson's data are from the 1990-91 National Personal Transportation Survey (NPTS) of 22,000 household interviews randomly selected by telephone of people age 18 to 65 (Levinson 1999). Thus a long commute is most rational when the workday is long.

Another aspect of the rationality of a long commute, aside from the duration of the workday, is the amount of money or job prestige that the commute yields (Glenn et al. 2004). Wages and status affect individuals' willingness to tolerate a long commute: more pay or status per working hour means that a longer commute is justified because of the additional money it brings in (Levinson 1999; McLafferty and Preston 1997). But a job that pays more also affords workers more housing options. Wealthier earners may have longer commutes in part because they can afford nicer, larger homes that are farther away from work. Conversely, those with more income can also afford to buy housing closer to work if they want to, because price is less of an obstacle. These families may populate the wealthy inner-ring neighborhoods of cities and inhabit high-price condos and apartments closer to their

workplaces. Workers in less affluent families must drive great distances from work to arrive at housing in their price range or else settle for sub-standard inner city housing (MacDonald and Peters 1994). Therefore, theoretically, income could operate to reduce or extend the commute.

*Human Capital Theory and spatial mobility*

Human capital theory suggests that earnings inequities are due to differential investments in human capital (such as education and job experience) and the resultant differences in individuals' abilities to produce (Howell and Bronson 1996). Beyond income alone as a factor in predicting commuting distances, human capital theory would suggest that, as job rewards, including income, are linked to human capital investment, and if a shorter commute is a job reward, it too should be linked to human capital investment. But, if more human capital means a better job that is worth traveling longer to get to, then greater human capital should be linked to a longer commute, not a shorter one. This latter explanation has the most support in the literature (Hanson and Pratt 1988a; Hanson and Pratt 1992; Madden 1981; McLafferty and Preston 1997; Turner and Niemeier 1997). Men tend to invest more heavily in human capital that will increase their earnings (through education and lucrative social networks) than women do (Camstra 1996). Therefore, commute length should vary by gender because of the differential investments in human capital of men and women. As women invest more in their human capital, their commutes should look more and more like men's commutes.

Howell and Bronson (1996), in their study of nearly 10,000 young employed men and women (ages 23-30) in the NLSY (National Longitudinal Study of Youth) in 1988, attempt to explain the gender difference in wages through differences in commuting time, but found only modest linkage between the journey to work and annual earnings. Howell and Bronson (1996) use the 1988 wave of the NLSY of young employed respondents (age 23 to 30; n= 9956). Their dependent variable is earnings, with commutes longer than 20 minutes as a dummy variable. Other controls include region, hours at work, age, married, Black, Hispanic, Duncan SEI index, education, number of children, and city size: rural, small urban, suburban, central city. When controls for other determinants are added (such as gender, age, race, and city size), the relationship between wages and commuting time is reduced among all but women in small urban settings (for whom the shorter journey to work is linked to substantively lower earnings). Gender and place of residence interact, with women in rural and suburban areas

commuting the longest. They found that commuting and earnings relationships operate the same way for men and for women: within each type of residential location, men and women who commute longer received more earnings (Howell and Bronson 1996). Howell and Bronson's study has limitations: older age groups or those getting additional education at the time of the interview are not represented in their sample. In addition, they had no measures of job prestige, which may compensate for lower income in providing incentive to travel longer to work.

Human capital theory usually overlooks structural factors in the labour market that bar access to human capital resources for some, especially women and racial and ethnic minorities (Granovetter 1981). Some of these structural factors appear as assumptions in the literature on gender differences in commute length; for example, that women have less access to private transportation and fewer desirable job opportunities that extend beyond their neighborhoods than men do.

Jobs that don't pay very well or are not prestigious do not provide as much incentive for workers to travel as far to get to them as jobs that pay very well or bring with them significant prestige (Levinson 1999).

Nearly 10 percent of job changes involve relocation in the United States (Yankow 2003). Research by Yankow (2003) provides evidence that the reasons for relocation for a job, and the financial consequences of a relocation, vary by the education level of the mover. Those with low levels of human capital who do move for another job tend to do so to restore previous wage levels because of a loss in their current position or area (and they benefit from long-range moves). Those with higher human capital tend to move because of good incentives in the new job. Their salary tends to show much higher returns after about 2 years.

Myers (1999) finds that past experience influences likelihood to relocate. Those whose families were relocated when they were children are more likely to consider relocation as a response to life course transitions in adulthood (Myers 1999).

Another set of predictors of relocation willingness involves ties to the local community. Workers with strong ties are less likely to be willing to relocate within their job positions (Stilwell et al. 1998).

*Career Commitment, Gender, and spatial mobility*

Regardless of gender, the spouse whose career is more personally salient or higher-earning may get the first choice of job and the "best" commute, with the other spouse arranging employment around that first spouse's job. But according to Bielby and Bielby's data (collected in 1977) on individuals in dual-earner couples, even between men and women of equal job investments, earnings, occupational status, and family circumstances, women are far less likely than men are to say they would maximise their job prospects by relocating their families. Bielby and Bielby's 1977 study uses interviews with 162 wives and 197 husbands in dual-earner families taken from the Quality of Employment Survey (representative multistage probability sample of adults 16 years or older, working 20 or more hours a week) (Bielby and Bielby 1992). Another study answers a slightly different question. Using 1967-1972 data from the National Longitudinal Study of Mature Women, with a sample size of 3353 women married continuously between 1967 and 1972, Lichter found that wives' career commitment did not affect families' relocation rates, though wives' employment had a strong negative effect on relocation, even controlling for husbands' income, education, and professional status, the presence of children, and wives' education and age (Lichter 1982). Career commitment was measured by asking whether the respondent would continue to work even if money were not needed. This second study assumes that relocation would be due to husbands' career prospects, and not at all due to wives' careers, an indicator of the social climate of the time in which it was conducted (with few women having career commitments or egalitarian marriages). By extension, wives may also be less likely to inconvenience their families by taking long commutes themselves or requiring them of their husbands. On the other hand, the commute arrangement may be a concession of one spouse to the other as a trade off for the ideal job: the spouse with the better (higher earning, more personally salient) career may compromise for getting job priority by taking on the more arduous commute and allowing the job-compromising spouse the first choice of residential location.

*Two-Earner Couples: Rational Action and Human Capital*

Note that 40 minutes a day is spent in transit for the average worker, which is over three hours per week (Howell and Bronson 1996; Levinson and Kumar 1997). This time is not a trivial amount: morning commute time is traded for sleep time or time getting children prepared for their days; evening commute time is exchanged for "family" time around dinner preparation, time spent with a spouse, time spent with children, and leisure. Individuals and

families must weigh this time relative to the sacrifices and benefits of long commutes to arrive at a livable solution. Time is a scarce and finite resource, especially in dual-earner couples where no one is necessarily specializing in domestic labour. Rationally acting couples make tradeoffs with each other, with their time, and with the location of work and home to maximise benefit to the household. Extrapolating from Becker (1981), the worker who is earning the most should be "specializing" in the work domain and is best able to "afford" a longer commute. This earner's overall investment in work, even considering the commute time, makes it worthwhile to the household to lose that worker to the road for those hours a day.

Some aspects of the incentive to commute longer have yet to be directly examined in research, such as attitudes toward work or home responsibilities. No published research to date models commute time by any measures of beliefs or attitudes about these conceptual constraints. Intangible rewards of work, like job satisfaction or supervisor support, may be better predictors of some kinds of commuting behavior, because some may be willing to travel longer for jobs that provide high satisfaction or have a supportive supervisor. This kind of tradeoff may be particularly true for women or others less likely to enjoy other kinds of job rewards (such as income) or for whom certain benefits are more salient. Job importance relative to other spheres of life may replace earnings as a meaningful explanation for gender differences in commute length, in that the intrinsic value of a job may be at least as important as earnings in predicting a willingness to travel for a job. The relationships of job importance or income to commute length may be moderated by gender or simply correlated with gender. Essentially, a lifestyle dominated by labour market aspirations can justify a longer commute, but men are more likely than women to have high labour market aspirations (Camstra 1996).

## 2.3. Individual Features: Family and household contexts

Some may argue that women don't really have limitless choices regarding human capital acquisitions that lead to job and housing locations and household responsibility levels. Feminism, as a branch of conflict theory, points to women's systematic and long-term oppression and subjugation in the power structure (Bem 1993; England 1993; Johnson 1993). Feminist theory illustrates how the structure of the residential and job locations, and the allocation of household resources within couples (such as the use of the automobile to get to work), perpetuate the inequality between men and women in earnings and job prestige (Hanson 1992). Feminist theory implies that until these structural obstacles are abolished, women will continue to have less power and control over their lives, and, by extension, over

the length and quality of their commutes.

A number of studies have confirmed the "common knowledge" that men have longer commutes than women (Giuliano and Small 1993; Johnston-Anumonwo 1992; Johnston-Anumonwo et al. 1995; McLafferty and Preston 1997). Explanations for the gender difference fall into two categories: those that focus on differences between men and women who are unaffiliated with each other, called 'individual level differences,' and those that account for within-couple gender differences. There are two individual-level explanations for gender differences. One is that women's lower wages make a long commute impractical for them (Madden 1981), assuming that housing near work is, in fact, affordable. Another is that women's occupationally segregated work tends to be service work in suburban areas, nearer to housing, rather than in downtown business districts (Johnston-Anumonwo et al. 1995; Wyly 1999).

Within-couple differences in commute times are explained in two ways. Wives have more limited access to transportation than their husbands because husbands' transportation needs are prioritised. Thus wives seek out closer workplaces that are accessible via public transportation or on foot. Or (the most prevalent explanation), wives' domestic responsibilities compel them to shorten their commutes (Preston et al. 1993). The direction of causality for the latter explanation can go two ways. Do wives choose shorter commutes because it's in their families' best interest that they spend that time at home instead of on the road, given their smaller contribution to household income? Or, do women have fewer job choices because their household responsibilities limit the time they can spend going to work (Preston et al. 1993)? The wage gap between men and women is at least partially explained by the geographic constraints of women who seek employment closer to home so as to minimise the conflict between their employment and family responsibilities (Howell and Bronson 1996). The literature avoids the issue of how couples negotiate their residential location to their workplaces and vice versa, assuming that husbands' job location determines the home location, with wives finding jobs somewhere near their homes (Camstra 1996; Madden 1981; Wyly 1999).

Couples do sometimes decide to live apart. Gross (1980) conducted one of the first studies of couples who live apart because of career reasons. Couples who have been married longer when the residential separation occurred had fewer conflicts between their family loyalty and work pursuits than couples who were more newly married. Others with better

adjustment were women (because these live-apart relationships recognise the legitimacy of the women's careers, which the women appreciate), non-parents, older couples, and couples where one spouse has an established career (Gross 1980). Gerstel and Gross completed an in-depth study of "commuter marriages" where spouses live apart during the week with an elaboration of these results (Gerstel and Gross 1984).

*Household responsibility and spatial mobility*

Differences in human capital investment are often related to women's additional responsibilities for childcare. This latter explanation is where the Household Responsibility Hypothesis begins. The last section posed a variant of these questions: do women have limited access to, or limit their own, career-boosting human capital? If so, then are their time and energy resources more efficiently applied to household responsibilities than are their husbands' resources? Or do women assume they'll absorb a greater share of household responsibility and thus develop less human capital for their jobs? The causal direction here is a chicken-and-egg dilemma: which comes first? Not only are most studies of the journey to work unable to test the causal direction, but also traditional measures in most journey-to-work research don't even capture actual time obligations related to household responsibilities. Instead, inadequate proxies for household responsibility and differential human capital are used, including "household responsibility" as simply the presence of children and husband, and human capital measured with income (whether over or under $10,000 a year) and occupation (whether in an occupation that was 70 percent female or more in 1980) (Johnston-Anumonwo 1992). Better, but seldom used, measures would include actual hours spent on household labour, or attitudes about who should do household labour and how the labour is divided in the home (as suggested by Turner and Niemeier 1997).

Despite the lack of clear causal direction or accurate operationalisation, the primary explanation for gender differences in commuting length in the journey to work literature has been women's differential investments in their own human capital, "caused by" women's conflict between work and home (For examples of the ways in which women's conflict between home and work has been used as a reason for women's shorter commutes, see Johnston-Anumonwo 1992; Madden 1981; McLafferty and Preston 1997; Odland and Ellis 1998; Preston et al. 1993; Wyly 1998). This conflict, often called the Household Responsibility Hypothesis (HRH) (Blumen 1994; Johnston-Anumonwo 1992; Wyly 1998), says that women work closer to home because of their need to take care of household and

child care issues. The HRH introduces a new set of explanations for commuting length – that of family and gender – in explaining an individual's choices regarding job and housing locations and the resultant commuting times. Implicit is a couple-level trade-off between home and work, and the relative investments and responsibilities in each sphere. Although commuting patterns have not traditionally been viewed as part of the division of household labour, there are clear gender differences in commute patterns and explanations for these differences that point directly to the household division of labour. The HRH may predict either the differential investments in capital which produce the gender difference in commute time, or it may directly predict the commute length (with women, no matter their level of human capital, tending to work closer to home to maintain those responsibilities).

Turner and Niemeier (1997) evaluate the literature on the household responsibility hypothesis (HRH) and test it with additional data, drawn from the 1990 National Personal Transportation Survey. The 1990 National Personal Transportation Survey data from the U.S. Department of Transportation, used by Turner and Niemeier, includes 22,000 household interviews randomly selected by telephone of people age 18 to 65. These data contained information on 13,074 work trips, with 7352 being made by men and 5722 made by women. In 1990, ninety-five percent of trips were made in private vehicles. Turner and Niemeier constructed reduced-form equations to model commute distance and time, using separate models for men and women. Control variables included marital status, education level, age, household income, the number of adults in the household, whether the household is in urban area (as a proxy for home prices), and whether the household head is black or Hispanic. Higher household income and suburban households, markers of greater human capital, are factors thought to be correlated with longer commutes (Turner and Niemeier 1997). Other factors that contribute to commute distance are women's parenthood and marital status, education, income, and other labour force characteristics. They predict that age could operate either direction: more age is linked to more experience and wages, so the commute could be longer, or older workers could prefer a shorter commute and have the resources to facilitate such and so age could be negatively related to commute length. They predict that more education and higher wages will lead to a longer commute. Results of the regression equation on distance and time suggest that parenthood and marital status, their proxies for household responsibility, have only small effects on reducing women's trip distance. Turner and Niemeier assert that human capital theory applies to commuting distances in the sense that women accept greater household responsibility when their employment provides less potential advancement or income than their spouses' employment provides, suggesting that what comes

first is the human capital investment and reward acquisition. But their measures of household responsibility, like most studies of household responsibility, are people (husband and children), not actual time investments.

*Role Theory: Strain, Accumulation, and Salience*

Roles are the routinised relationships we hold relative to others (Goode 1960; Sieber 1974). In most roles there are sets of activities that are expected and others that are inappropriate. Gender differences in human capital investments and acquisition, in the levels of responsibility for household tasks and child care, and in commute length are all linked to husbands and wives' roles. Spouses act in tandem, if not always in cooperation, because husbands and wives fill roles in relation to, and sometimes in conflict with, each other.

Research on the willingness of American top managers to take an overseas position finds that characteristics of the spouse, in particular the amount of investment the spouse has in a career and the spouses' level of adventurousness were strong predictors in the ability of a manager to accept an international relocation (Konopaske et al. 2005).

Couples' role expectations are often bundled together, especially in married couples' households where role sets come with (often gendered) meanings about identity and contributions to the household (Brines 1994; Hochschild 1989; Komarovsky 1964; Potuchek 1997; Stanfield 1996; Ward 1993; Wilkie et al. 1998). For example, a spouse who is working part time may take on more of household responsibility to "make up for" the lack of income and to compensate for the lack of labour force time, thus forming a bundle of roles from both the work and home spheres. In this example, that role bundle is typically a female-gendered pattern, and it's unclear what comes first: the part time job or the majority of housework. Each facilitates the other. In some role schemas, both partners may see a long commute as a normal part of the requirements of the (male) breadwinner role. Thus, whether or not it makes rational sense for one or the other spouse to bear an extra long or short commute, the commuting structure is established because of gender-role expectations, not logic. A long commute may be a defining aspect of what it means to be "a good breadwinner," and a short commute that facilitates access to children's needs may be part of the definition of "a good mother." Turner and Niemeier (1997) found that among women working close to home

(within 10 minutes), those in female-type occupations[74] were twice as likely (32 percent) to say they wanted to be able to get home quickly for children or emergencies compared to women in non-female type occupations who lived equally close to home (15 percent). If a shorter commute is viewed as a feminine role marker, wives with longer commutes may feel role dissonance because of the inconsistency between their actions and cultural expectations, in addition to bearing the physical and psychological stress of being in transit for a long period each day. For example, if a wife and mother thinks her long commute and investment in work are inappropriate because her values are on her household responsibilities, or if her household responsibilities exceed her time available, then she is likely to experience role dissonance. The degree of stress associated with a longer commute may vary by life stage, with long-commuting mothers of younger children feeling greater stress than women without children or with grown children. Indeed, Levinson (1999) finds that life stage predicts 10 percent of the variation in the duration of time spent at home, at work, and in "other" activities; people do vary their time investment in these spheres when they can, as a way of coping with the demands of young children[75]. I turn to life stage factors more explicitly in the next section.

### *Gender Bargaining: a Cultural Explanation*

A gender bargaining approach would consider both household roles and rational action as both operating to create couples' commuting patterns. Couples "do gender" in their homes through the ways in which they choose to divide work, avoid work, and create work from among their available options (Bellah et al. 1985; Brines 1994; Hochschild 1989; West and Fenstermaker 1993; West and Fenstermaker 1995). Most household tasks carry with them a specific culturally-imposed gender label. Couples can either default to these gender divisions or forge their own. But couples are engaging in gender work, whether actively opposing traditional gender divisions or following traditional paths. Whichever way couples divide their labour, they can think about it as either in the household's rational best interest, or as part of "what we do here."

---

[74] A female-type occupation, according to Turner and Niemeier (1997), is one where 70 percent or more of workers in that occupation are female.

[75] The age of the oldest child and the number of adults in the household indicate life stage in Levinson's study. Logit models are employed to explain proportion of minutes in each day spent in different domains: work, home, shopping, and other (Levinson 1999). Gender was entered as a control variable. Given that time spent in different domains has long been gendered, models would have been better estimated separately for men and women, or else interactions between gender and most other variables should have been added.

*Parenting Stage and spatial mobility*

The life course is a moving picture of a life over time. Parenting stage, as one variety of life stage, captures the current configuration of one's structural location in relationship to reproduction: age, partnership status, and childbearing, the momentary snapshot that the life course has created up to that point.

I have already identified a few areas of research that have found life stage predictive of commuting decisions and patterns. Recall Levinson's (1999) findings, from the 1990 National Personal Transportation Survey of 22,000 households, that life stage predicts ten percent of the variation in the duration of time spent at home, at work, and in "other" activities. Recall, also, how household responsibility (broadly defined as marriage and parenthood) relates to more time commuting for men and less time commuting for women. Some additional research focuses on life stage more explicitly. I turn to this body of work now.

Some "life stage" work is really just testing marital or parenting status. In this literature, findings conclude that married men commute longer than single men, but the findings are mixed on the effect of marriage for women's commute times. Some research, using a panel study, finds that it's the presence of children, and not marriage, that decreases women's commute times (McLafferty and Preston 1997)[76]. Two other studies, using cross-sectional data, find that married women commute shorter distances than unmarried women, regardless of the presence of children (Johnston-Anumonwo 1992; Preston et al. 1993)[77]. A partial explanation for the difference between married and unmarried women's commutes is that married couples often prioritise the husband's career in relocation decisions, leaving the wife to find work closer to home once they move to a new area for his job (McLafferty and Preston 1997).

Some of the life stage differences in commuting are structural; others can be seen as deliberate strategies. Married men's commutes are longer than single men's commutes even when income is the same, which suggests that the long commute of married men implies a

---

[76] McLafferty and Preston (1997) create path models predicting commute length using 1980 and 1990 PUMS data of the New York City Census population.

[77] Johnston-Anumonwo uses 1977 Baltimore data on 787 people and uses actual distance to work rather than time traveled. Preston, McLafferty, and Hamilton use data use 1980 New York City Central Metropolitan Statistical Area (CSMA) Census data on four populations: married women with and without children, and unmarried women with and without children.

choice to commute longer in exchange for better residential options, perhaps as a family lifestyle strategy (McLafferty and Preston 1997). Mothers may handle their work-family responsibilities, particularly when children are school-aged, by limiting their commutes. Mothers of preschool children do not limit their commutes as much as mothers of school aged children, probably because of the structural constraints of the school day, compared to preschool childcare arrangements, which often can encompass a larger portion of the work day (Preston et al. 1993). Preston, McLafferty, and Hamilton (1993) suspect that one finding is unique to New York City: that children reduce the commute more than marriage does. Another study using two years of in-depth, participant observation with 25 suburban mothers finds that women attach personal and family importance to their neighborhood only after their children are born, at which point the neighborhood itself becomes important for meeting needs of the family and for safety (Dyck 1989), suggesting a valuing of neighborhood over work convenience.[78]

Most of these studies tiptoe around life stage factors and couple-level considerations on commuting, with few addressing it head-on. For example, "life stage" studies on the journey to work often use marriage or the presence of children as variables that may influence the journey to work for men and women, but do not consider these effects as bundles that are associated with each other and with respondents' chronological age (Johnston-Anumonwo 1992; McLafferty and Preston 1997; Preston et al. 1993). The exception is research from the Netherlands.[79]

---

[78] Unaddressed, however, are the changes in the meaning and use of the neighborhood as children and parents age, in other words, considering these dynamics over the life course rather than just life stage. Such a study could have yielded vast implications for the meaning of physical space for families over time.

[79] One of the most extensive couple-level commuting studies to date comes from the Netherlands, by Rouwendal and Rietveld (1994), but is limited in its couple-level qualities because it uses only the householder (usually the male) as an informant on the other spouse. Rouwendal and Rietveld's research uses the Dutch Housing Demand Survey, a random sample of 1551 people collected in 1985 and 1988 weighted toward low income households, especially unemployed households: half the households had unemployed "householders" (breadwinners, male if male is present or female if a single household with no male). Respondents were interviewed about their own and their spouses' commuting distances (Rouwendal and Rietveld 1994). Rouwendal and Rietveld find that the commute distance of the head of the household is longer when the partner is employed, compared to households where the partner is not employed. For their part, partners (wives) have shorter distances when the husband is employed. Weekly work hours are related to more commuting, but children under age 18 are related to short commutes for partners (wives). Age has a decreasing effect on commute distance, with people less likely to commute long distances as they age. Rouwendal and Rietveld's study finds that job search costs include commute length. Often when someone obtains a new job, their commute increases, rather than their relocating is closer to work.

In another study from the Netherlands, Camstra's (1996) research uses the 1992-93 Dutch Telepanel dataset with over 2300 women and men, a retrospective life-course focused survey collected in 1992-93 in the Netherlands. He takes a life course perspective from one respondent per couple to examine the links between family formation timing patterns (timing of marriage and first child) and later-life commuting distances, but it does not look at the

Commuting strategies most likely vary by current life stage as well as the prior sequencing of life events. In addition, reports of commute length are undoubtedly influenced by who is doing the reporting: the commuter or the spouse of the commuter.

However, age reflects cohort as well as life stage. Older wives who began their employment careers in an earlier era may still work near home because they fulfilled the expectation of women to work near home when their careers began or when their children were young, and their occupational choice or actual job still reflects earlier life stage adjustments.

Young non-parent wives are as likely as their husbands to have long commutes. By contrast, older wives are more at risk of having had a home and work location designed according to previous gendered life stage considerations (such has having had young children). Even if children are out of the house, there is an inertia to the home and workplace left over from an earlier time in the life course of the family, and in the patterns of society, where women readily took on the second shift of caring for home and children (Hochschild 1989).

## 3. Consequences of Mobile Living: Quality of Life and Family Outcomes

There are a variety of consequences examined in the literature. These fall into the following categories:

1. Conflicts or strains between spheres of work and home;
2. Children's psychological development; and
3. Life satisfaction.

---

couple as a unit. He uses data on 1113 women and 1217 men 29 years or older with no missing data on timing and geographical location of the labor force, housing, and family dimensions of respondents, including individuals' past timing of children's births, their date of marriage, and the length and duration of their work careers (Camstra 1996). Camstra also considers the role of residential moves and job changes on commuting distances. Camstra creates a typology of "family life-styles" that group people by whether they married and had children right away when they were in their early 20s, waited for both marriage and children, or married but waited before having children. Past family patterns don't predict the probability of moving by gender, although he finds that current life stage factors do play a role. Younger women are more likely to commute longer than older women, but women in general are more likely than men to move or change jobs than face a long commute. According to Camstra, family patterns do predict whether wives quit work after a residential move, with family-centered women more likely to quit working, but career-centered women more likely to just commute longer distances after a move. The probability of quitting a job increases with more traditional family styles for women, decreases for men with more traditional family styles. Modern women commute over larger distances, traditional women quit work, but moves favor men's careers. The moves a family makes tend to shorten men's commute, not women's, for all lifestyle groups. The length of the move moderates this effect. Short moves correspond to moving near the job of the wife; long moves correspond to working near the job of the husband. These data are retrospective, and thus the memory of the events may be biased by the ideology of the respondent.
One major weakness of Camstra's study is that he does not have husbands and wives' reports. Instead, he can only talk about aggregated women and men who are in couples and are implicitly being influenced by the events in their households. With his data nothing can be said about the simultaneous motivations of both spouses.

### *3.1. Conflicts or strains between spheres of work and home*

Regarding conflicts or strains stemming from job-related mobility, Voydanoff (2005) studied what she terms "boundary-spanning demands" including commuting time, taking work home, working from home, and an unsupportive work culture. Commuting time creates work-to-family conflict, but not family-to-work conflict, according to her research using the National Survey of the Changing Workforce 1997 (Voydanoff 2005).

Research on the journey to work has focused on the stress resulting from transit. Comparing train commuters and those driving themselves in the New Jersey-New York area and using self-reports and neuroendocrinological measures of stress, Evans, Wener, and Phillips (2002) affirm the hypothesis that the predictability of the commute is an important determinant of its stressfulness to the individual. The more predictable commutes were associated with lower stress levels. (Evans et al. 2002)

Reasons for relocating influence outcomes. Eby and Dematteo (2000) find that those who relocate for lateral or worse quality jobs than the ones they had before perceive less employer support and have higher job turnover. Those with downward moves or who were moved involuntarily had greater intentions to quit (Eby and Dematteo 2000).

### *3.2. Children's psychological development*

In a review of studies of family instability done by Adam (2004), the conclusion is that residential instability and long or frequent separations from parent figures have negative consequences for children's development in a variety of domains (Adam 2004). Adolescents whose families move frequently are more likely to be involved in violent behavior than those whose families remain stable (Haynie and South 2005). But research by Pettit (2004) indicates that not all family instability leads only to negative outcomes. She describes the conditions under which relocation is healthy for children: moving to more well-off or safer neighborhoods is helpful for teenagers' social connections. Disruptions to social ties are typically short-lived and do not lead to long-term negative consequences. Age of the child matters in the consequences of a move: younger children cannot be as involved in extra-curricular activities after moving to a middle-class neighborhood from a low-income one because of the higher costs of the activities (Pettit 2004). Studies of military families also show evidence that moves are not necessarily bad for children and that age of child matters for the effect of the move (Weber 2005). Myers (2005) finds that children who moved frequently have less close relationships with their fathers later in life, and sons also have less

close relationships to their mothers (Myers 2005).

### *3.3. Life Satisfaction*

Bunker et al (1992) examined the quality of life in couples, comparing those in single-residence households and those where one lived away during the week. The researchers found that commuters (shuttles/LDRs) were more satisfied with their work lives and with time for themselves than single-residence couples, but less satisfied with life overall, with their family life, and with their partnerships. Overload was reduced for the couples in commuter relationships, making the researchers conclude that there are tradeoffs, and that the mobile lifestyle is not purely one of disadvantage. They also found no difference in satisfaction and stress reports of the mobile couples between those who traveled and those who stayed at home (Bunker et al. 1992). By contrast, a study of involuntarily mobile clergy and their wives showed that the wives experienced many more negative consequences from relocation than the clergy husbands did (Frame and Shehan 1994).

A study by Rindfuss and Stephen (1990) on marital non-cohabitation, one of the few studies of this in the United States, shows that marriages where couples do not cohabit are much more likely to dissolve within three years than those that stay together. In the U.S., married non-cohabitors are likely to be separated due to imprisonment or military service rather than "normal" job demands. Results come from the National Longitudinal Survey between 1972 and 1976. Being married and the quality of the marriage are strong predictors of (un)willingness to have a long distance relationship or live in a shuttle-style marriage in the United States (Rindfuss and Stephen 1990).

## 4. Conclusions

The United States has a good deal of research on gender differences in commute times, but less about relocation decision-making (Pixley and Moen 2003). Furthermore, the effects of mobile living on family life and marital quality are only minimally understood, and those studies that do exist are typically done using older data or special populations. Future research should focus on the decision-making process within families for choosing relocation or long commuting/shuttling, the effects of life stage, infrastructure availability, and human capital on these decisions, and the consequences for family formation and family life.

**Sanneke Kloppenburg**

# X. Literature on Job Mobility in the Netherlands

## 1. General overview

Most Dutch studies about mobility are based on geographical approaches, economic approaches, or are policy oriented.

The geographical approaches study mobility in relation to the particular spatial structure and planning in the Netherlands (see research conducted by Maarten Van Ham, Pieter Hooimeijer, Frans Dieleman, Tim Schwanen). These studies sometimes make use of GIS to visualise people's moving behaviour (see also Martin Dijst's theory on action spaces as the area containing activity places that people reach subject to a set of temporal and spatial conditions).

Economic approaches about how mobile individuals maximise their utility have been elaborated with theories on two-earner households, where people try to maximise household utility (see research by Jos van Ommeren, Piet Rietveld, and Peter Nijkamp) as well as gender-oriented research (see Rouwendal)

Policy oriented research (as for example conducted by the Dutch planning offices) consists of a large five-yearly research on time-use (TijdsBestedingsOnderzoek (TBO)) and a yearly research on mobility (Mobiliteitonderzoek Nederland (MON), formerly called Onderzoek Verplaatsings Gedrag (OVG). MON distributes questionnaires to Dutch households to measure the mobility of the Dutch population. The results are presented mainly as quantitative data.

In general, Dutch mobility research can be said to focus more on the relation between mobility and planning, jobs, and the environment (how to change the modal split) and less on families and social capital.

## 2. Job Mobility and Motility (incl. infrastructure)

### 2.1. Demands of high mobility of modern life

Some information on the tensions and problems can be found in section 3.2 on family functioning.

### 2.2. *Mobility potential or motility: the access to transport infrastructure*

The impact of infrastructure and services on mobility practices is an important issue in the Netherlands with its high population density. The Netherlands has a strong urban planning and design tradition, and there are several studies that evaluate the impact of spatial planning policies on mobility of individuals. A study by Schwanen et al (2004b) focuses on the consequences of the Netherlands national physical planning policy for an individual's travel behaviour. Their analysis provides a summary of spatial planning policies after World War II .They find that spatial planning policy influenced travel behaviour in the Netherlands, but only to a limited extent and not always as intended (Schwanen et al 2004b, 596). Spatial planning has been most effective in keeping the high shares of cycling and walking in large and medium cities, in particular for shopping (Schwanen et al 2004b 596). Compared to other European countries, car-use for shopping in the Netherlands is much lower. A second conclusion is that in terms of travel time, spatial policy seems to have been less successful. The building of new towns and the development of greenfield neighbourhoods close to cities appear not to have led to a reduction in commuting times.

A recent theoretical contribution to the debate about network cities is offered by Bertolini and Dijst (2003). They work from the idea that cities are open systems of connected open sub-systems. They have introduced the concept of mobility environments, which they define as 'the whole of the external conditions that may have an influence on the presence of people in a given location'. These conditions include both features of the transportation services available there, and features of the activity place in itself, and they include institutional arrangements. Bertolini and Dijst see accessibility as an important quality of mobility environments and describe an accessible mobility environment as one where 'many different people can come, but also one where many different people can do many different things' (Bertolini and Dijst 2003, 31). Accessibility, they argue, is now more important than proximity.

Meurs and Haaijer (2001) have investigated to what extent the spatial structure and planning of the residential environment provide an explanation for travel patterns and what urban planning and traffic management aspects play a significant role in this. They see mobility as influenced by three factors:

a) *Lifestyles*. Personal characteristics and characteristics of the household to which someone belongs

b) *Spatial characteristics* classified according to area, home, and environmental characteristics, spatial planning and traffic management situation

c) *Accessibility* in terms of travel time, cost, quality and comfort of various means of transport which can be used to reach any given destination from the point of origin (Muconsult)

Their analysis shows that the characteristics of the spatial environment have a demonstrable relationship with mobility and mode of transport. This effect is most apparent in journeys made for shopping and social or recreational purposes, and almost absent for commuting. Commuter traffic appears to be determined almost entirely by personal characteristics (Meurs and Haaijer 2001, 445).

### 2.3. Mobility potential or motility: a resource

Van Ham (2002) has shown that having good geographical access to suitable employment from the residence positively influences individual labour market outcomes and leads to a greater probability of being in paid employment and better jobs for those in employment. Lack of motility can therefore be estimated to have an effect on job career (see 3, also for gender differences).

## 3. Family functioning, family structure, family development

### 3.1. Family structures

The link between family structures and mobility has been done by economists and geographers. Rouwendal and Rietveld (1994) have studied the commuting distances of households in the Housing Demand Survey (WBO) of the Netherlands. They find that one-person households have shorter commuting distance than heads of households of larger households. An explanation put forward is that these households can more easily adapt their housing situation to their work location. However, the authors find meagre evidence in favour of the hypothesis that households with both the head and the partner employed have larger commuting distances (Rouwendal & Rietveld 1994).

Van Ommeren and Nijkamp have made an analysis of spatial moving behaviour of

dual earner households, based on search theory[80]. Dual earner households share a dwelling, but have different workplaces (Van Ommeren & Nijkamp 1998). They find that unemployed workers who have employed spouses set higher reservation wages and are therefore less likely to accept longer-distance job offers than those without employed spouses. Thus, unemployed workers with employed spouses may be much more selective with respect to jobs that are far from the current residence than those households that are sole wage earners.

Van Ham and Mulder investigate the links between geographical access to child-care facilities and labour force participation of mothers. They argue that, for many mothers with preschool-age children, access to employment opportunities is partly determined by geographical access to childcare facilities. In the case of the Netherlands geographical access to childcare is even more relevant than spatial variation in the costs of care. Because the Dutch government regulates the childcare market, there is only little spatial variation in the financial barriers to institutionalised childcare. The spatial differences in availability of institutionalised childcare facilities however are big. This leads Van Ham and Mulder to conclude that mothers living at different locations have different geographical access to childcare facilities. Single mothers are expected to have a lower probability to be in paid employment than married or cohabiting mothers. Single mothers have no partner within the household to share responsibilities, and this restricts their freedom to be active on the labour market. In addition, they have only one potential income and might consider buying care too expensive. Furthermore, the social security system in the Netherlands is relatively generous so there is no financial necessity to be involved in paid employment (Van Ham and Mulder 2005).

### 3.2. Family functioning

Studies about the division of domestic and professional labour focus on earner type (see Keuzenkamp & Hooghiemstra, 2000) rather than household type. In the Netherlands, the labour force participation of women has increased over the past decades. The dominant earner model of two-income families is the 'one and a half' earner model, in which the male partner works full-time and the female partner part-time (Keuzenkamp & Hooghiemstra 2000). This model of combining work and care may cause stress. A study by Van der Lippe, Jager and Kops focuses in particular on the influence of the work and household situation on

---

[80] Search theory has its basis in labour economics. Van Ommeren and Nijkamp describe search theory as follows: Search theory aims to explain the behaviour of individuals who search for jobs or residences in order to improve their current situation.

'combination pressure' of men and women. Based on data gathered in 2001, they find that both men and women perceive combination pressure, but the reasons why differ between them. For men, working overtime in the evening produces combination pressure. For women, working overtime in the weekend means more combination pressure. The presence of a spouse working long hours produces more combination pressure for men but not for women. For women the presence of small children is more important (Van der Lippe et al 2003). They also find that men continue to do a greater part of paid employment and women a greater part of unpaid labour. A study by Dijst on travel patterns and use of space by two-earner households and the gender-related differences in two Dutch municipalities shows how the increase in women's labour market participation will lead to an increase in the number of miles travelled by private car. Dijst finds that compared to part-timers, full-timers participate less in action spaces on the local level but more in action spaces on higher spatial levels. Since more women than men work part-time, he therefore expects an increase in the use of the private car during commuting hours but also in the evenings and weekends to participate in leisure activities (Dijst 1999).

Keuzenkamp and Hooghiemstra (2000) find what they call a typically Dutch family ideology. There exists an emphasis on freedom of choice: women may work but they do not have to. But in addition to this freedom of choice, a strongly developed family ideology prescribes that if there are children, the family must be given priority. Keuzenkamp and Hooghiemstra find that men in particular support that view. Wel and Knijn conclude from research among 1,285 women with young children, that cultural factors rather than economic motives or institutional obstacles offer the most important explanation for whether they work or not. They argue that a 'culture of care dominates more among women with lower than higher education levels, which clarifies the more limited labour participation of lower educated mothers' (Wel & Knijn 2006, 633).

Literature on household strategies for combining paid employment with care of family and household shows that household tasks are more and more contracted out, especially in households with double earners (Van der Lippe, Tijdens & De Ruijter 2004; Keuzenkamp & Hooghiemstra 2000). A strategy of families with children to limit mobility to a minimum is to combine mobility to the workplace with taking children to/from childcare facilities, and shopping (Harms 2005).

### *3.3. Family life cycle*

Harms (2005) found that households that consist of families with children are most often 'on the move'. It appears however that in sum their travel distance is lower and they spent less time travelling than other households. Harms also sees a systematic decrease in mobility when people get older (Harms 2005). This finding is confirmed by a study by Tacken, although he also finds that the types of trips of the active group of elderly people are comparable in duration and distance with the trips made by other age groups (Tacken 1998). Both Harms and Tacken explain the lower mobility rate of elderly people by referring to the worsening state of health, and their lower income. Harms adds to this that older people less often have a driving license and own a car. Harms and Tacken expect the next generation of older people to be more mobile, because these people will have more income, more cars, and more driving licenses (Tacken 1998, Harms 2005).

## 4. Job market

### *4.1. Social mobility and spatial mobility*

Reserach by Van Ham (2001a) investigates whether workplace mobility (accepting a job a long distance away from the residence (Van Ham et al 2001c) has an effect on occupational achievement. He finds that workers who accept a job over a longer distance make more career advancement after a job change than workers who accept jobs closer to home. Van Ham et al (2001c) have also revealed that women show less workplace mobility than men. For women with a partner, workplace mobility has no effect on career advancement, because they are often 'tied movers'. Some women accept a job over a larger distance because the household as a whole migrates for the sake of the career of the male spouse. Van Ham concludes that for women workplace mobility is only instrumental in career advancement when jobs are accepted over a long distance for their own careers (Van Ham 2001a).

In a different article Van Ham et al (2001c) go into more details about the determinants of workplace mobility: what people are spatially more flexible? They find that the following factors influence workplace mobility:

-age: as people get older, their workplace mobility decreases rapidly

-education: high education increases workplace mobility

-presence of children: presence of children reduces workplace mobility for women, but not for men.

-marriage decreases workplace mobility for women, but not for men

-employment status: unemployed men show more workplace mobility than employed men. For women there is no effect from previous labour status.

Two further factors that influence workplace mobility are the characteristics of the job and the present commuting distance. Van Ham et al conclude that

Our findings show the importance of the residential location in avoiding costly workplace mobility. Workplace mobility serves as a mechanism to overcome poor local access to suitable jobs. This statement implies that, for people who want to avoid mobility costs in terms of commuting and migration, those locations with the highest locational quality in terms of job access are the most favourable. These locations can be found at the edge of the larger cities, in between the major concentrations of employment. This is especially important for working women with partners and mothers, because they are more spatially constrained than men and are therefore more dependent on local job opportunities. These locations will also be superior for the unemployed, some of which may remain outside employment because of their spatial inflexibility'. (Van Ham et al 2001c: 938).

### 4.2. *Spatial mobility choices according to opportunities and requirements of the job market*

Research has found that dual earner households have a lower propensity to migrate than couples or families with a single breadwinner (Mulder 1993, Mulder and Hooimeijer 1999) but may accept a longer commute (Van Ham 2001a).

Economic analysis of residential mobility, workplace mobility and commuting has been conducted by Van Ommeren. In a 2000 article together with Rietveld and Nijkamp he investigates the relationship between residential and workplace relocation behaviour. They assume that 'individuals maximise utility by moving through different labour market and housing market states, while taking into consideration that moving from one state to another is costly' (Van Ommeren et al 2000, 213). One particularly interesting finding is that, when compared to employed people, non-employed people will accept fewer job offers and search less intensively in the labour market when residential moving costs are higher (Van Ommeren et al 2001, 231). These moving costs are higher in particular when housing policies (e.g. the housing subsidies in the Netherlands) discourage people to change residence. An earlier study by these three authors on two-earner households (see 2.1) indicated that on average, two earner households will move less than single wage earners.

Schwanen et al (2001) distinguish four different types of urban systems in the Netherlands. The effects of the relocation of jobs and residences to suburban locations appear mixed. For some urban regions, they find less commuting distances, but for other locations they find longer commuting distances.

Rouwendal (1999) in his study of spatial job search and commuting distances for Dutch women confirms that female workers have a shorter average commute than male workers. The Dutch married and cohabiting women in his sample have a stronger reluctance to accept jobs with long commutes when they are older or have children.

### *4.3. Localisation of jobs within each country, spatial distribution of various kinds of jobs*

There are several studies from geography and urban studies focusing on the polynucleated urban structure of the Randstad area. Van Ham (2005) addresses the question to what extent does spatial variation in job access within the Netherlands' polynucleated urban structure influence job-related migration (Van Ham 2005). He finds that it is not the cities but the suburban residential locations in between the cities in the Randstad that show the highest level of job access. Higher level job access is shown to decrease the probability of job related migration. The results also show that, compared with people living outside the Randstad, people living in the major cities in the Randstad and in between these major cities have the lowest probability of changing residence for a job (Van Ham 2005). Another study by Van Ham, Hooimeijer, and Mulder (2001b) shows that urban form has a tremendous effect on job access. The authors evaluate job access of residential locations at varying level of commuting tolerance and for various types of employment. By means of a GIS analysis they are able to make maps which show that in the Randstad the suburban locations in between major employment centres provide the best job access for households with highly skilled workers. For poorly skilled workers with limited commuting tolerance the city centre is the best place to live (Van Ham et al 2001b).

## 5. Social integration, social capital

### *5.1. Social capital and mobility types*

No studies on social capital and mobility types could be found. For social capital in general Steyaert (2003) sees a trend of decreasing social capital in the Netherlands. Data from

the TBO (TijdsBestedingsOnderzoek)[81] help Steyaert conclude that the time that people spend on social contacts at home is decreasing for both one-person households and households that consist of two or more people. Social contacts at home consist of talking with housemates or giving attention to children. Talking to housemates in particular has declined, probably due to a decrease in family size, but also due to individualisation of time spent at home. Social contact at home with others consists of activities such as receiving visitors, visiting other people and telephoning. Only telephoning shows an increase (Steyaert 2003).

## 5.2. *Social support, social networks and social capital*

Liefbroer and Mulder (2004) show that Dutch people find family solidarity important, but that most of them do not think that children have specific obligations towards their parents. A minority of people thinks children should take care of their ill parents, visit their parents weekly, and that elderly parents should be welcome to live in their childrens' household.

Dykstra has done research about family ties in the Netherlands. She argues how ties between family members are now more voluntary and based on mutual affection, and have less to do with an idea of obligations or task-awareness (Dykstra 2004). She says that this change however does not influence the amount of support given to family members: 'family members engage in strong efforts to support and assist those in need' (Dykstra 2004, 4).

## 5.3. *Spatial distribution of personal networks*

The Netherlands Kinship Panel Studies (NKPS) has researched the geographical distance among family members in the Netherlands (see Mulder and Kalmijn 2004). The results show that distance among parents, children, siblings, and parents-in-law who live outside their own household is 30-40 kilometres on average (Mulder and Kalmijn 2004, 78). For high educated people this distance is considerably larger. Mulder and Kalmijn also find that parents and children less often live in the same place of residence as compared to a few decades ago, but the researchers argue that this trend is not spectacular.

De Boer et al study the geographical aspects of informal care-giving. Based on data by the NKPS, they conclude that distance to network members is an important factor in

---

[81] Since 1975 every five years the Social and Cultural Planning Office of the Netherlands (SCP) carries out a research on time use called Tijdbestedingsonderzoek (TBO). This TBO measures movements in travel time only. The Time use research is based on five-yearly diary annotations of activities during a full week in October.

providing informal care. The chance that people give care is biggest when the distance between the potential care provider and receiver is 5 kilometres maximum, for a distance between 5-40 kilometres this chance strongly decreases, and from 40 kilometres onwards the chance is constant. These results apply to support given to family-members and friends alike. Furthermore, the authors find that children most often receive support, while parents-in law receive the least support (De Boer et al 2005, 78).

## 6. Quality of life

### 6.1. *Subjective well-being, health related issues and spatial mobility*

The Living Condition Index (LCI) of the Netherlands, produced by the SCP, explicitly refers to mobility as a factor for measuring living condition. People with cars have a higher score on living conditions than those without, because having a car gives many people a sense of freedom, of being able to come and go as they please. This is presumed to have a favourable effect on their living conditions. In 1997 it has been decided to include possession of a public transport season ticket alongside car ownership, because having a public transport card can give a similar sense of freedom (Boelhouwer 2002).

A research by Steg and Kalfs (2000) shows that Dutch people more and more feel they are short of time (Beckers 1995 in Steg and Kalfs). A reason for this is that on average they now spend more time on compulsory activities and they have less time for leisure activities. In their leisure time, people do more and visit more places that are also at a larger distance.

Peters (1998) in Harms (2005) talks about freedom of movement: people want to decide for themselves about where, when, and how they move.

**Gil Viry and Detlev Lück**

# XI. Conclusion

## 1. Overview of the empirical state-of-the-art in Europe

The literature review in eight European countries and in the United States shows the large plurality of perspectives analysing the phenomenon of job-related spatial mobility connected with the family life. There is research oriented towards macro-level studies of the spread of mobile living arrangements and their impacts on the private sphere, as well as research carried out through micro or meso-level studies linking spatial mobility with family dynamics or social networks. Regarding the mobility forms that are studied, the main division concerns the studies of migration and seasonal work in Poland, whereas other countries have been shifting their interests towards the "modern" forms of mobility, like weekly commuting.

In this conclusion we will firstly review the main empirical findings and then identify the gaps concerning the state-of-the-art in Europe. We will finish with some important insights of this literature review, partly detecting new aspects, partly confirming unverified assumptions, in connection with the research questions of the project.

## 2. Main empirical findings

The description of the empirical findings is structured into two axes: the first (sections 2.1 to 2.4) describes the *conditions* (structural, cultural, family- or social network-related), supporting or hindering job mobility, whereas the second axis (sections 2.5 to 2.7) summarises the *impact* of job mobility on family, social networks or quality of life. Despite this separation for descriptive reasons, the *conditions and impacts* of job mobility, to a large degree, are the same: Mostly, the identical phenomena, like the family background or people's social capital, are interacting with mobility in a reciprocal causal relationship, appearing as a *condition for* mobility and *influenced by* mobility at the same time.

### 2.1. *Individual socio-economic and family-related conditions, supporting or hindering job mobility*

Although representative data of the different mobility forms are missing, the national literature reviews show clear tendencies that occupational mobility is strongly structured socially. This leads to social inequalities regarding mobility as a resource and as a competence.

Firstly, occupational mobility is clearly linked with the education level and the job position (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b, De Miguel, 2002, Bancaja, 2005, Gobillon, 2001, Bonnet & Desjeux, 2000). Job-related mobility is then frequently associated with highly qualified workers (Haas, 2000, Büchel et al., 2002) or with managers (Guerrero, 2001). A first explanation of this relationship is that there is a definite demand of mobility for specially certain occupational groups, relatively high-positioned. Persons who choose such jobs have prerequisite skills of mobility and are highly career-oriented, so they willingly accept the demands of mobility as a precondition for career enhancement. Skilled workers have also greater opportunities to get a job through residential mobility (to large cities particularly) (Bassand, 1985). The case of (incomplete) migration and seasonal work of Poland is an exception, with a high demand of unskilled labour. In the case of daily or weekly mobility forms, the relationship between high social status and mobility is also explained by differences in the residential localisation. People with higher education live more frequently in the cities and in suburbs or outlying areas, where the time of commuting is longer (De Miguel, 2002). The spatial mobility of the poorest categories of the population can be also explained by the difficulties in the access of public transport, which can lead to new forms of spatial segregation and financial problems in accessibility by car (Kaufmann, 2002, Le Breton, 2005).

Secondly, the occupational mobility is strongly related with family structures. People who have the responsibility of small children are less mobile than those who do not. If the former are mobile, they also do not as far as the latter, staying in a regional proximity (Paulu, 2001, Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b, Hagemann-White, 1996, Paéz, 1999, Montulet, Hubert, Huynen, 2005). Not surprisingly, it is then the categories of the younger people, the singles, the separated and the divorced that experience more mobile livings and these experiences are more desired (Gobillon, 2001, Paéz, 1999). Moreover, single-income couples are more mobile than dual-income couples. According to certain studies, this result is explained by the fact that the move is less advantageous if both partners work (Jürges, 2005, Kalter, 1997, Collmer, 2005). For Modenes (2000, 2004), the probability for single-income families to move to another residence is also higher, because the transition from renting to owning is financially more difficult.

The difference between couples (with or without children) and singles is yet not so well-defined. Whereas some studies (Kalter, 1997, 1998) show a higher mobility of singles, Bonnet, Collet and Maurines (2006d) have shown through a survey that people who live in a

couple are more liable to experience occupational mobility than those living alone. The authors explain this result by a question of age and by the fact that people of middle age and living alone are more likely to move closer to their place of work. Linked to this last explanation, some authors (Kaufmann, 2001, Ascher, 1998) have shown that the desire of families to live outside the city (in order to raise children in a detached house) can lead to an increase of the daily mobility of families. More constrained, the high commuting time of low income households, like mothers with children, can be explained by the localisation of low-cost homes in remote areas (ECVT, 2004, Kaufmann, 2002).

In a gender perspective, some studies show that women are less frequently mobile than men. This finding seems to be explained mainly by the gender-structured labour market and by the gendered division of domestic work. When these factors are controlled, significant differences between men and women disappear (Jürges, 2005, Casado, 2003). Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel (2002a) have moreover shown that mobile men establish families just as often as non-mobile of the same age group, whereas mobile women are older (specially long-distance commuters and weekly mobile) than childless moving-mobile or non-mobile women.

Different studies are interested in analysing the influence of family functioning on the mobility decisions. Challiol (1998, 2002) and Vignal (2005a, 2005b) focus, for example, their analysis on how the couple negotiates their professional and family roles within the household. According to these authors, a double-career couple, a single-career couple, or a couple where both partners subordinate their professions to family, will tend to choose different forms of mobile living. Kaufmann and Widmer (2006) suggest to go further in this perspective, in order to link the different dimensions of family functioning, i.e. the autonomy/fusion, the openness/closure and the regulation within the family, with specific forms of mobility and of mobility socialisation. For these authors, families oriented towards independence or openness could foster the mobility of the child on his own. This kind of family would then choose in the majority residential locations with a wealth of nearby amenities. In families valuing a prescriptive type of regulation, motility of the child would be controlled by strict rules, whereas in families based on contractual regulation, the independence of children would be seen more as an object that must be negotiated. The relationship between strong mobility and autonomy within the family functioning was not confirmed in the Spanish research (Meil, 1999, Alberdi & Escario, 2003, Diaz et al., 2004), whereas the study of Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel (2002a) establishes a link with

mobility strategies of families. Couples that place personal autonomy in the foreground frequently select the mobility forms shuttle and long distance relationship. Individuals who are family and/or partnership oriented choose more other forms like commuting.

Very few findings are known about the influence of family structures on the different living arrangements. The relationship between family structure and migration was illustrated in the Polish situation. It was shown that having children generally motivates men to undertake stable work abroad and seasonal work, whereas childless men undertake more frequently short-term, temporary migration (Korczynska, 2003, Jonczy, 2003).

## 2.2. *Social network related conditions, supporting or hindering job mobility*

The composition and the localisation of interpersonal relationship networks can be related with specific forms of spatial mobility or on the contrary with forms of immobility. Certain studies about the solidarity network in the family (Pitrou, 1978, Coenen-Huther et al., 1994) have showed that couples or individuals with low residential mobility belong to networks that are focused on family ties. By contrast, individuals with strong residential mobility have networks that are more open, more varied, less dense and less centred on the family. The strong ties constructed from an early age and existing within networks of relatives and friends were also identified as strong barriers of residential mobility (see next section on cultural conditions).

Moreover the presence of a network of relatives, in particular the presence of grandparents, can facilitate childcare and other kinds of help when the parents work different hours or are absent in case of migration (Dandurand & Ouellette, 1995, Attias-Donfut & Segalen, 1998, Messant-Laurent et al., 1993, Hirszfeld & Kaczmarczyk, 1999, Korczynska, 2002). These family networks can foster specific forms of spatial mobility. The migration network for example plays a key part in the migration process (Gorny & Stola, 2001). Conversely, the network of relatives and friends plays a significant role in the mobility strategies of individuals, for example, in their ability to react to a job loss by moving (Vignal, 2005a, 2005b).

Different research works (Pooley & Turnbull, 1998) bring out a new relation with space, characterised by the reversibility: The non-recurring of mobility (migration, move) are substituted by recurring forms (daily or weekly mobility). This substitution leads to a transformation of space-time temporalities of the long term into the short term. It also

corresponds to a modification of the impact of mobility on the social networks. When individuals travel rather than migrate, commute rather than move, the social networks and attachments can be maintained easier (Larsen et al., 2005).

## 2.3. Cultural conditions, supporting or hindering job mobility

Although no systematic analysis about mobility culture in Europe was carried out, it appears from numerous national empirical studies a strong yearning for sedentary life and residential stability. Rather than spatial mobility desires, people insist on the binding to hometowns and on the importance to keep the familiar circle of relatives and friends (see above the section social networks conditions). This desire seems to be connected to the fact that many people live in the same place as their parents, or close to them. The residential mobility beyond the borders of ones' own region is particularly rejected (Bassand, 1985, Schneider, 2005). This strong unwillingness to move is also confirmed when the residential mobility must be considered for professional reasons (in order to keep or to get a job) (Vignal, 2005a, 2005b, Allesklar.com, 2006). A change of residence is then often seen as one of the worst alternatives (Meier, 1998, Brixy & Christensen, 2002).

Except for some specific differences between countries (like regional identities in Spain or in Switzerland), the cultural reasons mentioned by national studies not to move are similar, mainly strong binding with the homeland region and strong family culture (Paéz, 1999, Bassand, 1985, Limmer, 2005 and for an example of weak attachment to the city leading to a stronger mobility willingness: Nahon, 2001). Beyond the importance of these two cultural factors, some studies insist on the influence of the combination of several factors, including structural ones (see next section), which influence the negotiation and the mobility decisions of the household (Vignal, 2005a, 2005b, Modenes, 2000, 2004).

Given the difficulty for people to change residence, some studies present the commuting as a more accepted mobile living (Kalter, 2004; Collmer, 2005). However, the acceptance to cover great distances by commuting also seems not to be high, even in the case of unemployed people in order to get a job (Allesklar.com, 2006). Even among the mobile persons, spatial mobility seems not to be positively evaluated as an individual achievement (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b), rather considered as unable to fulfil their roles of parent, of friend or of community member.

Freisl (1994) associates this rather negative evaluation of mobility in European Union

with the values systems and dominant norms. In contrast with the North American values of freedom and equality promoting spatial mobility, the European Union is characterised by values like property ownership and education which have hindered it.

Mobility is perceived some other way in Poland. In a country where spatial mobility is mainly linked to migration and seasonal work, mobile living is more seen as a normal part of life (Kaczmarczyk & Hirszfeld, 1999, Kaczmarczyk, 2001, Solga, 2002, Romaniszyn, 2002, Slany, 1997). The socialisation of children of migrants plays an important part in this migration culture (Hirszfeld & Kaczmarczyk, 2000, Lopacka-Dyjak, 2006).

### 2.4. *Structural and economic conditions, supporting or hindering job mobility*

In a context of economic liberalisation and opening up of markets for communication and workers, the national literatures confirm the increasing importance of the spatial job-related mobility. On a macro-economic level, occupational mobility is supported as fight against unemployment, by more job flexibility and an increased inter-regional mobility (Zühlke, 2000, Büchel, Frick, & Witte, 2002). The unemployment is particularly a push factor in Poland, in the case of migration and seasonal workers. The governments set up different kinds of incentives, such as improvement of the transport infrastructure (Ugoiti, 1999, Gutierrez, 1993, Kochanska, 2002), tax write-off (like in Germany), etc.

Nevertheless, according to the literature reviews, some structural, economic and political factors still are an obstacle to occupational mobility. A first set of factors is linked to the housing market. For example, the shortage of flats, the prices and the lack of legal private ownership in Poland (Krynska, 2001), the rigidity of the housing market and the strong and early home ownership in Spain (De Miguel, 2002, Modenes & Lopez, 2004), the high home owning rate in France (Vignal, 2005a, 2005b) or the high value of home owning in Germany (Wagner, 1989) restrict the residential mobility. For the Spanish authors, this aspect is even strongly associated with the increase in the commuting time. A second set of reasons is linked with economic factors, such as the lack of job opportunities, the persistence of the split shift system in Spain (Bentolila, 2001, De Miguel, 2002), the unequal prospect of employees in France, which facilitates mobility of certain skilled workers, whereas it hinders the mobility of others (Vignal, 2005a, 2005b), etc. A third set of factors are more political, like the political decentralisation, the regional distribution of income and the expansion of the welfare state and the trade union activity in Spain (Bentolita, 2001) or the decentralised political and educational system in Germany and Switzerland. For De Miguel (2002), the lack of mobility

in Spain is also explained by the heavily concentration of the population in urban communities, even in agricultural areas. For this latter country, but particularly for Poland, one main barrier of mobility remains the lack of road and public transport infrastructures.

### 2.5. *Impact on partnerships and family relations, coping strategies*

Very few studies explicitly deal with the interaction between job-related mobility and family lives. Nevertheless, a few tendencies emerge clearly from the national literature review.

A first strong tendency is that male job mobility reinforces the traditional division of labour in the partnership/family (with a female partner taking on the main burden of housework and child rearing and putting her own professional career on hold), whereas the female mobility leads instead to more equality in the division of labour between the two partners (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a, Limmer, 2004a, Bonnet, Collet, & Maurines, 2006a, 2006d, ECVT, 2004). However when the woman is mobile, she continues to invest considerably more than the man in the domestic sphere, even if she is fully employed (Limmer, 2004a, Bonnet, Collet, & Maurines, 2006a, 2006d). When the two partners are mobile, the woman generally chooses a job that is nearer to the place of residence than those chosen by the man, in order to take care of the home, but also because her lower salary and her shorter working hours reduce the cost-effectiveness of the commuting (Casado, 2003).

The double tasks of mobile women (home and work) lead them, when they have children, to face difficulties, unless they are supported by a social network or by a very well developed childcare infrastructure (Pelizäus-Hoffmeister, 2001). In the survey of Bonnet, Collet and Maurines (2006a) about high-ranking professions, certain women explain that they appreciate their higher autonomy while the male partner is away. In the case of long distance relationship or shuttles, the unequal division of labour in the household is not verified in the different studies, which were carried out about this issue. In the same way than the other studies, Soriano (2005) observes that mobility, in this case a separation of residence, increases the inequality in the division of labour. The small amount of participation by the man disappears almost entirely when he spends most of his time away from the household. Becerril (2003) presents quite the reverse with a very fair division of tasks taking place during the time the couple is together.

In the case of migration in Poland, this difference in the division of labour between mobile men and mobile women is also observed (Lukowski, 2001, Lopocka-Dyjak, 2006, Solga, 2002). When the man migrates, the woman is often overburdened with responsibilities and tasks (Solga, 2002). She develops new skills and personality traits, becomes more self-sufficient and independent (Kukułowicz, 2001). In many cases, the woman quits her job to fully take care of home duties and children (Solga, 2002). When it is the woman who migrates, the man is poorly coping with the domestic responsibilities, seeking assistance of relatives, especially in taking care of children, whereas the migrant woman tends to coordinate the family life even from distance (Lukowski, 2001). In the case of mother's migration, children get more involved in housework (Lopocka-Dyjak, 2006, Solga, 2002).

A second tendency is that in families of occupationally mobile individuals, certain problems are intensified (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a, Wendl, 2005a, Soriano, 2005, Becerril, 2003, Lopocka-Dyjak, 2006, Kaczmarczyk-Sowa, 1996, Grzymała-Kazlowska, 2001b, Romaniszyn, 2002). The main problem seems to be the lack of time shared with the family/partner. This leads to a plurality of difficulties, which can vary with the type of mobility. It seems that weekly commuting and other forms of mobility associated with long separation of the family are the most problematic. Certain mentioned difficulties are the decrease of parental authority over the children, the necessity to bring up the children on one's own, the children's suffering from separation, the decrease of closeness between family members or partners, loneliness and stress, the weekends overloaded with leisure activities, the fear that the relationship might fail, etc. The often less problematic form would be the residential mobility, with difficulties like the adaptation of children and partners into the new environment, the intercultural problems in case of travelling in foreign countries, and so on.

Occupationally mobile individuals primarily attempt to find relief from stress by developing strategies to adapt themselves and their family to their situation in life. These strategies can be of different kinds, such as the choice in the mobility form (Wagner, 1989, Schneider, 2002a), the implication of the mobile father maintaining involved in raising children and finding time for their children despite long absences from home (Schneider, 2002a, Montulet, Hubert, & Huynen, 2005), the usage of modern forms of communication technology (telephone, e-mails, internet) in place of physical proximity (Karczynska, 2003, Kesselring, 2005), the ability to deal with transport infrastructures (Kesselring, 2005), the adaptation of the couple in order to privilege the moments of interaction with the partner or with the family, finding time strategies in order to cleverly combine work and private life

between planning and improvisation (Montulet, Hubert, & Huynen, 2005), the reorganisation of the working time (part-time, work at home), and finding help from the extended family.

The study of Bonnet, Collet and Maurines (2006b, 2006c) links family functioning, family problems and mobility. It shows that when the man is mobile, the best arrangement is that the woman dedicates herself entirely to running the home while the man is away. In situations where the professional fulfilment of each partner exists, more constraints are attached to spatial mobility. When the mobility of one partner is clearly experienced as an impediment for self-fulfilment (in family/partnership life, in social life, in community life), the couple generally quickly puts an end to the situation of mobility.

## *2.6. Impact on social networks*

Very little is known about the relationship between spatial mobility and social networks. A number of studies relate the difficulty for mobility people to form and maintain social networks. The main explanation is the little time for new acquaintances outside the close circle of family for high mobile people. Couples and families prefer to spend the little time they have together (Collmer, 2005, Becerril, 2003, Soriano, 2005). The contacts outside of the professional environment are delegated to the immobile partner (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a). However another set of studies focuses on the capabilities of mobile people to develop an extensive social network through their occupational mobility and the job-related contacts with other people. For Schmitz (2004), residential mobility and change of workplaces are not directly a handicap for integrating local social networks unless the initial difficulties. For Montulet and Kaufmann (2004), high-speed mobility is an essential competence for social and professional integration, for linking up the various sphere of life, thus being able to connect the different and spatially-separated networks.

## *2.7. Impact on health and quality of life*

The different studies measuring the quality of life show that mobile people consider themselves to be more dissatisfied with the amount of free time they have (ECVT, 2004). The commuters feel more psychologically stressed (Stalder et al., 2000) and show an increased frequency of illnesses (Jüttner, 1976, Ott & Gerlinger, 1992). In contrast to the time spent on commuting, the distance travelled has little impact on health risks (Blickle, 2005, Rapp, 2003). Schneider, Limmer, and Ruckdeschel (2002) showed that stress experienced by mobility workers significantly depends on the actual form of mobility. The most stressed are workers with at least one hour one way to work, weekend commuters and "vari-mobile." At

the other end of this scale, the people in long distance relationship and people who moved are not or hardly more stressed than non-mobile people. Interestingly, mobility has also an impact on the well-being of the wives or partners of long distance and weekly commuters (Rodler & Kirchler, 2001, Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002).

## 3. Gaps concerning the state-of-the-art in Europe

In the past, job-related mobility has often been studied in economic terms with a focus on migration, and an interest in mobility of human resources in relation to the labour market and to unemployment. Secondly there is research on job-related mobility in terms of urban planning, with the issues of controlling traffic flow and pollution, addressing daily commuting only implicitly. Thirdly there are recent studies on the social and psychological consequences of mobility. Also research on the interaction between job-related mobility and family life exists. However, these and other studies are rather rare and address mostly highly selected groups and/or issues. The issues, interests, and state-of-the-arts vary strongly between countries. A systematic overview over the forms of job-related mobility with representative data is missing, for Europe as for each of the participating countries. Some developing mobile living forms, such as long distance relationships, shuttles or job nomads were hardly studied. Moreover the theoretical concepts related to job mobility have not yet been systematically applied.

### 3.1. Creating a systematic, holistic, representative empirical data-base

For most forms of mobile living, there is no representative data to describe them. Especially a cross-national comparison and European level-data are missing. So far, research has been either following a qualitative approach, or an explorative non-representative design, or it has focussed on a very specific sub-group, such as officers in the armed forces or seamen. So no data-base exists that would allow to describe the proportions of job-related mobility in European societies in general.

### 3.2. Providing a systematic, holistic description of the various forms of mobility or dimensions to do so

If job-related mobility is described, scientists usually focus on specific categories, such as migrants, movers or daily commuters. Due to the limited focus, the definition of these categories remains a formality that reproduces a conception already given in society. The categories people generally have in mind also serve as heuristic categories for the research. Scientists are looking for migrants, movers, and daily commuters, so it is migrants, movers,

and daily commuters which they find.

It is not known in which proportions these various forms of mobility – according to which definition – exist in European societies (and how relevant research on them is). Neither a systematic holistic description for one or more European countries has been made, nor a comparison between countries. It is not known how many further or "in-between" forms of mobility exist in which quantities that have not yet been studied or even labelled. Also some "modern" forms of mobility that are known to exist, like weekly commuting or "job nomads," have hardly been studied. Very little is then known about how these different forms of mobility may be combined.

### 3.3. *Linking spatial mobility to other research fields: family, social networks, social structure, personality, and health*

We know something about the consequences of precarious job-situations for private life. Yet, we know rather little about the consequences of job-related *mobility demands* for the private sphere, such as partner and family relations, social networks, health, and quality of life. With the exception of migration, we also know rather little about how the private sphere, how socio-economic or how demographic features influence decisions regarding becoming mobile. And we know even less about in what way these interdependencies need to be differentiated by the form of mobility or the (political, economical, cultural, or geographical) national context.

The different mobility strategies of families, as an alternative to moving, such as living in a long distance relationship or weekly commuting, are not well known. According to the interplay between mobility and private sphere, very few studies analyse how the family context and the interpersonal networks influence the mobility practices and mobility acceptance. Yet, we have good reason to believe that there are important consequences and significant variations.

### 3.4. *Applying theoretical concepts*

Empirical research, especially quantitative research on migration, so far has been strongly influenced by *Rational Choice theories*. However, there is reason to believe that an economic view on the decision to become mobile is not sufficient, especially not in explaining job-related mobility in every form. Also, a theory is missing for describing *consequences* of mobility for the private sphere.

On a theoretical level there is much literature about flexibilisation, globalisation, precariousness or vulnerability of occupations, as a broader category, and its effects on the private sphere. However, within these publications spatial mobility mostly remains an implicit aspect. And even if it is made explicit its assumed interrelation with the private sphere is hardly tested empirically.

A few more specific theoretical concepts have been designed, analysing job mobility explicitly, especially the concepts of *motility* or those of *family career*. The former insists on the potential and actual capacity of people to be mobile, i.e. the way an individual or a group appropriates the realms of possibility concerning mobility and puts it to use. The concept of *family career* analyses job mobility through the global perspective of family life course and the various contingencies of the family environment. However, these two concepts have not yet been satisfyingly applied in empirical research.

### 3.5. Summary

Basically, the literature reviews confirm that the gaps concerning the state-of-the-art in mobility research that have been thought to exist really do so. Research proposal and research design of *Job Mobility and Family Lives in Europe* have aimed to answer a number of major open questions in this research field. These questions were formulated as research areas based on a sound knowledge of the state-of-the-art. However, only a systematic in-depth research on the published research was able to confirm that none of the formulated questions has yet been answered. The gaps in the state-of-the-art that have been verified to exist are:

- A representative empirical data-base is missing that would allow a systematic study of occupational spatial mobility of all kinds. Also a data-base for cross-national comparative research on occupational spatial mobility is missing.

- Due to this lack of data, no systematic and holistic description has yet been made of the various forms of mobility in general. And, of course, a systematic comparison between European countries in this respect is also missing. Only specific sub-groups have been studied so far. Also a systematic description of relevant dimensions distinguishing forms of mobility does not yet exist.

- Occupational spatial mobility has not yet systematically been linked to other research fields, such as: family, social networks, social structure, personality, and health. Although several linkages have been reported, they have not been studied in a quantitative study, integrating various interrelated factors and potential causal interrelations, so the

significance of any of these linkages, so far, can only be estimated.

- The correlations and variations have not all yet been satisfyingly explained within a theoretical framework. And the existing theoretical concepts that are probably able to do so have not yet been satisfyingly applied in empirical research.

## 4. Insights concerning the research agenda of *Job Mobilities and Family Lives in Europe*[82]

In this section a number of significant insights are presented, which are emerging from the national literature reviews. Some of them have been anticipated, and now can confirm the research design in this anticipation. Others are new. For these, the possible consequences concerning the research questions of *Job Mobility and Family Lives in Europe* and/or the construction of its questionnaire are discussed.

### 4.1. The ideological dimension of spatial mobility

Like for most topics in social sciences, the issue of job-related mobility is connected to strong emotional associations and normative evaluations. And maybe more than in other research fields, the scientific debate is shaped by these evaluations. Whether considered positively (Kaufmann et al., 2004, Paéz, 1999) or in a more critical way (Lanoy, 2004, Boltanski & Chiapello, 1999), the ideological dimension of spatial mobility is strongly present in the literature reviews. In many studies spatial mobility seems indeed to be presented as a good or a bad thing. As analysed by Montulet and Kaufmann (2004), one reason is that the contemporary ideology of spatial mobility confuses spatial mobility and social fluidity: Mobility is interpreted as a symptom for the openness of societies for *social* mobility, as freedom for individuals to move upwards and achieve self-fulfilment. On the other hand the mobility demands of the labour market are considered a restraint or even a threat to partnerships, families, and people's social integration, arguing that the maintenance of social relations requires physical presence.

This insight emphasises the importance of mobility research maintaining emotional distance to the object of research. That includes neutrality in the way the questions in the questionnaire are formulated. In a more general perspective, it also questions our view of spatial mobility and spatial competences. It is often assumed that mobility is moving quickly and far away. However the lack of mobility is not necessarily a disadvantage or an advantage.

---

[82] As to be formulated in their final version in deliverable 4 (D4)

Spatial competences are not simply composed of mobility competences. To be able to settle in an area, to link together sedentary and mobile life, to be able to put together the different activities in space and time are completely essential, in particular regarding the family and social integration issues.

It is fair and necessary that research is *informed* about positive and negative evaluations of mobility. It has to take these evaluations into account when interpreting the decisions people make regarding becoming or not becoming mobile, regarding the choice between relocation and commuting. It is even worthwhile to measure the evaluations people have in their minds empirically, so that effects on mobility decisions can be documented. However, like in every other field of social science, the researcher should avoid policy advice that take on any of these evaluations as necessarily and only true.

### 4.2. All forms of mobility are concentrated on specific societal groups

The literature reviews show clearly that certain categories of the population concentrate practically all forms of mobile living, whereas other categories are characterised by few mobility practices of all kind. The societal groups that are likely to become mobile are those with a high level of education, men, young people, single earner couples, etc.

More generally one can summarise that most studies underline the relation between mobility (competences, valuation and practices) and social structures (social status, occupational groups, gender, age, etc.), revealing notable inequalities to mobility between social groups (among others: Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b, Jürges, 2005, Le Breton, 2005, De Miguel, 2002, ECVT, 2004, Bassand et al., 1985). The differences in mobility and in motility, in this perspective, are strongly linked with the social structure and appear as more as pure individual differences between actors (ability to be mobile, to cope with stress, to maintain relative networks, etc.).

This insight emphasises the view on motility as being socially structured, as being a dimension of social inequality. It emphasises the legitimacy of the research questions which groups in society are enabled or pushed towards or excluded from becoming mobile. However, this insight does not diminish the legitimacy of individual level analyses and psychological approaches to mobility.

### *4.3. Mobility and gender relations*

The literature reviews confirm the fact that job mobility is differently experienced by men and women. The link between family and mobile life often hinges on this difference, with more or less opposite effects of men or of women facing job mobility demands. Whereas the man is often the mobile partner in the couple, the woman plays a crucial part in adapting the family life with the professional obligations of her spouse and in facing up the difficulties that it brings. They do so as much when the man is gone (childcare) as when he is home (socializing together) (Bonnet, Collet, & Maurines, 2006a). Several studies confirm the gender inequalities to mobility, in reinforcing the traditional division of domestic and professional labour (Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002a, Limmer, 2004a, Bonnet, Collet, & Maurines, 2006a, 2006d, ECVT, 2004). More frequently, the woman has to give up career plans when her partner is mobile. Furthermore, when she herself is mobile, she continues to invest more than the man in the domestic sphere.

This insight confirms that the research questions of *Job Mobility and Family Lives in Europe* need to pay a particular attention to the gender perspective in the mobility issues. It emphasises the importance of the female part within the mobile couple to deal with family and mobile life at once.

### *4.4. Mobility types may be combined with each other*

The different studies quoted in the national literature reviews (among others: Schneider, Limmer, & Ruckdeschel, 2002b) bring out that the different spatial mobility forms sometimes are combined with each other, not only in the sense of affecting the same "risk groups," but also on an individual level. This can be true in a sense of two or more recurring forms of mobility happening at the same time (like long-distance commuting and frequent business trips with overnights away from home). It is even more likely to be true in a sense of a sequence of various singular forms of mobility (like a migration followed by a long-distance move within the country). Furthermore there are hybrid forms or "in-between" forms of mobility, as the following section is describing in more detail.

### *4.5. Mobility behaviour may be ambiguous regarding the category it belongs into*

A further fact that has been anticipated is confirmed by the literature reviews: Mobility behaviour as found in the empirical reality can not always be clearly associated with a specific category or more general type. Often, frequent changes of mobility behaviour, simultaneous existence of more than one form or irregularities make the empirically found

phenomenon appear too complex and ambiguous to sort it into a simple system of categories.

This insight raises the question whether the typology of *Job Mobilities and Family Lives in Europe* is sensitive enough for ambiguity and whether any typology can be. It seems unavoidable to use some sort of pre-defined concept as a heuristic approach, and given the diversity of mobility forms, it seems unavoidable that this concept has to be some sort of pre-defined category system. However, it can be discussed how broad, open, and general heuristic categories should be, so that they allow capturing also ambiguous and unexpected forms of mobility. With a broad category system to start out with, more variation can be captured as it exists in the empirical reality. Later, the various forms of mobility can be described by using a more differentiated and precise typology, constructed on the grounds of existing data. These forms could be defined from the dimensions of spatial mobility: time of travel, frequency of travel (daily, weekly or yearly mobility, irregular mobility) and irreversibility of travel (move, migration). Beyond analytic types, it seems relevant to construct empirical mobility types through a cluster analysis for example.

### *4.6. Difficulty to isolate the professional cause in the movement*

The national literature reviews show very clearly the difficulty to isolate the professional reason in some phenomena of mobility. The studies of Détang-Dessendre et al. (2004), of Gobillon (2001), of Debrand and Taffin (2005) or of Kaufmann and Widmer (2006), for example, show the simultaneous influence of many factors (economic, professional, family or residential) on spatial mobility at the same time. The increasing phenomenon of peripheral urbanisation illustrates this very well. Such localisation favours long distance commuting to the urban centres. However, this living arrangement can probably be partly explained by family reasons (to raise children in a detached house), by environmental ones (to take advantage of clean air, stillness), by the property market (to buy an affordable house), etc. The studies of Modenes (2000, 2004) show also the necessity of a multi-dimensional perspective to explain occupational mobility. The stronger commuting practices by mothers with children are understood by economic reasons and spatial localisation (living in more remote areas).

This ambiguity has not been foreseen in the research design in that extent. This raises the issue of how to deal with mobility that is *gradually* motivated by occupational reasons. One consequence for the research design of *Job Mobility and Family lives in Europe* might be to at least measure the motivation by occupational reasons as a gradual phenomenon that is on

a continuum rather than as a dichotomy.

### 4.7. Interactions between mobility and other social phenomena

Various studies of the national literature reviews (Kaufmann & Widmer, 2006, Vignal, 2005a, 2005b, Challiol, 1998, 2002, Korczynska, 2003, Jonczky, 2003) show clearly the reciprocal causality between mobility and *family structures and family functioning*. Mobility practices influence private life, but family context considerably influences in return mobility decisions. The family functioning and family structures (Kaufmann, Widmer, Korczynska, Jonczky), the "reciprocity rules" within the couple (Challiol), the "family logics" (Vignal) play an important part in spatial mobility acceptance and spatial mobility practices.

What is true for family dynamics is true also for other phenomena that are related to mobility: In most cases we find reciprocal causal influences rather than one-way impacts. The *life course* structures mobility by making it likely or unlikely for specific groups to be confronted with mobility, for example with young adults in the beginning of their professional careers being more affected than elder people. However, mobility can, in return, affect the events structuring the life course, for example by postponing the family phase to a higher age. A strong *social integration* in a specific geographical place might make mobility less likely or commuting more likely than relocating. In return, mobility, once it happens, (or non-mobility) has a strong influence on the social integration of an individual. Similar reciprocal causalities can probably be found for *inter-generational ties, psychological condition, quality of life* and other social or psychological phenomena.

This insight emphasises the view on job mobility as being embedded in a larger system linked to family dynamics, to life course, to spatial localisation and so on. It confirms that the research questions of *Job Mobility and Family Lives in Europe* need to pay a particular attention to interaction and not only to the unidirectional impact of spatial mobility on family lives. Generally this is already implemented in the research design. However, it might be worthwhile to be reminded and to systematically check assumed relationships for reciprocal relationships that might have been overseen. Furthermore, this insight highlights the importance to analyse the family and the professional life course through some diachronic questions in the questionnaire.

### 4.8. Social network, social capital and spatiality

Some studies (Grosetti, 2006, Schmitz, 2004, Kaufmann, Widmer, 2006, Larsen et al., 2005, Soriano, 2005, Becerril, 2003) focus on the interactions between social networks and spatial mobility. Although not many studies link these two scientific fields, the few findings suggest us to attach a great importance to this perspective. The job mobility is likely to modify the interpersonal networks, in terms of composition (status of the members), of localisation (near the workplace, the place of residence, the birthplace), of structure (density, connectivity), of strength of ties (weak or strong ties). In return, the networks and their characteristics can influence the mobility of people integrated into these networks. It is particularly the fact in the case of migration and seasonal work, as related in the Polish literature review (among others: Kaczmarczyk & Lukowski, 2004). However, the interpersonal network can also exercise an influence on daily forms of mobility. For example, a dense and broadened family network near the place of residence can hinder residential mobility and foster long-distance commuting, instead. Therefore, the network analysis is in a position to grasp mobility forms, also characterised by ephemeral time and extent space according to the definition of Montulet's space-time theory (Montulet, 2005).

Since network analyses are particularly in a position to understand the systemic structure of mobile phenomena (through the spatiality and the structure of interrelations), the research questions should integrate the network problematic in order to deal with issues linking mobility, family lives and social integration. It is important to recognize that not only the more *intense* networks of immediate family, kinship, and close friends, but also the broader networks of neighbourhood, community engagement, of memberships and voluntary activities in clubs, associations, unions, and parties may be significant.

# XII. Bibliography

Abellán, C. (1998). La ganancia salarial esperada como determinante de la decisión individual de emigrar. *Investigaciones económicas*, 22.

Adam, E. K. (2004). Beyond quality: parental and residential stability and children's adjustment. *American psychological society*, 13, 210-213.

Adams, J. (1999). The social implications of hybermobility, OECD project on environmentally sustainable transport. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.geog.ucl.ac.uk/ ~jadams/publish.htm

Ahmed, S., Castaneda, C., Fortier, A.-M., & Sheller, M. (2003). *Uprootings /Regroundings. Questions of home and migration*. Oxford, New York: Berg.

Alaluf, M. (2004). Immigration instrumentale et droit à la mobilité, *Signes des temps*, 3, 9-11.

Alberdi, I. (1999). *La nueva familia española*. Buenos Aires: Taurus.

Alberdi, I., & Escario, P. (2003). *Flexibilidad, elección y estilos de vida familiar*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.

Albert, C., & Toharia, L. (2001). Las transiciones laborales en la UE. *Condiciones de vida en España y en Europa*. INEE.

Albrow, M. (1996). *The global age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Albrow, M. (1997). Travelling beyond local cultures: socioscapes in a global city. In J. Eade (Ed.), *Living the global city: globalization as local process*. London: Routledge.

Albrow, M. (1998). *Abschied vom Nationalstaat. Staat und Gesellschaft im Globalen Zeitalter*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Albrow, M., Eade, J., Durschmidt, J., & Washbourne, N. (Eds.) (1997). The impact of globalization on sociological concepts: Community, culture and milieu. In J. Eade (Ed.), *Living the global city: Globalization as local process*. London: Routledge.

Alemán Páez, F. (1999). La movilidad geográfica de los trabajadores. Notas para un debate jurídico y sociológico. *Revista de Fomento Social*, 54, 475-505.

Allan, G., & Crow, G. (Eds.) (2001). *Families, households and society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Allesklar.com AG. (2006). *Befragungsprojekt zur Mobilität*.

Altvater, E., & Mahnkopf, B. (1996). *Grenzen der Globalisierung. Ökonomie, Ökologie und Politik in der Weltgesellschaft*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Altvater, E., &. Mahnkopf, B. (2003). *Globalisierung der Unsicherheit. Arbeit im Schatten, schmutziges Geld und informelle Politik*. Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot.

Antolin, P. (1997). Los flujos de trabajadores en el mercado laboral español. *Papeles de economía española*, 72. El mercado de trabajo en perspectiva europea. Fundación de Cajas de Ahorro Confederadas.

Antolin, P. (1999). La movilidad y los flujos de trabajo. El mercado de trabajo en España I. Realidades y Posibilidades. *Revista del Instituto de Estudios*, 1 y 2.

Antolin, P., & Bover, O. (1997). Regional migration in Spain: The effect of personal characteristics and of unemployment, wage and house price differentials using pooled cross-sections. Oxford: *Bulletin of Economics and Statistics,* 59.

Antoniszyn, E. (2004). Regionalna dywersyfikacja bezrobocia w Polsce [Regional differentiation of unemployment in Poland]. In Z. Mikołajewicz (Ed.), *Społeczne i regionalne aspekty przemian strukturalnych w polskiej gospodarce okresu transformacji [In social and regional dimensions of the structural changes in the Polish economy during transformation]* Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.

Antonovsky, A. (1988). *Unraveling the mystery of health – how people manage stress and stay well.* London: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Antony, C. (1987). Divorce et logement. In N. Haumont & M. Segaud (Eds.), *Familles, modes de vie et habitat*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 226-244.

ARE (2001). *La mobilité en Suisse – Résultats du microrecensement 2000 sur le comportement de la population en matière de transports*. DFI-DETEC/ARE-OFS: Berne et Neuchâtel.

Arnott, R. (1998). Economic theory and the spatial mismatch hypothesis. *Urban studies*, 35, 1171-1185.

Arrollo, A. (2005). *Las familias monoparentales en España una desviación u otra forma de organización familiar?* Madrid: Universidad Complutense de Madrid.

Artís Ortuño, M., Romaní Fernández, J., & Suriñach i Caralt, J. (1998). *Análisis de los factores determinantes de la movilidad territorial en Cataluña*, 1986-1991. Documento de trabajo de la división de Ciencias Jurídicas, Económicas y Sociales, E98/27, Barcelona: Universidad de Barcelona.

Ascher, F. (1998). *La République contre la ville*. L'aube, La Tour d'Aigues.

Ascher, F. (2000). *Ces événements nous dépassent, feignons d'en être les organisateurs*. L'Aube, La Tour d'Aigues.

Assadian, A., & Ondrich, J. (1993). Residential location, housing demand and labour supply decisions of one- and two-earner households: The case of Bogota, Colombia. *Urban studies*, 30, 73-86.

Attal-Touvert, K., & Lavergne, H. (2006). Premiers résultats de l'enquête sur l'emploi 2005, *Insee Première*, 1070.

Attias-Donfut, C. (1996). Les solidarités entre les générations, *Données Sociales*. Paris, Insee, 317-323.

Attias-Donfut, C. (2000). Rapports de générations, transferts intrafamiliaux et dynamique macrosociale, *Revue française de sociologie*, 41 (4), 643-684.

Attias-Donfut, C., & Segalen, M. (1998). *Grands-parents: la famille à travers les générations*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Baccaini, B. (2005). Enquêtes annuelles de recensement: résultats de la collecte 2004. Des changements de région plus fréquents qui bénéficient aux régions du sud et de l'ouest, *Insee Première*, 1028.

Bachen, C. (2001). The Family in the networked society: A summary of research on the American family. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://sts.scu.edu/nexus/Issue1-1/Bachen_TheNetworkedFamily.asp

Badoe, D. A. (2002). Modelling work-trip mode. Choice decisions in two-worker households. *Transportation planning and technology*, 25, 49-73.

Badura, J. (Ed.) (2005). *"Globalisierung". Problemsphären eines Schlagwortes im interdisziplinären Dialog*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Balcerzak – Paradowska, B. (1994). Wpływ okresowej nieobecności małżonków na warunki życia rodziny [The influence of the temporary absence of spouses on the family conditions]. *Problemy rodziny* nr 5.[ *Problems of the Family no 5]* Wyd. Towarzystwo Rozwoju Rodziny.

Balcerzak-Paradowska, B. (2003). Pożyteczne, gdy sensowne. [Useful, if reasonable]. *Personel i Zarządzenie [Personnel and Management]*, 23 (164).

Bancaja (2005). *Capital Humano y desplazamientos diarios al lugar de trabajo*. Valencia: Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas.

Banse, G. (Ed.) (2005). *Rationality in an uncertain world*. Berlin: edition sigma.

Baraton, M. (2006). De la difficulté à devenir cadre par promotion. *Insee Première*, 1062.

Barceló, C. (2001). Modelling housing tenure and labour mobility: An empirical investigation. Manuscrito, CEMFI.

Bassand, M., Brulhardt, M-C., Hainard, F., & Schuler, M. (1985). *Les Suisses entre la mobilité et la sédentarité*. Lausanne: Presses polytechniques romandes.

Bassand, M., Joye, D., & Schuler, M. (Eds.) (1988). *Les enjeux de l'urbanisation: Agglomerationsprobleme in der Schweiz*. Berne: Peter Lang.

Bauman, Z. (1998). *Globalization: The human consequences (European perspectives)*. New York: Columbia University.

Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Cambridge: Policy Press.

Bauman, Z. (2003). *Liquid love*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Baumrind, R. (1971). Current patterns of parental authority. *Developmental Psychology Monograph*, 4 (1, pt. 2).

Bausinger, H., Beyrer, K., & Korff, G. (Eds.) (1999). *Reisekultur. Von der Pilgerfahrt zum modernen Tourismus*. München: Beck.

Beaufils, B. (1997). La qualité de vie, analyse bibliographique. *Association APF (Association des paralysés de France)*.

Beaverstock, J. (2005). Transnational elites in the city: British highly-skilled transferees in New York's financial district. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies,* 31(2), 245-269.

Beck, U. (1997). *Theorien der Globalisierung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Beck, U., Bonß, W., & Lau, C. (2003). The theory of reflexive modernization: Problematic, hypotheses and research programme. *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20, 2, 1–34.

Beck, U., Giddens, A., & Scott, L. (1994). *Reflexive modernization. Politics, traditions and asthetics in the modern social order*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Becker, G. S. (1981). Division of labor in households and families. *A treatise on the family*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Becker, P., Schulz, P., & Schlotz, W. (2004). Persönlichkeit, chronischer Stress und körperliche Gesundheit. Eine prospektive Studie zur Überprüfung eines systematischen Anforderungs-Ressourcen-Modells. *Zeitschrift für Gesundheitspsychologie,* 12 (1), 11-23.

Beck-Gernsheim, E. (1995). Mobilitätsleistungen und Mobilitätsbarrieren von Frauen. Perspekiven der Arbeitsmarktentwicklung im neuen Europa. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie,* 5 (2), 163-172.

Beisheim, M., Dreher, S., Walter, G., Zangl, B., & Zürn, M. (1998). *Im Zeitalter der Globalisierung? Thesen und Daten zur gesellschaftlichen und politischen Denationalisierung.* Baden-Baden: Nomos.

Bell, D. (1973). *The coming of post-industrial society. A venture in social forecasting.* New York: Basic Books.

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bem, S. L. (1993). *The lenses of gender*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Bender, A.F., Cadin, L., & De Saint-Giniez, V. (1999). Les carrières " nomades ", facteur d'innovation. *Revue française de Gestion*, 126, 58-67.

Bentolila, S. (1997). La inmovilidad del trabajo en las regiones españolas. *Papeles de Economía Española,* 72. Fundación de Cajas de Ahorro Confederadas.

Bentolila, S. (2001). Las migraciones interiores en España. *Mercado de trabajo, inmigración y estado de bienestar*. Aspectos económicos y debate político. CEA- FEDEA. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.fedea.es/pub/Papers/2001/dt2001-07.pdf

Bentolila, S., & Dolado, J. (1991). Mismatch and internal migration in Spain, 1962-1986. *Mismatch and Labour Mobility*. Cambridge: University Press.

Bericat, E. (1994). *Sociología de la movilidad espacial. El sedentarismo nómada*, Monografía, 140. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Berłowski, P. (2000a). Prorodzinnie czy prozadaniowo? [Family- or Task-oriented?]. *Personel i Zarządzenie [Personnel and Management]*, 10 (79).

Berłowski, P. (2000b). Między pracą a rodzina [Betwenn the Job and the Family]. *Personel i Zarządzenie [Personnel and Management]*, 13/14 (82/83).

Berłowski, P. (2003). Firma i rodzina – razem czy osobno? Debata o programach wspierających osiąganie równowagi między życiem zawodowym i życiem prywatnym [The Firm or the Family – Together or Separately? The debate on programmes assisting balancing occupational and private life]. *Personel i Zarządzenie [Personnel and Management]*, 23 (164).

Bernaś, J. (2000). Stres bez tajemnic. [Stress without mysteries]. *Personel i Zarządzenie [Personnel and Management]*, 13/14 (82/83).

Berthold, N., & Neumann, M. (2004). Der gemeinsame Europäische Arbeitsmarkt. Wunschdenken oder Realität? Wirtschaftswissenschaftliches Studium. *Zeitschrift für Ausbildung und Hochschulkontakt*, 33 (7), 386-393.

Bertolini, L., & Dijst, M. (2003). Mobility environments and network cities. *Journal of Urban Design,* 8 (1), 27–43.

Best, H., & Lanzendorf, M. (2005). Division of labour and gender differences in metropolitan car use. An empirical study in Cologne, Germany. *Journal of Transport Geography* (in print).

Biehl, H., Keller, J., & Tomforde, M. (2005). "Den eigentlichen Einsatz fährt meine Frau zu Hause ...": Belastungen von Bundeswehr-Soldaten und ihren Familien während des Auslandseinsatzes. In G. Kümmel (Ed.), *Diener zweier Herren: Soldaten zwischen Bundeswehr und Familie*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 79-107.

Bielby, W. T., & Bielby, D. D. (1992). I will follow him: family ties, gender role beliefs, and reluctance to relocate for a better job. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1241-67.

Błazucka, A. J. (1991). Funkcjonowanie rodzin samotnych ojców rodziny [Single fathers families functioning]. *Problemy rodziny* 6 [*Problems of the family 6]*. Wyd. Towarzystwo Rozwoju Rodziny.

Blickle, W. (2005). *Darstellung und Analyse besonderer Belastungseffekte bei Berufspendlern.* Göppingen: Universität Ulm.

Blöss, T. (1987). Se loger quand on est jeune. Affaire de famille, affaire d'Etat. *Revue internationale d'action communautaire*, 18 (58) 109-117.

Blossfeld, H.-P., Klijzing, E., Mills, M., & Kurz, K. (Eds.) (2005): *Globalization, uncertainty, and youth in society*. London: Routledge.

Blumen, O. (1994). Gender differences in the journey to work. *Urban Geography*, 15, 223-245.

Boden, D., & Molotch, H. (1994). The compulsion of proximity. In R. Friedland & D. Boden (Eds.), *Nowhere: Space, time and modernity. Berkeley*: University of California Press.

Bodenmann, G. (2000). *Stress und Coping bei Paaren*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Boelhouwer, J. (2002). Quality of life and living conditions in the Netherlands. *Social Indicators Research,* 58, 115–140.

Boer, A. de , Iedema, J., & Mulder, C. H. (2005). Geografische kenmerken en informele zorg. In A. De Boer (Ed.), *Kijk op informele zorg*. Den Haag, Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, 75-87.

Bogenschneider, K., Small, S. A., & Tsay, J. C. (1997). Child, parent, and contextual influences on perceived parenting competence among parents of adolescents. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 345-362.

Boltanski, L., & Chiapello, E. (1999). *Le nouvel esprit de capitalisme*. Paris: NRF, Gallimard.

Bonnet, E., Collet, B., & Maurines, B. (2006a). Mobilités de travail, dissociation spatio-temporelles et carrières familiales. In M. Bonnet & P. Aubertel (Eds.), *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*, PUF, 183-191.

Bonnet, E., Collet, B., & Maurines, B. (2006b). Les ajustements de la carrière familiale à la mobilité géographique professionnelle, *Cahiers du Genre*, 41, (forthcoming in September 2006).

Bonnet, E., Collet, B., & Maurines, B. (2006c). Working away from home: Juggling private and professional lives. In W. Canzler, V. Kaufmann & S. Kesselring (Eds.), *Tracing mobilities. The cosmopolitan perspective in mobility research*. Hampshire UK: Ashgate, (forthcoming January 2007).

Bonnet, E., Collet, B., & Maurines, B. (2006d). *Mobilités géographiques professionnelles et carrières familiales*, Rapport de recherche PUCA (Plan Urbanisme Construction Architecture), Ministère de l'Equipement, juin 2006.

Bonnet, M., & Aubertel, P. (2006). *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*. Paris: PUF.

Bonnet, M., & Desjeux, D. (2000). *Les territoires de la mobilité*. Paris: PUF.

Bonß, W., & Kesselring, S. (1999). Mobilität und Moderne. Zur gesellschaftstheoretischen Verortung des Mobilitätsbegriffes. In C. Tully (Ed.), *Erziehung zur Mobilität. Jugendliche in der automobilen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 39-66.

Bonß, W., Kesselring, S., & Weiss, A. (2004). Society on the move. Mobilitätspioniere in der zweiten Moderne. In U. Beck & C. Lau (Eds.), *Entgrenzung und Entscheidung: was ist neu an der Theorie reflexiver Modernisierung*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 258-280.

Bonvalet, C. (2003). La famille entourage local, *Population*, 58 (1) , 9-44.

Bonvalet, C. et al. (1993). Proches et parents, *Population*, 1, 83-110.

Bonvalet, C., Gotman, A., & Grafmeyer, Y.(1999). *La famille et ses proches, l'aménagement des territoires*. Paris: PUF.

Bonvalet, C., & Ogg, J.(2006). *Enquêtes sur l'entraide familiale en Europe*, 4, INED/PUF.

Bott, E. (1957). *Family and social networks*. London: Tavistock.

Bover, O., Arellano, M., & Bentolila, S. (2000). The distribution of earnings in Spain during the 1980s: The effect of skill, unemployment, and union power. *Banco de España, Working paper 0015*.

Bover, O., & Velilla, P. (1997). Migrations in Spain: Historical background and current trends. *Banco de España, Working paper 9909*. Consejo Económico y Social (2000), Informe sobre la movilidad geográfica, Madrid.

Boyle, P. J., Kulu, H., Cooke, T., Gayle, V., & Mulder, C. H. (2006). *The effect of moving on union dissolution*. MPIDR working paper no. 2006-002. Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://www.demogr.mpg.de

Bozon, M., & Villeneuve-Gokalp, C. (1994). Les enjeux des relations entre générations à la fin de l'adolescence. *Population*, 6, 1524-1556.

Breedveld, K. (2000). *Van arbeids- naar combinatie-ethos: Maatschappelijke ontwikkelingen op het snijvlak van economie en cultuur*. Den Haag: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Brines, J. (1994). Economic dependency, gender, and the division of labor at home. *American Journal of Sociology*, 100, 652-688.

Brixy, U., & Christensen, B. (2002). *Flexibilität. Wie viel würden Arbeitlose für einen Arbeitsplatz in Kauf nehmen?* Nürnberg: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung der Bundesanstalt für Arbeit. IAB Kurzbericht Nr. 25.

Brown, B. (2002). Studying the use of mobile technology. In B. Brown, N. Green & R. Harper (Eds.), *Wireless world: social and interactional aspects of the mobile age*. London: Springer.

Brown, B., & O'Hara, K. (2003). Place as a practical concern of mobile workers. *Environment and Planning A,* 35, 1565-1587.

Broze, L., Gavray, C., & Ruyters, C. (2002). Mobilité et determinants familiaux : une analyse des transitions sur le marché du travail. In D. de la Croix, F. Docquier, C. Mainguet, S. Perelman & E. Wasmer (Eds.), *Capital humain et dualisme sur le marché du travail*. Brussels: de Boeck.

Brutel, C., Jegou, M., & Rieu, C. (2000). La mobilité géographique et la promotion professionnelle des salariés : une analyse par aire urbaine. *Economie et statistique*, 336, 53-68.

Büchel, F., Frick, J. R., & Witte, J. C. (2002). Regionale und berufliche Mobilität von Hochqualifizierten: ein Vergleich Deutschland – USA. In L. Bellmann & J. Velling (Eds.), *Arbeitsmärkte für Hochqualifizierte*. Nürnberg: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung der Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 207-247

Buffet, L. (2002). *La mobilité quotidienne des membres de la famille dans les quartiers défavorisés : processus d'autonomisation et négociation familiale,* paper presented at the AISLF symposium *Mobilités familiales au quotidien*, October 10-12, 2002, Lausanne.

Bühler, E. (2002). *Atlas suisse des femmes et de l'égalité*, Zurich: Seismo.

Bühlmann, F., Barbey, J., Kaufmann, V., Levy, R., & Widmer, E. (2005). Between metropolization and suburban settlement: Contextual dynamics of family roles. *Swiss Journal of Sociology,* 31 (2), 321-342.

Bunker, B. B., Zubek, J. M., Vanderslice, V. J., & Rice, R. W. (1992). Quality of life in dual-career families: Commuting versus single-residence couples. *Journal of marriage and the family*, 54, 399-407.

Burr, W., Klein, S., Burr, R., Doxey, C., Harker, B., & Holman, T. B. et al. (1994). *Reexamining family stress: New theory and research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Buyens, D., Mortelmans, D., & Soens, N. (2006). Vast, voltijds en levenslang. Het onwrikbare eenbaanskarakter van de loopbaan, Tijdschrift voor HRM in druk.

Cahiers internationaux de sociologie (2005). *Mobilité et modernité,* volume CXVIII.

Cairns, S., Sloman, L., Newson, C., Anable, J., Kirkbridde, A., & Goodwin, P. (2004). *Smarter choices - changing the way we travel*. London: Department of Transport.

Camarero Rioja, M. (2003). El Conflicto Cultural entre Modelos de relaciones Familiares. *El Conflicto Cultual en España. Acuerdos y desacuerdos entre los españoles*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Camstra, R. (1996). Commuting and gender in a lifestyle perspective. *Urban Studies*, 33, 283-300.

Canzler, W., & Schmidt, G. (2003). *Das zweite Jahrhundert des Automobils*. Berlin: edition sigma.

Caplan, R. D., & Harrison, R. V. (1993). Person-environment fit theory: some history, recent developments, and future directions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 49, 253-275.

Caradec, V. (2003). Le Soi intime à la lumière de la recomposition conjugale tardive. *Sociologie et sociétés*, 35 (2).

Casado, J. M. (2000). *Diferencias de género en los desplazamientos cotidianos por razones laborales*. Valencia: Documento de trabajo del Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas (IVIE), WPEC 2000-2003. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.ivie.es

Cass, N., Shove, E., & Urry, J. (2003). *Changing infrastructures, measuring socio-spatial inclusion*. Report for DfT. Lancaster: Department of Sociology, Lancaster University.

Cass, N., Shove, E., & Urry, J. (2005). Social exclusion, mobility and access. *The Sociological Review,* 53 (3), 539-555.

Castañer, M., Vicente, J., & Boix, G. (Eds.). (2001). *Áreas urbanas y movilidad laboral en España. Girona*: Universidad de Girona (Actas de jornadas).

Castells, M. (1996). *The rise of the network society*. Malden, Oxford: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1997). *La société en réseaux, l'ère de l'information*, Paris: Fayard.

CBOS. (2005). Raport z badań [Research Report]. *Wartości i normy w życiu Polaków [Values and norms in the life of Poles]*. Boguszewski Rafał (Ed.).

Celińska-Nieckarz, S. (2003). Komponenty zmiany. [Change components]. *Personel i Zarządzenie [Personnel and Management]*, 7 (154/155).

CENSO (2001). *Censo de población y vivienda*. Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

Chałasiński, J. (1936). Migracja jako zjawisko społeczne [Migration as the Social Phenomenon]. *Przegląd Socjologiczny [Sociological Review]*. 1-4. Łódź.

Challiol, H. (1998). Les décisions de transition de carrière dans les couples : les apports de la recherche en marketing, communication au *9ème Congrès de l'AGRH (Association francophone de Gestion des Ressources humaines)*.

Challiol, H. (2002). L'influence du conjoint dans les décisions de mobilité géographique des individus en couple à double carrière. Communication au *XIIIème Congrès de l'AGRH (Association francophone de Gestion des Ressources humaines)*.

Chamberlain, M. (1995). Family narratives and migration dynamics. *Immigrants and minorities,* 14 (2), 153-169.

Chauvel, L. (2006). Les nouvelles générations devant la panne prolongée de l'ascenseur social, *La lettre de problèmes économiques*, 182, 12 avril 2006.

Chevrier, S., & Sauvage, A. (2000). Plein cadre. Les cadres internationaux à l'épreuve du déplacement. In M. Bonnet & P. Aubertel (Eds.), *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*, Paris: PUF.

Chlond, B., Last, J., Manz, W., & Zumkeller, D. (2004). Eckwerte des Personenfernverkehrs in Deutschland. *Internationales Verkehrswesen,* 56 (10), 430-434.

Chombart de Lauwe, P.-A. (1959). *Famille et habitation*. Paris: CNRS.

Cichosz, M., & Trempała, E. (2001). Więź rodzinna jako czynnik integracji rodziny niepełnej [The family bond as the integrative factor of the incomplete family]. In *Pedagogika społeczna. tradycja. teraźniejszość. nowe wyzwania [Social Pedagogics: tradition, contemporary life, new challenges]*. Olecko: Wszechnica Mazurska.

Ciupak, B. (1997). *Spełnianie funkcji w rodzinie z czasową nieobecnością rodziców [The fulfillment of the family functions in a family under temporary parents absence]*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Stalowa Wola: filia WNS KUL.

Clifford, J. (1997). *Routes*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Coenen-Huther, J. Kellerhals, J., & von Allmen, M. (1994). *Les réseaux de solidarité dans la famille. Réalités sociales*, Lausanne.

Coleman, J. S. (1990). *Foundations of social theory*. Cambridge: Belknap.

Coles, T., & Dallen, T. (Eds.) (2004). *Tourism, Diasporas and Space*. London: Routledge.

Collmer S. (2002): Heute hier morgen fort - Zur Mobilität des modernen Soldaten. In G. Kümmel, & S. Collmer (Eds.), *Europäische Streitkräfte in der Postmoderne*. Baden Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft, 97-115.

Collmer, S. (2005). Soldat, Familie und Mobilität: Neue Trends zur Lösung widersprüchlicher Anforderungen. In G. Kümmel (Ed.), *Diener zweier Herren: Soldaten zwischen Bundeswehr und Familie*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang, 53-77

Cornet, A. (2005). Les femmes cadres expatriées: une espèce rare! In *Université d'été : Femmes et Mobilités : atelier «mobilités professionnelles»*. Liège: Ferulg.

Courgeau, D. (1985). Interaction between spatial mobility, family and career life cycle: a French survey. *European Sociological Revue*, 1 (2), 139-162.

Courgeau, D. (1993). Nouvelle approche statistique des liens entre mobilité du travail et mobilité géographique. *Revue économie*, 44, 791-807.

Courgeau, D., & Meron, M. (1995). Mobilité résidentielle activité et vie familiale des couples, *Economie et statistique*, 290, 17-31.

Crowder, K. D. (2001). Racial stratification in the actuation of mobility expectations: Microlevel impacts of racially restrictive housing markets. *Social forces*, 79, 1377-1396.

Cummins, R. A. (1996). The domains of life satisfaction: an attempt to order chaos. *Social Indicators Research,* 38, 303-328.

Dafflon, B (2003). *La politique familiale en Suisse: enjeux et défis*. Lausanne: Réalités sociales.

Dahrendorf, R. (1958). *Homo Sociologicus. Ein Versuch zur Geschichte, Bedeutung und Kritik der Kategorie der sozialen Rolle*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Dandurand, R. B., & Ouellette, R. (1995). Le quartier comme espace de vie des familles en milieu populaire. In B. Bawin-Legros et al. (Eds.), *Les espaces de la famille*, Actes du colloque de Liège, AISLF, 173-183.

Danilewicz, W. (2000). Społeczno-wychowawcze konsekwencje zarobkowych wyjazdów rodziców za granicę [The social and upbringing consequences of the international economic migration of parents]. In T. Lewowicki (Ed.), *Rodzina- wielokulturowość -wychowanie. [Family-multiculturality-upbringing]*. Opole: WUO.

Dateline (2003). *Design and application of a travel survey for European long-distance trips based on an international network of expertise*. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.ncl.ac.uk/dateline/home_page.htm

Davidson, R., & Cope, B. (2003). *Business travel: Conferences, incentive travel, exhibitions, corporate hospitality and corporate travel*. London: Prentice Hall.

Davoine, E. (2000), Formation d'euromanagers et préparation à la mobilité internationale. *Actes du XIe congrès de l'AGRH*, Paris.

De la Fuente, A. (1999). La dinámica territorial de la población española: un panorama y algunos resultados provisionales. *Revista de Economía Aplicada*, 7.

De Miguel, A. (1965). Movilidad social y geográfica en España. *Anales de Moral Social y Económica*. Problemas de los Movimientos de Población en España. Madrid: Centro de estudios del Vale de los Caídos, 107-130

De Miguel, A., & De Miguel, I. (2002). *Calidad de vida laboral y organización del trabajo*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.

De Singly, F. (2001). *La liberté de circulation de la jeunesse*. Paris: Institut pour la Ville en Mouvement

Debrand, T., & Taffin, C. (2005). Les facteurs structurels et conjoncturels de la mobilité résidentielle depuis 20 ans. *Economie et statistique*, 381-382.

Debroux, J. (2005). Processus migratoire et socialisation: les actifs migrant vers l'espace rural isolé, *Colloque Faire Campagne*, Rennes, 17-18 mars.

Déchaux, J.H. (1994). Les échanges dans la parenté accentuent-ils les inégalités? *Sociétés contemporaines*, 17, 75-90.

Decup-Pannier, B. (2000). Avoir une chambre chez chacun de ses parents séparés. In F. De Singly (Ed.), *Libres ensembles*. Paris: Nathan, 219-236.

Degenne, A., Fournier, I., Marry, C., & Mounier, L. (1991). Les relations sociales au coeur du marché du travail. *Sociétés contemporaines*, 5, 75-95.

Degrave, F., Lhuillier, V., & Petrella, F. (2002). *La transformation des structures familiales et des politiques sociales et les modes d'accueil des jeunes enfants. La Communauté Française de Belgique. Communauté Française de Belgique*. CERISIS, UCL, Charleroi.

Del Campo, S. (Ed.) (2003). *La familia española*. Monográfico de la Revista Arbor, Madrid.

Del Campo, S., & Rodríguez- Brioso, M. (2002). La transformación de la familia española durante la segunda mitad del siglo XX. *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociológicas*, 100, 103-165.

Dema, S. (2005). Entre la tradición y la modernidad: las parejas españolas de doble ingreso. *Revista Papers*, 77, 55-75.

Depras, F. (2001). *Se déplacer en ville quand on a entre 10 et 13 ans*, Institut pour la Ville en Mouvement, RATP, Paris.

Détang-Dessendre, C., Piguet, V., & Schmitt, B. (2002). Les déterminants micro-économiques des migrations urbain-rural : leur variabilité en fonction de la position dans le cycle de vie, *Population*, 57 (1), 35-62.

Deutschmann, C. (2002). *Postindustrielle Industriesoziologie. Theoretische Grundlagen, Arbeitsverhältnisse und soziale Identitäten*. München: Juventa.

DfT (2004). *Transport statistics bulletin: national travel survey: 2003 final results*. London: Department for Transport.

Díaz Martínez, C., Díaz Médez, S., Dema Moreno, S., & Ibáñez Pascual, M. (2005). *Dinero, amor e individualización: las relaciones económicas en las familias/parejas contemporáneas*. Oviedo: KRK Ediciones.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 542–575.

Dijst, M. (1999). Two-earner families and their action spaces: A case study of two Dutch communities, *GeoJournal,* 48, 195–206.

Donnovan, N., Pilch, T., & Rubenstein, T. (2002). *Geographic mobility*. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from: http://www.strategy.gov.uk/downloads/su/gmseminar/gm_analytical.pdf

Doutrelepont, R., Mortelmans, D., & Casman, M.T. (Eds.), (2004). *Onze ans de vie en Belgique, Analyses socio-économiques à partir du Panel Démographie Familiale. Belgium* [Eleven years of life in Belgium]. Ghent : Académia Press.

Doyle, J., & Nathan, M. (2001). *Wherever next: Work in a mobile world*. London: The Industrial Society.

Dries, N. (2005). Home sweet home? Een onderzoek naar de effecten van een expatriate opdracht op de werk-gezin balans, licentiaatverhandeling, Psychologie, Vrij Universiteit Brussel.

Dubar, C. (1992). Formes identitaires et socialisation professionnelle. *Revue française de sociologie*, XXXIII, 505-529.

Duda-Dziewierz, K. (1938). *Wieś małopolska a emigracja amerykańska. Studium wsi Babica powiatu rzeszowskiego [The Malopoloska village and the American migration. The study of the Babica village, Rrzeszow district]*. Warszawa-Poznań: Polski Instytut Socjologiczny.

Dümmler, P. et al. (2004). *Standorte der innovativen Schweiz – Räumliche Veränderungsprozesse von High-Tech und Finanzdienstleistungen*. Neuchâtel: OFS.

Durkheim, É. (1999). *Über soziale Arbeitsteilung. Studie über die Organisation höherer Gesellschaften*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, (3rd ed.; French orig. 1893).

Dürrschmidt, J. (1997). Delinking of locale and milieu: on the situatedness of extended milieus in a global environment. In J. Eade (Ed.), *Living the global city: globalization as local process*. London: Routledge.

Dürrschmidt, J. (2002). *Globalisierung*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Dworak-Fisher, K. (2004). Intra-metropolitan shifts in labor demand and the adjustment of local markets. *Journal of urban economics*, 55, 514-533.

Dyck, I. (1989). Integrating home and wage workplace - women's daily lives in a Canadian suburb. *Canadian Geographer-Geographe Canadien*, 33, 329.

Dykstra, P. A. (2004). Het zit in de familie, Oratie ter gelegenheid van de aanvaarding van de leerstoel Verwantschapsdemografie aan de Universiteit Utrecht. *Bevolking en Gezin,* 33 (1), 3-28.

Eby, L. T., & Dematteo, J. S. (2000). When the type of move matters: Employee outcomes under various relocation situations. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 21, 677-687.

ECVT (2004) *Encuesta de Calidad de Vida en el Trabajo.* Madrid: Instituto Nacional de Estadística.

England, P. (1993). *Theory on gender / feminism on theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Erlinghagen, M. (2002). Die Entwicklung von Arbeitsmarktmobilität und Beschäftigungsstabilität im Übergang von der Industrie- zur Dienstleistungsgesellschaft - eine deskriptive Analyse des westdeutschen Arbeitsmarktes zwischen 1976 und 1995 auf Basis der IAB-Beschäftigtenstichprobe. *Mitteilungen aus der Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung*, 35 (1), 74-89.

Escuela de Organización Industrial. (2002). *Desajustes en el mercado laboral: movilidad interregional y pleno empleo*. Madrid: Escuela de Organización Industrial.

Esser, H. (1993a). *Soziologie. Allgemeine Grundlagen*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Esser, H. (1993b). The rationality of everyday Behavior. A rational choice reconstruction of the theory of action by Alfred Schütz. *Rationality & Society*, 5, 7-31.

Esser, H. (1996). Die Definition der Situation. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 48, 1–34.

Esser, H. (2000). Normen als Frames: Das Problem der „Unbedingtheit" des normativen Handelns. In R. Metze, K. Mühler & K.-D. Opp (Eds.), *Normen und Institutionen: Entstehung und Wirkung*. Leipziger Soziologische Studien, 2. Leipzig: Leipziger Universitätsverlag, 137-155.

Esser, H. (2001). *Soziologie. Spezielle Grundlagen, 6: Sinn und Kultur*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Evans, G. W., Wener, R. E., & Phillips, D. (2002). The morning rush hour: Predictability and commuter stress. *Environment and behavior*, 34, 521-530.

Fagnani J. (2000). *Un travail et des enfants. Petits arbitrages et grands dilemmes*. Paris: Bayard Ed.

Fahey, T., Nolan, B., & Whelan, C., T. (2003). *Monitoring quality of life in Europe*. Luxembourg.

Faltermeier, T. (1994). Subjektive Konzepte von Gesundheit in einer salutogenetischen Perspektive. In P. Kolip (Ed.), *Lebenslust und Wohlbefinden. Beiträge zur geschlechtsspezifischen Jugendgesundheitsforschung*. Weinheim: Juventa, 103-119.

Family Relationships: the ties that bind. A sociological and demographic Research Programme 2000-2006.

Featherstone, M. (Ed.) (1990). *Global culture: Nationalism, globalization and modernity*. London: Sage.

Featherstone, M. (1995). *Global Modernities*. London: Sage.

Featherstone, M., Thrift, N., & Urry, J. (Eds.) (2005). *Automobilities*. London: Sage.

Feria, J., & Susino, J. (1996). *Movilidad por razón de trabajo en Andalucía. Dimensiones básicas y organización espacial*. Sevilla: Instituto de Estadística de Andalucía.

Feria, J., & Susino, J. (2001). *Movilidad por razón de trabajo en Andalucía*. Sevilla: Instituto de Estadística de Andalucía.

Fernández Cordón, J. A., & Tobío, C. (1999). *Las familias monoparentales en España*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.

FHA (1994). *Nationwide personal transportation survey: implications of emerging travel trends by the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Federal Highway Administration*. Washington, DC: GPO.

Flamm, M. (2004). *Comprendre le choix modal*. EPFL thesis, Lausanne.

Flaquer, L. (1999). *La estrella menguante del padre*. Barcelona: Ariel.

Flaquer, L. (2004). La articulación entre familia y el Estado de bienestar en los países de la Europa del Sur. *Revista Papers*, 73, 27-58.

Flaquer, L. (2005). Régimen de bienestar, familiarismo y ciudadanía. *El uso de las políticas sociales por las mujeres inmigrantes*. Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, 22-55.

FOESSA (1995). *V Informe sociológico sobre el cambio social en España*. Madrid: Euro-América.

Forschungsinstitut für Ordnungspolitik (FIO) (2000): Mobilität und flexible Erwerbsbiographien im Urteil der Bevölkerung. *FiO-Brief* 3 (2), 1-7.

Fourastié, J. (1954). *Die große Hoffnung des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Köln: EVA 1969, (2nd ed.).

Frame, M. W., & Shehan, C. L. (1994). Work and well-being in the two-person career: relocation stress and coping among clergy husbands and wives. *Family relations*, 43, 196-205.

Frändberg, L., & Wilhelmson, B. (2003). Personal mobility: a corporeal dimension of transnationalisation. The case of long-distance travel from Sweden. *Environment and Planning A* 35, 1751-1768.

Freisl, J. (1994). *Die berufliche und räumliche Mobilität auf dem Arbeitsmarkt: eine vergleichende Studie über die Europäische Union und die USA*. München: tuduv.

French, J. R. P. Jr., Rodgers, W., & Cobb, S. (1974). Adjustment as person-environment fit. In G. U. Coelho, D. A. Hamburg & S. J. E. Adams (Eds.), *Coping and Adaptation*, New York: Basic Books, 316-333.

Fulton, P. N. (1983). *Public transportation: solving the commuting problem?* Washington, DC: Population Division, US Bureau of the Census.

Fundación de los Ferrocarriles Españoles (1997). *Ordenación del territorio y funciones del ferrocarril en el marco regional*. Madrid: Fundación de los Ferrocarriles españoles.

Fusulier, B. (2003). Articuler travail et famille. *Les politiques sociales*, 3 et 4.

Fusulier, B. (2005b). Aux antipodes de la Finlande – Le Japon et son modèle alternatif d'articulation travail-famille. In D.-G. Tremblay (Ed.), De la conciliation emploi-famille a une politique des temps sociaux. 271-280.

Fusulier, B. (forthcoming). Articuler vie familiale et vie professionnelle en Amérique du Nord. *Les Politiques Sociales*.

Fusulier, B., Merla, L., Laloy, D., & Plaideau, C. (2005). Vers un modèle cumulatif d'articulation famille/travail. In J. Marquet (Ed.), *L'évolution contemporaine de la parentalité*. Gent: Academia Press. 2.

Fususlier, B. (2005a). Concilier emploi-famille en Finlande – un modèle cumulatif aujourd'hui contrarié. In D.-G. Tremblay (Ed.), *De la conciliation emploi-famille a une politique des temps sociaux, Etudes d'économie Politique*, 20, 259-270.

Fux, B (forthcoming). Family change and family policy in Switzerland. In P. Flora (Ed.), *Family change and family policies in consociational democracies: Belgium, Switzerland and The Netherlands*, 2, Oxford: Clarendon Press

Fux, B. (2002). Which models of the family are en- or discoureaged by different policies. In F.-X. Kaufmann, A. Kuijsten, & H.-J. Schulze (Eds.), *Family Life and Family Policy, Oxford*: Oxford University Press.

Garfinkel, H. (1984). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Malden: Polity Press/Blackwell Publishing.

Gavray, C. (2004a). Les premières années d'insertion professionnelle en liaison aux autres engagements et à la lumière du genre. In R. Doutrelepont, D. Mortelmans & M.-T. Casman (Eds.), *Onze ans de vie en Belgique*. Ghent: Academia Press, 295-324.

Gavray, C. (2004b). Engagements familiaux et professionnels: regard sur les projets des jeunes hommes et femmes en fin de formation scolaire. In E. Istace, M. Laffut, R. Plasman & C. Ruyters (Eds.), *Sphères privées et professionnelles: vers une recomposition des rôles et des actions*. Bruxelles: de Boeck, coll. Economie, Société et Région, 3, 7, 199-220.

Gavray, C. (2006). Vers une égalisation des débuts de trajectoire professionnelle des jeunes hommes et des jeunes femmes. In E. Flahault (Ed.), *L'insertion professionnelle des femmes : entre contraintes et stratégies d'adaptation*. Presses Universitaires de Rennes, 33-46.

Gerstel, N., & Gross, H. E. (1984). *Commuter marriage*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Giddens, A. (1990). *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Gillespie, A., & Richardson, R. (2004). Teleworking and the city: myths of workplace transcendence and travel reduction. In S. Graham (Ed.), *The cybercities reader*. London: Routledge.

Giuliano, G., & Small, K. A. (1993). Is the journey to work explained by urban structure? *Urban Studies*, 30, 1485.

Giza-Poleszczuk, A. (1996). The consequences of migration. In E. Jaźwińska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Causes and consequences of migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Podlasie and Śląsk Opolski: basic trends in 1975-1994*. Warszawa: ISS UW.

Glenn, P., Thorsen, I., & Ubøe, J. (2004). Wage payoffs and distance deterrence in the journey to work. *Transportation research B*, 38, 853-867.

Glorieux, I., & Vandeweyer, J. (2002a). Belgische vrouwen en mannen, een wereld van verschil. Over de verdeling van het werk tussen Belgische vrouwen en mannen. In *Vrouwen en mannen in België, naar een egalitaire samenleving*. Brussel: Federaal Ministerie van Tewerkstelling en Arbeid, 73-80.

Glorieux, I., & Vandeweyer, J. (2002b). En er kwamen geen andere tijden... Arbeidstijden en uurregelingen in de Vlaanderen op het einde van de 20e eeuw. In *De arbeidsmarkt in Vlaanderen - Jaarboek 2002*. Brussel: Steunpunt WAV en VIONA Stuurgroep Strategisch Arbeidsmarktonderzoek, 253-265.

Glyn, A. (Ed.) (2004). *Globalization.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gobillon, L. (2001). Emploi, logement et mobilité résidentielle. *Economie et statistique*, 1-9/10, 349- 350.

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. University of Edinburgh, Social Sciences Research Centre.

Goffman, E. (1977). The arrangement between the sexes. *Theory & Society*, 4, 301-331.

Golob, F. T., & Regan, C.A. (2001). Impacts of information technology on personal travel and commercial vehicle operations: Research challenges and opportunities. *Transportation Research Part C,* 9, 87-121.

González Seara, L., Muñoz, S., García, J.L., & Abrahamson, P. (1999). *Las estructura de bienestar en Europa*. Madrid: Civitas.

Goode, W. (1960). A theory of role strain. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 483-496.

Górny, A., & Stola, D. (2001). Akumulacja i wykorzystanie migracyjnego kapitału społecznego [Accumulation and utilisation of the migratory social capital]. In E. Jazwinska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Götz, K. (2005). Wohin verkehrt Europa? Mobilität und Lebensstile im Europa der 25. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.hbs-hessen.de/pol/fachtagung_verkehr/frame.htm

Götz, K., & Schubert, S. (2004). Mobilitätsstile: Ein sozial-ökologisches Analyse-, Integrations- und Zielgruppenkonzept. In Cornelia Zanger et al. (Eds.): *Bleibt das Auto mobil? Mobilität und Automobil im interdisziplinären Diskurs*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang, 224-239.

Götz, K., Jahn, T., & Schultz, I. (1998). Mobilitätsstile in Freiburg und Schwerin. Ergebnisse eines sozialwissenschaftlichen Projekts zu "Mobilitätsleitbildern und Verkehrsverhalten". *Internationales Verkehrswesen*, 50 (6), 256-261

Grafmeyer, Y. (1992). *Les gens de la banque*. Paris: PUF.

Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360-1380.

Granovetter, M. (2000). *Le marché autrement. Les réseaux dans l'économie*. Desclée de Brouwer, collection "sociologie économique".

Green, A. E. (1997). A question of compromise? Case study evidence on the location and mobility strategies of dual career households. *Regional Studies*, 31, 641-657.

Green, E. A., & Canny, A. (2003). *Geographical Mobility, Family Impacts*. Cambridge: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, Policy Press.

Gribaudi, M. (1999). *Espaces temporalités, stratifications, exercices sur les réseaux sociaux*, EHESS.

Grieco, M., & Raje, F. (2004). Stranded mobility and the marginalisation of low income communities: an analysis of public service failure in the British public transport sector. *Urban*

*Vulnerability and Network Failure*. University of Salford, Retrieved April 29/30, 2004, from http://www.geocities.com/transport_and_society/networkfailure.html

Grosetti, M. (2006). La ville dans l'espace des réseaux sociaux. In M. Bonnet & P. Aubertel (Eds.), *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*. Paris: PUF Sciences sociales et sociétés, 83-90.

Gross, H. E. (1980). Dual-career couples who live apart: two types. *Journal of marriage and the family*, 42, 567-576.

Grzymała-Kazłowska, A. (2001a). *Polscy nielegalni pracownicy w Belgii [Polish illegal workers in Belgium]*. Warszawa: ISS CMR Working Paper 41.

Grzymała-Kazłowska, A. (2001b). *Dynamika sieci migranckich: Polacy w Brukseli [The dynamics of the migration networks: Poles in Brussels]*. In E. Jazwinska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Guerrero, S. (2001). Les comportements nomades en matière de carrière sont-ils source de réussite professionnelle? Comparaison entre la mobilité et l'internationalisation d'un poste, *Actes du XIIe congrès de l'AGRH*.

Guichard-Claudic, Y. (1998). *Eloignement conjugal et construction identitaire. Le cas des femmes de marins*, Paris: L'Harmattan.

Gutiérrez Puebla, R. (1990). *Análisis espacial de la movilidad metropolitana*. Madrid: Consorcio Regional de transportes de Madrid.

Haas, A. (2000). *Regionale Mobilität gestiegen: Arbeitsmarktausgleich; bei einem Betriebswechsel werden immer öfter größere Entfernungen überwunden - gerade auch von Arbeitslosen*. Nürnberg: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung der Bundesanstalt für Arbeit. IAB Kurzbericht Nr. 4.

Haas, A. (2002). *Regionale Mobilität am Arbeitsmarkt: wohin nach der Berufsausbildung?: die Ost/ West-Mobilität von jungen Fachkräften*. Nürnberg: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung der Bundesagentur für Arbeit. IAB Kurzbericht Nr. 7.

Hackl, M. (1992). *Pendler: räumliche Bindung und der Zwang zur Mobilität: die Trennung von Wohnort und Arbeitsort am Beispiel von Wochenpendlern im Bayerischen Wald*. Erlangen: Universität Nürnberg

Häfner, S., Kordy, H., & Kächele, H. (2001). Psychosozialer Versorgungsbedarf bei Berufspendlern. *PPmP Psychotherapie, Psychosomatik, Medizinische Psychologie, 51*, 373-376.

Hagemann-White, C., Hantsche, B., & Westerburg, K. (1996). *Mobilität von Familien und ihre Auswirkungen auf den Zusammenhalt der Generationen*. Abschlussbericht einer Untersuchung im Auftrag des Bundesministeriums für Familie und Senioren.

Ham, M. van (2001). Workplace mobility and occupational achievement, *International Journal of Population Geography,* 7, 295-306.

Ham, M. van, Hooimeijer, P., & Mulder, C. H. (2001). Urban form and job access: disparate realities in the Randstad MAARTEN. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie,* 92 (2), 231-246.

Ham, M. van. (2005). Job-related migration in the Netherlands. The role of geographical access to employment in a polynucleated urban region. *Journal of Housing and the Built Environment,* 20, 107–127.

Ham, M. van, & Mulder, C. H. (2005). Geographical access to childcare and mothers' labour-force participation. *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie,* 96 (1), 63–74.

Hanson, S. (1992). Geography and feminism: Worlds in collision? *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 82, 569.

Hanson, S., & Pratt, G. (1988a). Reconceptualizing the links between home and work in urban geography. *Economic Geography*, 64, 299-321.

Hanson, S., & Pratt, G. (1992). Dynamic dependencies - a geographic investigation of local-labor markets. *Economic Geography*, 68, 373.

Harms, L. (2005). Mobiliteit, In *De sociale staat van Nederland 2005*, Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau, 210 -236.

Haynie, D. L., & South, S. J. (2005). Residential mobility and adolescent violence. *Social forces*, 84, 364-376.

Heine, H., & Mautz, R. (1999). Die Mütter und das Auto. PKW-Nutzung im Kontext geschlechtsspezifischer Arbeitsteilung. In H. Lange (Ed.), *Ökologisches Handeln als sozialer Konflikt*. Opladen, 119-142.

Heine, H., Mautz, R., & Rosenbaum, W. (2000): *Möglichkeiten und Grenzen des Autoverzichts. Die Wahl des Verkehrsmittels angesichts der Mobilitätszwänge und normativen Ansprüche der heutigen Lebensweise.* Abschlussbericht, Göttingen.

Heine, H., Mautz, R., & Rosenbaum, W. (2001): *Mobilität im Alltag. Warum wir nicht vom Auto lassen*. Frankfurt am Main, New York.

Held, D. (1995). *Democracy and the global order*. Cambridge: Polity.

Herpin, N., & Déchaux, J. H. (2004). Entraide familiale indépendance économique et sociabilité. *Economie et statistique*, 373, 3-31.

Herschbach, P. (2002). Das "Zufriedenheitsparadox" in der Lebensqualitätsforschung. Wovon hängt unser Wohlbefinden ab? PPmP *Psychotherapie, Psychosomatik, Medizinische Psychologie, 52*, 141-150.

Heylen, L., & Mortelmans, D. (2006). Determinanten van loopbanen. Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken, (in review).

Heylen, L., Mortelmans, D., & Kuppens, A. (2005). De realiteit van de nieuwe loopbaan longitudinaal bekeken. *Over Werk*, 15 (1), 69-74.

Hilico, Ch., & Poulos, D. (2004). Les départements métropolitains: similitudes et oppositions socio-économiques. *Insee Première*, 943.

Hillman, M. (1993). One false move… A study of children's independent mobility: an overview of the findings and the issues they raise. In M. Hillman (Ed.), *Children, Transport and the Quality of Life*. London: Policy Studies Institute, 7-27.

Hirst, P., & Thompson, G. (1996). *Globalization in question. The international economy and the possibilities of governance.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Hirszfeld, Z., & Kaczmarczyk, P. (1999). *Ekonomiczne i społeczne skutki migracji na poziomie mikrospołecznym [The economic and social consequences of migration on the microscial level]*. Warszawa: ISS CMR Working Paper 21.

Hirszfeld, Z., & Kaczmarczyk, P. (2000). *Współczesne migracje zagraniczne ludności Podlasia [The contemporary international migration of the Podlasie inhabitants]* . Warszawa: ISS CMR Working Paper 30.

Hochschild, A. (1989). *The second shift*. New York: Avon.

Hofmeister, H. (2002). *Couples commutes to work considering workplace, household, and neighborhood contexts: the traffic triangle*. Cornell University, Dissertation.

Hofmeister, H. (2003). Commuting clocks: journey to work. In P. Moen (Ed.), *It's about time: couples and careers*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 60-79.

Hofmeister, H., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (2006). Women's careers in an era of uncertainty: conclusions from a 13-country international comparison. In H.-P. Blossfeld & H. Hofmeister (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and women's careers. An international comparison*. Cheltenham, Northampton: Edward Elgar, 433–450.

Holmes, M. (2004). An equal distance? Individualisation, gender and intimacy in distance relationships. *Sociological Review,* 52 (2), 180-200.

Holtzclaw, J., Clear, R., Dittmar, H., Goldstein, D., & Haas, P. (2002). Location efficiency: Neighborhood and socio-economic characteristics determine auto ownership and use - studies in Chicago, Los Angeles and San Francisco. *Transportation planning and technology*, 25, 1-27.

Horner, M. W., & Murray, A. T. (2003). A multi-objective approach to improving regional jobs-housing balance. *Regional Studies*, 37, 135-146.

Hoult, T. F. (Ed.) (1969). *Dictionary of Modern Sociology*, 93.

Howell, F. M., & Bronson, D. R. (1996). The journey to work and gender inequality in earnings: A cross- validation study for the United States. *Sociological Quarterly*, 37, 429.

Hradil, S. (2002). Mobilität. In G. Endruweit & G. Tromsdorff (Eds.), *Wörterbuch der Soziologie*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius, 368–373.

Hubert, J. P., & Toint, P. (2002). *La mobilité quotidienne des belges*. Namur: Presses Universitaires de Namur.

Hübner, K., & Petschow, U. (2001). *Spiel mit Grenzen. Ökonomische Globalisierung und soziale Kohäsion*. Berlin*:* edition sigma.

Iglesias de Ussel, J. (1998). *La familia y el cambio político en España*. Madrid: Tecnos.

Iglicka, K. (2001). *Migracje powrotne Polaków. Powroty sukcesu czy rozczarowania? [The return migrations of Poles. The come back of success or of dissapointment?]*. Warszawa: Instytut Spraw Publicznych.

Informe UE (2004). *Informe sobre la realización del plan de acción de la comisión sobre las capacidades y la movilidad* (COM(2002) 72 final). Bruselas.

Inglehart, R. (1977). *The silent revolution*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1989). *Culture shift in advanced industrial society*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Inglehart, R. (1997). Modernization and postmodernization. Cultural, economic, and political change in 43 societies. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Izdebska, J. (2001). Dziecko w rodzinie u progu XXI wieku. [Child in the family on the XXI century eve.]. *Problemy Opiekuńczo-Wychowawcze. [The care taking and pedagogical problems]*, 5.

Jahr, V., Schomburg, H., & Teichler, U. (2002). Internationale Mobilität von Hochschulabsolventinnen und -absolventen in Europa. In L. Bellmann & J. Velling (Eds.), *Arbeitsmärkte für Hochqualifizierte*. Nürnberg, 317-355.

Jahr, V., Schomburg, H., & Teichler, U. (2003). Internationale Mobilität von Absolventinnen und Absolventen europäischer Hochschulen. Kassel: Jenior u. Pressler

Jaillet, M.C., Rouge, L., & Thouzellier, C. (2006). Les modes de vie des navetteurs toulousains installés aux franges de l'aire urbaine: vers l'émergence de nouvelles figures de l'urbanité. In M. Bonnet & P. Aubertel (Eds.), *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*, Paris: PUF.

Janiszewski, L. (1967). *Rybacy dalekomorscy [Deep-see fishermen]*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

Janiszewski, L. (1976). *Rodzina marynarzy i rybaków dalekomorskich [The families of the deep-see sailors and fishermen]*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

Janiszewski, L. (1986). *Sukces małżeński w rodzinach marynarzy [The marital success in the sailors' families]*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

Janiszewski, L. (1991). Kategorie zawodowe ludzi morza a rodzina [The see people and the family]. In L. Janiszewski & A. Sosnowski (Eds.), *Ludzie morza i ich rodziny w procesie przemian [The see people and their families in the process of change]*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

Janssen, M. (2002). Freizügigkeit allein schafft noch keinen europäischen Arbeitsmarkt. In G. Peter (Ed.), *Journal Arbeit,* 3, 26-27.

Janssen, M., & van der Velde, M. (2003). *Cross-border commuting in the EU - Country report Germany, the Netherlands and Belgium*. CROBOCOB working paper.

Jaźwińska, E. (1996). Basic trends and characteristics of international migration. In E. Jaźwińska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Causes and consequences of migration in Central and Eastern Europe. Podlasie and Śląsk Opolski: basic trends in 1975-1994*. Warszawa: ISS UW.

Jaźwińska, E. (2001). Migracja niepełna a przebieg karier zawodowych [The incomplete migration and the career trajectories]. In E. Jazwinska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Jaźwińska, E. (2004). Mobilność zawodowa i terytorialna pracowników sezonowych [The occupational and spatial mobility of the seasonal workers]. In P. Kaczmarczyk & P. Łukowski (Eds.), *Polscy pracownicy na rynkach unii europejskiej [Polish workers on the EU markets]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Jaźwińska, E., & Okólski, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Johnson, M. M. (1993). Functionalism and feminism: Is estrangement necessary? In P. England (Ed.), *Theory on gender / feminism on theory*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Johnston-Anumonwo, I. (1992). The influence of household type on gender differences in work trip distance. *Professional Geographer*, 44, 161.

Johnston-Anumonwo, I., McLafferty, S., & Preston, V. (1995). Gender, race, and the spatial context of women's employment. In J. A. Garber & R. S. Turner (Eds.), *Gender in urban research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 236-255.

Jończy, R. (2003). *Migracje zarobkowe ludności autochtonicznej z województwa opolskiego. Studium ekonomicznych determinant i konsekwencji [The economic migration of the ethnic*

*population of the Opolskie voivodship. The study of the economic determinants and consequences*]. Studia i Monografie nr 264. Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.

Julien, Ph. (2001). Les grandes villes françaises étendent leur influence. *Insee Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur*, 766, avril.

Jürges, H. (2005). *Gender ideology, division of housework, and the geographic mobility families (Geschlechtsideologie, Arbeitsteilung im Haushalt und die geographische Mobilität von Familien)*. Mannheim: Universität Mannheim, Fakultät für Rechtswissenschaft und VWL, Mannheimer Forschungsinstitut Ökonomie und demographischer Wandel.

Jüttner, E. (1976). Der Einfluss der Entfernung zwischen Wohn- und Arbeitsort auf die Erkrankungshäufigkeit. *Zeitschrift für Gesundheit und Hygiene*, 22, 615-619.

Kaczmarczyk, P. (2001). Uwarunkowania procesów migracyjnych z perspektywy społeczności „wysyłającej" [The factors determinaning the migration processes from the perspective of the „sending" community] . In E. Jaźwińska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Kaczmarczyk, P. (2004). *Migracje zarobkowe polskiej młodzieży. Badania i analizy [The economic migrations of the Polish youth. The research and analysis]*. Urząd Komitetu Integracji Europejskiej. Departament Analiz Ekonomicznych i Społecznych. Warszawa.

Kaczmarczyk, P. (2004). Znaczenie migracji sezonowych dla migrantów, ich rodzin i społeczności wysyłających [The impact of the seasonal migrations for migrants, their families and the sending communities]. In P. Kaczmarczyk & W. Łukowski (Eds.), *Polscy pracownicy na rynkach unii europejskiej [Polish workers on the EU markets]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Kaczmarczyk, P. (2005). *Migracje zarobkowe Polaków w dobie przemian [The economic migration of Poles in the era of changes]*. Warszawa: Uniwersytet Warszawski. Wydział Nauk Ekonomicznych.

Kaczmarczyk, P., & Łukowski, W. (2004). *Polscy pracownicy na rynkach unii europejskiej [Polish workers on the EU markets]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Kaczmarczyk, P., & Łukowski, W. (2004a). Migracje sezonowe. Zarys problemów badawczych [The seasonal migrations. The sketch of the research problems]. In *Polscy pracownicy na rynkach unii europejskiej [Polish workers on the EU markets]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Kaczmarczyk, P., & Okólski, M. (2005). *Migracje specjalistów wysokiej klasy w kontekście członkostwa Polski w Unii Europejskiej [The high class professionals' migrations in the frame of Polish accession to EU]*. Warszawa: Urząd Komitetu Integracji Europejskiej.

Kaczmarczyk-Sowa, M. (1996). *Konflikty w rodzinach marynarzy [The conflicts in the sailors' families]*. Szczecin: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego.

Kaczmarek, U. (2004). Dychotomia miasto wieś w Polsce po 15 latach transformacji [The rural – urban dychotomy in Poland after 15 years of transformation]. In J. Parysek (Ed.), *Rozwój regionalny i lokalny w Polsce w latach 1989-2002 [The regional and local development in Poland 1989 – 2002]*. Poznań: UAM. Bogucki Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kalter, F. (1994). Pendeln statt Migration? Die Wahl und Stabilität von Wohnort-Arbeitsort-Kombinationen. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 23 (6), 460-476.

Kalter, F. (1997). *Wohnortwechsel in Deutschland. Ein Beitrag zur Migrationstheorie und zur empirischen Anwendung von Rational-Choice-Modellen*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Kalter, F. (1998). Partnerschaft und Migration. Zur theoretischen Erklärung eines empirischen Effekts. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 50, 283-309.

Kaluza, G. (2003). Stress. In M. Jerusalem & H. Weber (Eds.), *Psychologische Gesundheitsförderung. Diagnostik und Prävention*. Göttingen: Hogrefe, 339–444.

Kantor, D., & Lehr, W. (1975). *Inside the Family*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass.

Kassner, K., & Rüling, A. (2005). "Nicht nur am Samstag gehört der Papa mir!" Väter in egalitären Arrangements von Arbeit und Leben. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung, Sonderheft 4*, 235-264.

Katz, J., & Aakhus, M. (2002). *Perpetual contact: mobile communication, private talk, public performance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kaufmann, V. (2002). *Re-thinking mobility. Contemporary Sociolog.* Aldershot, Burlington: Ashgate.

Kaufmann, V. (2005). Mobilités et réversibilités: vers des sociétés plus fluides? *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, CXVIII, 119-135.

Kaufmann, V., Bergman, M., & Joye, D. (2004). Motility: Mobility as capital. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28 (4), 745-756.

Kaufmann, V. et al. (2001). *Automobile et modes de vie urbains: quel degré de liberté?* La Documentation Française, Paris.

Kaufmann, V., & Flamm, M. (2003). *Famille, temps et mobilité. Etat de l'art et tour d'horizon des innovations.* Rapport de recherche CNAF, IVM, Paris.

Kaufmann, V., Joye, D., & Widmer, E. (2006). *Réseaux sociaux, mobilités spatiales et inégalités de genre.* Requête pour le fond national de la recherche scientifique.

Kaufmann, V., Schuler, M., Crevoisier, O., & Rossel, P. (2003). Mobilité et motilité de l'intention à l'action, *cahier du Lasur 4*.

Kaufmann, V., & Widmer, E. (2006). Motility and family dynamics: current issues and research agenda. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung,* 18 (1), 111-129.

Kegerreis, S. (1993). Independent mobility and children's mental and emotional development. In M. Hillman (Ed.). *Children, transport and the quality of life*, Policy Studies Institute, London, 28-34.

Kellerhals, J. (1987). Les types d'interaction dans la famille, in *Année sociologique* 1987, Paris: PUF, 153-179.

Kellerhals, J. et al. (1984). *Microsociologie de la famille,* Paris: PUF.

Kellerhals, J., & Montandon, C. (1991). *Les stratégies éducatives des familles. Milieu social, dynamique familiale et éducation des pré-adolescents.* Lausanne: Delachaux et Niestlé

Kellerhals, J., Montandon, C., Ritschard, G., & Sardi, M. (1992). Le style éducatif des parents et l'estime de soi des adolescents. *Revue française de sociologie*, XXXIII, 313-333.

Kemper, P. (Ed.) (2003). *Glück und Globalisierung. Alltag in Zeiten der Weltgesellschaft.* Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Kennedy, P. (2004). Making global society: Friendship in networks among transnational professionals in the building design industry. *Global Networks,* 4 (2), 157-179.

Kennedy, P. (2005). Joining, constructing and benefiting from the global workplace: Transnational professionals in the building-design industry. *Sociological Review,* 53 (1), 172-197.

Kenyon, S., Lyons, G., & Rafferty, J. (2002). Transport and social exclusion: investigating the possibility of promoting inclusion through virtual mobility. *Journal of Transport Geography,* 10 (3), 207-219.

Kępińska, E. (2004). Kobiety i mężczyźni w migracjach sezonowych [Women and men in seasonal migrations]. In P. Kaczmarczyk & W. Łukowski (Eds.), *Polscy pracownicy na rynkach unii europejskiej [Polish workers on the EU markets]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Kesselring, S. (2005). New mobilities management mobility pioneers between first and second modernity (Neue Formen des Mobilitätsmanagements: Mobilitätspioniere zwischen erster und zweiter Moderne). *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung: Beiträge zu Haushalt, Verwandtschaft und Lebenslauf*, 17 (2), 129-143.

Keuzenkamp, S., & Hooghiemstra, E. (Eds.) (2000). *De kunst van het combineren: Taakverdeling onder partners*. Den Haag: Social and Cultural Planning Office.

Kleiman, C. (2001). Commuter care: a smart route to job satisfaction. *Chicago Tribune. Retrieved* June 5, 2001, from http://chicagotribune.com/business/printedition/article/0,2669,SAV-0106050302,FF.html.

Klöckner, D. (1998). Analyse des pratiques d'accompagnement des enfants et de leurs conséquences. In *Recherche Transport Sécurité*, 59, 17-32.

Klöckner, D., & Fliegner, S. (1997). *Autoreduzierte Mobilität in Halle*. Bonn: Ministère Fédéral de la Recherche

Klombik, K., & Morciniec, P. (2005). *Wyjazdy zarobkowe [Economic migrations]*. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). Values and value-orientations in the theory of action. In T. Parsons & E. A. Shils (Eds.), *Towards a general Theory of action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 388-433.

Knoll, M., Kreibich, R., Nolte, R., Scheermesser, M., Schlaffer, A., & Würtenberger, F. (2003). *Mobilität und Wohnen*. Berlin: IZT.

Kochańska, W. (2002). *Marginalizacja życia czy zmarginalizowanie: analiza sytuacji życiowej byłych pracowników PGR [The marginalization or the marginalization of life: the analysis of the life situation of the former PGR workers]* unpublished M.A.thesis. Warszawa: WFiS.

Kohler, S. (2002). *Analyse des Mobilitätsverhaltens von Kindern und Eltern als Basis einer institutionalisierten Mobilitätserziehung*. München: Technische Universität, Dissertation.

Kohli, M. (1978). *Soziologie des Lebenslaufs*. Darmstadt: Luchterhand.

Kohli, M. (1985). Die Institutionalisierung des Lebenslaufs. Historische Befunde und theoretische Argumente. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 37, 1, 1–29.

Kohli, M. (1988). Normalbiographie und Individualität: Zur institutionellen Dynamik des gegenwärtigen Lebenslaufregimes. In H.-G. Brose & B. Hildenbrand (Eds.), *Vom Ende des Individuums zur Individualität ohne Ende*. Opladen: Leske+Budrich, 33-53.

Kohli, M., Kühnemund, H., Motel, A., & Szydlik, M. (2000). Generationenbeziehungen. In M. Kohli & H. Kühnemund (Eds.), *Die zweite Lebenshälfte: gesellschaftliche Lage und Partizipation im Spiegel des Alters-Survey*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 176-211.

Komarovsky, M. (1964). *Blue-collar marriage*. New York: Random House.

Konopaske, R., Robie, C., & Ivancevich, J. M. (2005). A preliminary model of spouse influence on managerial global assignment willingness. *International journal of human ressource management*, 16, 405-426.

Korczyńska, J. (2000). Indywidualne motywy krótkookresowych wyjazdów zarobkowych za granicę w świetle funkcjonowania rodziny [The individual motivation of short term economic migration and the family functioning]. *Polityka społeczna 5/6, 1 [Social Policy 5/6, 1]*.

Korczyńska, J. (2003). *Sezonowe wyjazdy zarobkowe Polaków do Niemiec [The seasonal economic migrations of Poles to Germany]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Koryś, P. (2001). Peryferyjność a migracja niepełna [The peripheries and the incomplete migration]. In E. Jazwinska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Koslowsky, M. (1997). Commuting stress: problems of definition and variable identification. *Applied Psychology, 46*, 153–173.

Koslowsky, M., Kluger, A., & Reich, M. (1995). *Commuting stress. Causes, effects, and methods of coping*. New York: Plenum Press.

Kozek, W. (2006). *Zamknięte i otwarte rynki pracy a mobilność zawodowa [The opened and closed labour markets and the job mobility]*. paper presented at „Mobile Europe Conference", Warsaw 31.05.2006.

Kraemer, K., & Bittlingmayer, U. H. (2001). Soziale Polarisierung durch Wissen. Zum Wandel der Arbeitsmarktchancen in der "Wissensgesellschaft". In P. A. Berger & D. Konietzka (Eds.), *Die Erwerbsgesellschaft. Neue Ungleichheiten und Unsicherheiten*. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 313-330.

Kreutzer, F., & Roth, S. (Eds.) (2006): *Internationale Karrieren und transnationale Mobilität. Biographien, Lebensführung und Identität*. Wiesbaden: VS-Verlag.

Kroeber, A. L., & Kluckhohn, C. (1952). *Culture: A Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Kryńska, E. (2001). *Stymulacja ruchliwości pracowniczej [Stimulating employees' mobility]*. Warszawa: IPiSS.

Kryńska, E. (2002). *Mobilność zasobów pracy [Human resourses mobility]*. Warszawa: IPiSS.

Kryńska, E. (2004). Praca w nowych warunkach gospodarowania [Work in the new economic conditions]. In Z. Mikołajewicz (Ed.), *Społeczne i regionalne aspekty przemian strukturalnych w polskiej gospodarce okresu transformacji [The social and regional aspects of the structural changes in the Polish transforming economy]*. Uniwersytet Opolski.

Kukułowicz, T. (2001). Sytuacja wychowawcza w nowych kategoriach rodzin w okresie transformacji ustrojowej [The upbringing situation in the new family types in the period of transformation]. In M. Ziemska (Ed.), *Rodzina współczesna [The contemporary family]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.

Kuppens, A., & Mortelmans, D. (2004). Analyse longitudinale des parcours professionnels avec analyse séquentielle. In R. Doutrelepont, D. Mortelmans & M.-T. Casman (Eds.), *Onze ans de vie en Belgiqu,* Op.cit., 350-352.

La Caixa (2004). *Anuario Social de España 2004*. Colección de Estudios sociales. Barcelona: Fundación "La Caixa".

La lettre de problèmes économiques (2006). *Les transferts entre les générations*. 12 avril, 182.

Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S. (1991). Patterns of competence and adaptation among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent and neglectful families. *Child Development*, 62, 1049-1065.

Lannoy, P. (2004). La mécanique des flux : l'ingénierie du trafic routier comme politique d'intégration. In B. Montulet & V. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Mobilités, fluidités,... libertés?* Bruxelles: Publication des Facultés Saint-Louis, 99-119.

Larsen, J., Urry, J., & Axhausen, K. (2005). *Social networks and future mobilities*. Final draft: report to the UK Depertement for transport, Lancaster University and IVT ETHZ, Lancaster, Zurich.

Latour, B. (1995). *Wir sind nie modern gewesen. Versuch einer symmetrischen Anthropologie*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag.

Laurier, E. (2004a). Doing office work on the motorway. *Theory, Culture & Society,* 21 (4-5), 261-277.

Laurier, E. (2004b). *Busy meeting grounds: the café, the scene and the business*. presented at *a*n international specialist meeting on ICT, everyday life and urban change, Utrecht.
Retrieved August 1, 2006, from
from: http://web.geog.gla.ac.uk/~elaurier/cafesite/texts/elaurier007.pdf.

Laurier, E., & Philo, C. (2003). The region in the boot: mobilising lone subjects and multiple objects. *Environment and Planning* D, 21, 85-106.

Lazarus, R., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.

Le Breton, E (2006). Homo mobilis. In M. Bonnet & P. Aubertel (Eds.), *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*, Paris: PUF.

Le Breton, E. (2002). L'orientation familiale des mobilités. Quelques remarques à partir de l'étude d'une population disqualifiée, communication présentée au colloque AISLF *Mobilités familiales au quotidien*, October 10-12, Lausanne.

Le Breton, E. (2005). *Bouger pour s'en sortir*. Paris: Armand Colin.

Le Floch, N., Clarisse, R., Testu, F., & Kindelberg, C. (2005). La conciliation des rôles professionnels et parentaux, un facteur de stress professionnel : construction et première validation d'une échelle de mesure. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée*, 55 (1), 9-20.

Le Gall, D. (1996).  Beaux-parents au quotidien et par intermittence. In D. Le Gall & C. Martin (Eds.), *Familles et politiques sociales. Dix questions sur le lien familial contemporain*. Paris: L'Harmattan, 136-141.

Leisering, L. (2003). Government and the life course. In J. T. Mortimer & M. J. Shanahan (Eds.), *Handbook of the life course*. New York: Kluwer, 205–225.

Lethbridge, N. (2002). *Attitudes to travel*. London: ONS.

Letherby, G., & Reynolds, G. (2003). Making connections: The relationship between train travel and the processes of work and leisure. *Sociological Research Online,* 8 (3): http://www.socresonline.org.uk/8/3/letherby.html.

Levinson, D. M. (1999). Space, money, life stage, and the allocation of time. *Transportation*, 26, 141-171.

Levinson, D. M., & Kumar, A. (1997). Density and the journey to work. *Growth and Change*, 28, 147-172.

Levinson, D., & Wu, Y. (2005). The rational locator reexamined: Are travel times still stable? *Transportation*, 32, 187-202.

Lévy, J. (2000). Les nouveaux espaces de la mobilité. In M. Bonnet & D. Desjeux (Eds.), *Les territoires de la mobilité*, Paris: PUF, 155-170.

Lévy, J., Joye, D., Guye, O., & Kaufmann, V. (1997). *Tous égaux? De la stratification aux représentations*. Zurich: Editions Seismo.

Lichter, D. T. (1982). The migration of dual-worker families: does the wife's job matter? *Social Science Quarterly*, 63, 48-57.

Liefbroer, A., & Mulder, C. H. (2004). Op je familie kun je rekenen: Opvattingen over familiesolidariteit onder autochtonen en allochtonen, *Demos,* 20 (10), 87-88.

Limmer, R. (2004). Job mobility and living arrangements. In W. Bonß, S. Kesselring & G. Vogel (Eds.), *Mobility and the cosmopolitn perspective. A workshop at the Munich Reflexive Modernization Research Centre (SFB 536) 29 - 30 January 2004,* Munich: Neubiberg: Universität der Bundeswehr, 89-94.

Limmer, R. (2005). Berufsmobilität und Familie in Deutschland. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung: Beiträge zu Haushalt, Verwandtschaft und Lebenslauf*, 17 (2), 96-114.

Lindenberg, S. (1985). An assessment of the new political economy: its potential for the social sciences and for sociology in particular. *Sociological Theory*, 3 (1), 99–114.

Lindner, D. (1999). Bestimmungsfaktoren der "Abbruchbereitschaft" von Auslandsentsandten: Eine theoretische und forschungsprogrammatische Analyse. *Zeitschrift für Personalforschung* 3, 246-268.

Lippe, T. van der, Jager, A., & Kops, Y. (2003). In balans tussen werk en privé? De invloed van de arbeidssituatie en de thuissituatie op combinatiedruk van mannen en vrouwen. *Bevolking en Gezin* 32 (3), 3-24.

Lippe, T. van der, Tijdens, K., & Ruijter, E. de (2004). Outsourcing of domestic tasks and time-saving effects. *Journal of Family Issues,* 25 (2), 216-240.

List, J. (1996). *Grenzüberschreitende Mobilität von Hochschulabsolventen in Europa: bildungspolitische Rahmenbedingungen und praktische Umsetzung*. Köln: DIV.

Liu, J., Daily, G., Ehrlich, P., & Luck, G. (2003). Effects of household dynamics on resource consumption and biodiversity. *Nature,* 421 (Jan), 530-533.

Llano, C., & Gómez, R. (2005). *Informe sobre la inmigración y el mercado laboral de la Comunidad de Madrid*. Madrid: Instituto L. R. Klein.

Lobo Gutiérrez, I. (1993). *Carreteras y desarrollo socio-económico*. Documento de trabajo 009725. Madrid: Ministerio de Fomento.

Łopocka-Dyjak, E. (2006). Wpływ wyjazdów rodziców do pracy za granicę na funkcjonowanie dziecka w szkole [The impact of the international migrations of parents on the children functioning at schools]. *Publikacje edukacyjne [Educational publications]*. pismo internetowe 4 2005/2006. from: http://www.publikacje.edu.pl/publikacje.php?nr=2868

Lowe, J. C. (1998). Patterns of spatial dispersion in metropolitan commuting. *Urban Geography*, 19, 232.

Luis Carnicer, M. P., Pérez Pérez, M., & Vela Jiménez, M. J. (2004). El conflicto trabajo-familia: un estudio empírico de factores familiares y laborales. *Capital Humano: revista para la integración y desarrollo de los recursos humanos*, 17, 175, 54-76.

Łukowski, W. (2001). Społeczny sens ruchliwości niepełnej (biwalentnej) [The social meaning of the incomplete (bi-valent) mobility]. In E. Jaźwińska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Łukowski, W. (2004). Społeczny sens migracji sezonowych [The social meaning of the seasonal migrations]. In P. Kaczmarczyk & W. Łukowski (Eds.), *Polscy pracownicy na rynkach unii europejskiej [Polish workers on the EU markets]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Lyons, G., & Urry, J. (2005). Travel time use in the information age. *Transport Research A,* 39, 257-276.

MacDonald, H., & Peters, A. (1994). Spatial constraints on rural women workers. *Urban Geography*, 15, 720-740.

Madden, J. F. (1981). Why women work closer to home. *Urban Studies*, 18, 181-194.

Malsan, S. (2001). *Les filles d'Alcatel. Histoire d'une reconversion industrielle*. Octarès.

Mangin, D. (2004). *La ville franchisée*. Paris: éditions de la Vilette.

Mannheim, K. (1978). Das Problem der Generationen. In M. Kohli (Ed.), *Soziologie des Lebenslaufs*. Darmstadt, Neuwied: Luchterhand, 38-53, (orig. 1928).

Marquet, J. et al. (2005). *L'évolution contemporaine de la parentalité* [Contemporary evolution of parenthood]. Gent: Academia Press, 23.

Martin, C. (1997). *L'Après-divorce. Lien familial et vulnérabilité.* Rennes: Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Martin, H.-P., & Schumann, H. (1996). *Die Globalisierungsfalle*. Reinbek: Rowohlt.

Maruani, M., & Reynaud, E. (2004). *Sociologie de l'emploi*. Paris: La découverte.

Marx, K., & Engels, F. (1848). Das kommunistische Manifest. In *Marx Engels Werke* 4, 7. Berlin (DDR): Dietz.

Marynowicz-Hetka, E., Piekarski, J., & Cyrańska, E. (1998). *Pedagogika społeczna jako dyscyplina akademicka. Stan i perspektywy [Social pedagogics as the academic dyscipline. The condition and perspectives]*. Łódź: Wyd. UŁ.

Mason, J. (1999). Living away from relatives: kinship and geographical reasoning. In S. McRae (Ed.), *Changing britain: families and households in the 1990s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mason, J. (2004). Managing kinship over long distances: the significance of the visit. *Social Policy & Society,* 3 (4), 421-429.

Massey, D. (1994). *Space, place and gender*. Cambridge: Polity.

Massey, D. S. (1987). The ethnosurvey in theory and practice. *International Migration Review,* 21 (4).

Massey, D. S. (1999). Why does immigration occur? A theoretical synthesis. In Ch. Hirschman, P. Kasinitz & J. de Wind (Eds.), *The Handbook of international migration: The American Experience*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Masson, A. (2006). Transferts entre générations: à la recherche d'un modèle, rapport au conseil d'analyse économique. *La lettre de problèmes économiques*, 182.

Matejko, E. (2004). Migracja sezonowa jako strategia działania w kontekście sytuacji na polskim i hiszpańskim rynku pracy [The seasonal migration strategy in the context of the situation on the Polish and Spanish labour markets]. In P. Kaczmarczyk & W. Łukowski (Eds.), *Polscy pracownicy na rynku Unii Europejskiej [Polish workers on EU market]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Matejko, E. (2006). *Border as a resource. Influence of cross-border trade on local community and local labour market*. Research project presented 19.05.06. at the Centre for European Migration Research. Institute for Social Studies. University of Warsaw.

Mayer, K. U., & Müller, W. (1989). Lebensverläufe im Wohlfahrtsstaat. In A. Weymann (Ed.), *Handlungsspielräume: Untersuchungen zur Individualisierung und Institutionalisierung von Lebensläufen in der Moderne*. Stuttgart: Enke, 41–60.

Mayer, K. U. (2004). Whose lives? How history, societies and institutions define and shape Life courses. *Research in Human Development*, 3 (1), 167-187.

McCubbin, H., & Patterson, J. M. (1983). The family stress process: The double ABC-X model of adjustment and adaptation. *Marriage & Family Review, 6*, 7-38.

McCubbin, M., & McCubbin, H. (1989). Theoretical orientations to family stress and coping. In C. R. Figley (Ed.), *Treating stress in families*. New York: Springer.

McLafferty, S., & Preston, V. (1997). Gender, race, and the determinants of commuting: New York in 1990. *Urban Geography*, 18, 192.

Meier, B. (1998). *Zwischen Freiheit und Erstarrung: wie reagiert die Gesellschaft auf die Mobilität der Wirtschaft*. Köln: Dt. Inst.-Verl.

Meil Landwerlin G. (1999). *La postmodernización de la familia española*. Madrid: Acento.

Meil Landwerlin, G. (2000*). Imágenes de la solidaridad familiar*. Cuaderno de Opiniones y Actitudes, 30. Madrid: CIS.

Meil Landwerlin, G. (2001). Hogares nucleares y familias plurigeneracionales. *Estructura y cambio social*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Meil Landwerlin, G. (2003). *Las Uniones de Hecho en España*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas.

Meinhold, M. (2002). Botschafter des Unternehmens. *Personalwirtschaft*, 7, 14-17.

Mercure, D. (1995). *Les temporalités sociales*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Merton, R. K. (1968). *Social theory and social structure*. New York: Free Press.

Messant-Laurent, F. et al. (1993). *Travailler la nuit et le weekend ?* Zurich: Seismo.

Meurs, H., & Haaijer, R. (2001). Spatial Structure and Mobility. *Transportation Research part D*, 429-446.

Mills, M., Blossfeld, H.-P., & Klijzing, E. (2006). Becoming an adult in uncertain times: a 14-country comparison of the losers of globalization. In H.-P. Blossfeld, E. Klijzing, M. Mills & K. Kurz (Eds.), *Globalization, uncertainty and youth in society*. London, New York: Routledge, 423–441.

Mincer, J. (1978). Family migration decisions. *Journal of Political Economy,* 86, 749-773.

Ministerio de Fomento (2004). *Plan Estratégico de Infraestructuras y Transporte*. Madrid: Ministerio de Fomento.

Ministerio de la Presidencia (2005). *Convergencia y Empleo. Programa Nacional de Reformas de España.* Madrid: Ministerio de la Presidencia.

Mirowski, W. (1997). Migracja jako forma przystosowania w okresie przemian [Migration as an adaptation strategy in the period of changes]. In J. Zamojski (Ed.), *Migracje i Społeczeństwo. Zbiór studiów. 2. [Migrations and Society. The collection of studies]*. Warszawa: IH PAN.

Mitchell, A. (1983). *The Nine American Lifestyles*. New York: Macmillan.

Mobiplan-Projektkonsortium (2002). *Kurzfassung. Eigene Mobilität verstehen und planen - Langfristige Entscheidungen und ihre Wirkungen auf die Alltagsmobilität.* Retrieved May 15, 2006, from http://www.isb.rwth-aachen.de/mobiplan/pdf/Kurzfassung.pdf

Módenes, J. A. (1998). *Flujos espaciales e itinerarios biográficos: la movilidad residencial en el área de Barcelona*. Tesis doctoral, Dept. Geografía, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, 442. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from: http://www.tdcat.cesca.es/TDCat-0531101-120649/index.html

Módenes, J. A. (2000). Movilidad residencial y dinámica familiar de los adultos jóvenes urbanos en los 80. *Papers de Demografia*, 170. Bellaterra: Centre d'Estudis Demogràfics.

Módenes, J. A. (dir.) (2002). *Trabajo y residencia como factores de las migraciones internas: un estudio comparativo europeo*. Bellaterra: Centre d'Estudis Demogràfics.

Módenes, J. A., & López, J. (2003). Movilidad residencial, trabajo y vivienda en Europa. *Revista electrónica de geografía y ciencias sociales*. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from www.ub.es/geocrit/sn/sn-159.htm

Módenes, J. A., & López, J. (2003). Movilidad residencial, trabajo y vivienda en Europa. *Revista electrónica de geografía y ciencias sociales*. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from www.ub.es/geocrit/sn/sn-159.htm

Mokhtarian, L. P. (1990). A typology of relationships between telecommunications and transportation. *Transport Research A, 24* (3), 231-42.

Mondou, V. (2006). Transports urbains: ceux qui ne les prennent jamais ... et ceux qui les prennent parce qu'ils ne peuvent pas faire autrement. In M. Bonnet & P. Aubertel (Eds.), *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*, PUF.

Montulet B., & Kaufmann V. (Eds.) (2004). *Mobilités, fluidités, ... libertés ?* Bruxelles: Publications des Facultés Saint-Louis.

Montulet, B. (1998). *Les enjeux spatio-temporels du social –Mobilités*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Montulet, B. (2005a). *"Mobility: a space-time theory"*. Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.osmobilities.net/index.php?id=10&subject=%2FCosmobilities+Workshops%2F2005%2f

Montulet, B. (2005b). Au-delà de la mobilité: des formes de mobilités. *Cahiers Internationaux de Sociologie*, CXVIII, 137-159.

Montulet, B. (2005c). Comportements temporels et usages des modes de transport. In B. Montulet, M. Hubert, C. Jemelin & S. Schmitz (Eds.), *Mobilité et temporalités*. Bruxelles: Publications des Facultés Saint-Louis, 167-182.

Montulet B. (2005d). Le temps, libéral ou libéré? Une introduction à l'analyse des temps sociaux. In Collectif, *L'ère du temps*. Bruxelles: Couleur livres, 3-24.

MOVILIA (2001). *Encuesta de movilidad de las personas residentes en España*. Madrid: Ministerio de Fomento.

MTAS (2003). *Encuesta de calidad de vida en el trabajo.* Madrid: Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, microdata.

MtiB (2003). *Strategia Rozwoju Infrastruktury Transportu na lata 2004-2006 [The strategy of developing transportation infrastructure 2004 – 2006].* Ministerstwo Transportu i Budownictwa. Retrieved June 12, 2006, from http://www.mi.gov.pl/moduly/informacje/informacja.php?id_informacji=135&opcja=pokaz

Mückenberger, U. (1985). Die Krise des Normalarbeitsverhältnisses. *Zeitschrift für Sozialreform*, 31, 415-434, 457-475.

Mückenberger, U. (1989). Entwicklungsperspektiven des Normalarbeitsverhältnisses. Anmerkungen zum Stand der gewerkschafts- und rechtspolitischen Diskussion. *Prokla*, 76, 14–26.

Mulder, C. H. (1993). *Migration dynamics, a life course approach.* Amsterdam: Thesis Publishers.

Mulder, C. H., & Hooimeijer, P. (1999). Residential relocations in the life course. In L. J. G. Wissen & P. A. Dykstra (Eds.), *Population Issues. An Interdisciplinary Focus.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 159-186.

Mulder, C. H., & Kalmijn, M. (2004). Even bij oma langs: NKPS laat zien hoe ver familieleden van elkaar wonen, *Demos,* 20 (10), 78-80.

Müller, K. (2002). *Globalisierung.* Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Murawska, H. (1994). *Imigranci wiejscy w mieście Olsztyn [The rural immigrants in the Olsztyn city].* Olsztyn: Ośrodek Badań Naukowych im. Wojciecha Kętrzyńskiego.

Myers, S. M. (1999). Residential mobility as a way of life: Evidence of intergenerational similarities. *Journal of marriage and the family*, 61, 871-880.

Myers, S. M. (2005). Childhood and adolescent mobility and aduld relations with parents. *Journal of family issues*, 26, 350-379.

Mytzek, R., & Schömann, K. (Eds.) (2004). *Transparenz von Bildungsabschlüssen in Europa. Sektorale Studien zur Mobilität von Arbeitskräften.* Berlin: edition sigma.

Nahon, S. (2001). Immobilisme dans une ville périphérique et rapport à la mobilité. In P. Lassave & A. Haumont (Eds.), *Mobilité spatiales –une question de société.* Paris: L'Harmattan, 61-74.

Nikitorowicz, J., & Sobecki, M. (1999). Rodzina a skutki migracji zagranicznych [The consequences of international migration for family]. In *Edukacja międzykulturowa w wymiarze instytucjonalnym [Intercultural education in the institutional framework].* Białystok.

Nippert-Eng, C. E. (1995). *Home and work: negotiating the boundaries through everyday life.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Novaco, R. W., Stokols, D., & Milanesi, L. (1990). Objective and subjective dimensions of travel impedance as determinants of commuting stress. *American Journal of Cummting Psychology*, 18 (2), 231-257.

Nowak, M., & Sikora, D. (2004). Przyczyny i konsekwencje migracji ludności dużych miast na tereny podmiejskie [The causes and consequences of the big cities inhabitants' migrations to suburbs]. In *Przemiany demograficzne i jakość życia ludności miast [The demographic changes and the quality of life of urban dwellers].* Opole: Uniwersytet Opolski.

Nowicka, E. (Ed.) ( 2004). *Migracje zarobkowe polskiej młodzieży [The economic migrations of Polish youth]*. Departament Analiz Ekonomicznych i Społecznych. Warszawa: UKIE. Retrieved June 6, 2006, from http://www1.ukie.gov.pl/HLP/files.nsf/0/38ABA8813C746441C1256F3400417A09/$file/be31.pdf

O'Reilly, K. (2003). When is a tourist? The articulation of tourism and migration in spain's costa del Sol. *Tourist Studies,* 3 (3), 301-317.

Observatorio Ocupacional del Servicio Publico de Empleo Estatal (2006). *Datos Básicos de Movilidad Estatal*, Informe Anual (2005). Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www2.inem.es/Observatorio

Odland, J., & Ellis, M. (1998). Variations in the labour force experience of women across large metropolitan areas in the United States. *Regional Studies*, 32, 333.

Office fédéral de la statistique (OFS) (2004). *La pendularité en Suisse*, Neuchâtel.

Ohmae, K. (1991). *Die neue Logik der Weltwirtschaft. Zukunftsstrategien der internationalen Konzerne.* Hamburg: Hoffmann und Campe.

Okólski, M. (2004). Mobilność przestrzenna z perspektywy koncepcji migracji niepełnej [The spatial mobility from the perspective of the incomplete migration theory]. In *Demografia zmiany społecznej [The demography of the social change]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Olson, D. H. (1986). Circumplex model VII: Validation studies and FACES III. *Family Process*, 25, 337-352.

Ommeren, J. van, Rietveld, P., & Nijkamp, P. (1998). Spatial moving behaviour of two-earner households. *Journal of Regional Science,* 38 (1), 23-41.

Ommeren, J. van, Rietveld, P., & Nijkamp, P. (2000). Job mobility, residential mobility and commuting a theoretical analysis using search theory. *The Annals of Regional Science,* 34, 213-232.

Orellana Pizarro González, H. (1994). *Evaluación de las infraestructuras de transporte y sus efectos sobre el desarrollo regional mediante la aplicación de indicadores de accesibilidad.* Madrid: Escuela de Ingenieros de Caminos, Canales y Puertos.

Osipowicz, D. (2001). Marginalizacja społeczna migrantów [The social marginalization of migrants]. In E. Jaźwińska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Ott, E., & Gerlinger, T. (1992). *Die Pendlergesellschaft*. Köln: Bund-Verlag.

Ouali, N. (2002). Politique migratoire et femmes migrantes en Belgique. In M. Charef (Ed.), *Les migrations au féminin.* Agadir: Ed. Sud Contact, 61-83.

Pailhé, A., & Solaz, A. (2001). Mobilité géographique, professionnelle et gains salariaux des hommes et des femmes. *Colloque SESAME*, Université Lille 1.

Parsons, T. (1949). The Social Structure of the Family. In R. Anshen (Ed.), *The Family: Its function and destiny*. New York: Harper, 173–201.

Parsons, T., & Shils, E. A. (Eds.) (1951). *Towards a General Theory of Action*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Parysek, J. (2004) Trajektorie rozwoju miast polskich [The trajectories of Polish cities development]. In J. Parysek (Ed.), *Rozwój regionalny i lokalny w Polsce w latach 1989-2002 [The regional and local development in Poland 1989 – 2002]*. UAM. Bogucki Wyd.Naukowe.

Paugam, S., & Zoyem, J.P. (1997). Le soutien de la famille: une forme essentielle de solidarité, *Economie et statistique*, 308-310, 187-210.

Paulu, C. (2001). *Mobilität und Karriere. Eine Fallstudie am Beispiel einer deutschen Großbank.* Wiesbaden: Dt. Univ.-Verlag.

Pauron, A. (2003). La mobilité des agents titulaires de l'Etat. *Economie et statistiques*, 369-370, 93-111.

Pelizäus-Hoffmeister, H. (2001). *Mobilität: Chance oder Risiko? Soziale Netzwerke unter den Bedingungen räumlicher Mobilität - das Beispiel freie JournalistInnen.* Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Perchanchon, M. (2002). *Apprendre à conduire, apprendre à se conduire : un objectif familial de la mobilité au quotidien.* Communication présentée au colloque AISLF "Mobilités familiales au quotidien", October 10-12, Lausanne.

Pérez Díaz, V., Chuliá, E., & Valiente, C. (2000). *La familia española en el año 2000. Innovación y respuesta de las familias a sus condiciones económicas, políticas y culturales.* Madrid: Fundación Argentaria.

Pérez Díaz, V., Chuliá, E., & Alvarez-Miranda, B. (1998). *Familia y sistema de bienestar: la experiencia española con el paro, las pensiones, la sanidad y la educación.* Madrid: Fundación Argentaria.

Pérez, L. (2004). *Envejecer en femenino: las mujeres mayores en España a comienzos del siglo XXI.* Madrid: Instituto de la mujer.

Périlleux, T. (2001). *Les tensions de la flexibilité.* Paris: Desclée De Brouwer.

Peters, P. (1998). 'De smalle marges van de politiek'. In H. Achterhuis & B. Elzen (Eds.), *Cultuur en mobiliteit.* Den Haag: Sdu, 39-64.

Peterson, G. W., & Hann, D. (1999). Socializing children and parents in families. In M. B. Sussman, S. K. Steinmetz & G. W. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Marriage and the Family.* New York: Plenum Press, 3327-3370.

Petitjean, C. (2001). *Partners van expatriates: Invloed van de eigen loopbaan en de yoorbereidingop de aanpassing in het buitenland.* licentiaatverhandeling, Brussel: Vrij Universiteit.

Pettit, B. (2004). Moving and children's social connections: Neighborhood context and the consequences of moving for low-income families. *Sociological Forum*, 19, 285-311.

Pierre, P. (2001). Les figures identitaires de la mobilité internationale. L'exemple d'une entreprise pétrolière. *Sociétés contemporaines*, 41, 53-79.

Piore, M. J. (1979). *Bird of passage: Migrant labour in industrial societies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pitrou, A (1992). *Les solidarités familiales, Vivre sans famille?* Toulouse: Editions Privat.

Pixley, J. E., & Moen, P. (2003). Prioritizing careers. In P. Moen (Ed.), *It's about time: couples and careers* (183-200). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Plaut, O. P. (2004). Do telecommunications make transportation obsolete? In S. Graham (Ed.), *The Cybercities Reader*. London: Routledge.

Plummer, J. T. (1974). The concept and application of life-style segmentation. *Journal of Marketing*, January.

Pochic, S. (2004). Le chômage des cadres : un révélateur des tensions entre carrière et vie privée. *Les cadres et ingénieurs au regard du genre*, *Les cahiers du GDR Cadres*, 5, 27-41.

Pooley, C., & Turnbull, J. (1998). *Migration and mobility in Britain since the 18th Century*. London: UCL Press.

Pooley, C., & Turnbull, J. (2000a). Commuting, transport and urban form: Manchester and Glasgow in the mid-twentieth century. *Urban History,* 27 (3), 360-383.

Pooley, C., & Turnbull, J. (2000b). Modal choice and modal change: the journey to work in Britain since 1890. *Journal of Transport Geography,* 8, 11-24.

Potuchek, J. L. (1997). *Who supports the family? Gender and breadwinning in dual-earner marriages*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Praszałowicz, D., Makowski, K., & Zięba, A. (2005). *Mechanizmy zamorskich migracji łańcuchowych w XIX w [The mechanisms of the overseas chain migrations in XIX century]*. Kraków: Księgarnia Akademicka.

Preißner, C. L., & Hunecke, M. (2002). Mobilität im Alltag - Wegeketten von Frauen. *Journal Arbeit*, 2 (1), 4-5.

Preston, V., McLafferty, S., & Hamilton, E. (1993). The impact of family status on black, white, and Hispanic women's commuting. *Urban Geography*, 14, 228.

PricewaterhouseCoopers (Ed.) (2002). *Managing mobility matters - a European perspective*.

PricewaterhouseCoopers, & Cranfield University (2005). *Understanding and avoiding barriers to international mobility*. PricewaterhouseCoopers Human Resource Services.

Priemus, H., Nijkamp, P., & Banister, D. (2001). Mobility and spatial dynamics: an uneasy relationship, *Journal of Transport Geography*, 9, 167-171.

Pries, L. (2000). *Internationale Migration*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Putnam, D. R. (2000). *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Puyol, R., & García Coll, L. (1997). *Dinámica de la población en España*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Rajkiewicz, A. (Ed.). (2000). *Zewnętrzne migracje zarobkowe we współczesnej Polsce. Wybrane zagadnienia [Outer economic migrations in the contemporary Poland. Selected problems]*. Włocławek: WSH-E.

Rammler, S. (1999). Die Wahlverwandtschaft von Moderne und Mobilität. *Arch +, Zeitschrift für Architektur und Städtebau*, August, 105–110.

Rammler, S. (2001). *Mobilität in der Moderne. Geschichte und Theorie der Verkehrssoziologie*. Berlin: edition sigma.

Rapp, H. (2003). *Die Auswirkungen des täglichen Berufspendelns auf den psychischen und körperlichen Gesundheitszustand*. Ulm: Universität Ulm.

Rascle, N. (2001). *Le stress de la mobilité professionnelle. Rôle de diverses caractéristiques personnelles et contextuelles dans l'ajustement au stress de la mutation professionnelle*, PU du Septentrion.

Regnier-Loilier, A., & Beaujouan, E. (2006). Qui sont ces personnes qui ne vivent pas avec leur conjoint? *Communication au Colloque international de la section famille de l'AISLF*,

organisé en collaboration avec le CERLIS, 29-30 mai 2006 à la Sorbonne, Paris.

Reiss, D. (1971). Varieties of Consensual Experience, *Family Process*, 10, 1-35.

Reich, R. B. (1991). *Die neue Weltwirtschaft. Das Ende der nationalen Ökonomien*. Berlin: Ullstein.

Requena, F. (1991). *Redes sociales y mercado de trabajo, elementos para una teoría del capital relacional.* Madrid: CIS.

Requena, F. (1994). *Amigos y redes sociales: elementos para una sociología de la amistad.* Madrid: CIS.

Requena, F. (2005*). La estructura ocupacional española. Un análisis de la Encuesta de Calidad de Vida en el Trabajo*. Madrid: Ministerio de trabajo y Asuntos Sociales.

Rindfuss, R. R., & Stephen, E. H. (1990). Marital noncohabitation: Separation does not make the heart grow fonder. *Journal of marriage and the family*, 52, 259-270.

Robertson, R. (1992). *Globalization – Social theory and Global Culture*. London: Sage.

Robertson, R. (1995). Globalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity. In M. Featherstone, S. Lash & R. Robertson (Eds.), *Global modernities. From modernism to hypermodernism and beyond*. London: Sage, 25–44.

Robin, M., Laubarie, M., Roussel, S., & Wallaert, M. (2001). Mise au point et début de validation d'un échelle de stresseurs de la vie quotidienne chez les femmes actives. *Revue Européenne de Psychologie Appliquée*, 51, 255-266.

Ródenas, C. (1994). Migraciones interregionales en España, 1960-1989. *Revista de Economía Aplicada*, 2.

Rodler, C., & Kirchler, E. (2001). Everyday life of commuters` wives. In H. Brandstatter & E. Andrzej (Eds.), *Persons situations, and emotions. An ecological approach,*163-183, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rodrigo Soriano, M. S. (2005). *Nuevas formas de organización familiar: matrimonios a distancia*. (Tesis doctoral). Granada: Universidad de Granada.

Rodríguez Cabrero, G., & Sotelsek, D. (2002). *Apuntes sobre bienestar social*. Universidad de Alcalá: Alcalá de Henares.

Rolfes, M. (1996). *Regionale Mobilität und akademischer Arbeitsmarkt. Hochschulabsolventen beim Übergang vom Bildungs- in das Beschäftigungssystem und ihre potentielle und realisierte Mobilität*. Osnabrück: Rasch.

Roman, A., Schippers, J., Heylen, L., Mortelmans, D. i.s.m., & Booghmans, M. (2006). *Career breaks in Belgium: how they affect labor participation and individual careers*. Tilburg: OSA-Publicatie, Universiteit van Tilburg.

Romaniszyn, K. (2002). *Kulturowe implikacje międzynarodowych migracji [The cultural implications of the international migrations]*. Lublin: Instytut Badań nad Polonią i Duszpasterstwem Polonijnym KUL.

Rosenbaum, M. (1993). Independent mobility and children's right. In M. Hillman (Ed.), *Children, transport and the quality of life*. London: Policy Studies Institute, 19-27.

Rosińska-Kordasiewicz, A. (2005). *Praca pomocy domowej. Doświadczenie polskich migrantek w Neapolu [Domestic work. Experience of Polish migrant women in Naples]*. Warszawa: ISS CMR Working Paper 62.

Rouwendal, J. (1999). Spatial job search and commuting distances, *Regional Science and Urban Economics,* 29, 491–517.

Rouwendal, J., & Rietveld, P. (1994). Changes in commuting distances of Dutch households, *Urban Studies,* 31 (9), 1545 - 1557.

Ruíz Becerril, D. (2003). Cuando el trabajo separa: los matrimonios de fin de semana. *Portularia*, 3, 179-206.

Sacher, M. (1998). Berufseinstieg – gestern und heute. Ein Kohortenvergleich. In Friedrichs, J. (Ed.). *Die Individualisierungsthese*. Opladen, 165-180.

Sakson, B. (2001). Źródła pionierskiego łańcucha migracyjnego [The origins of the pioneer migration chain]. In E. Jazwinska & M. Okólski (Eds.), *Ludzie na huśtawce. Migracje między peryferiami Polski i Zachodu [People on the swing. The migrations between the Polish peripheries and the peripheries of the West]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.

Salom, J. et al. (1995). Análisis de la movilidad obligada por trabajo y estudio en la Comunidad Valenciana. *Censos de Población y Habitantes*. Monografías. Volumen II. Instituto Valenciano de Estadística, 71-166.

Salom, J., & Delios, E. (2000). Movilidad laboral como criterio de delimitación territorial: su aplicación en la Comunidad Valenciana. *Áreas urbanas y movilidad laboral en España*. Girona: Universitat de Girona.

Sánchez Gutiérrez, J. I. (2005). *La movilidad al trabajo como elemento de planificación y actividad económica de los usos residenciales y de actividad económica*. Tesis Doctoral. Madrid: Comunidad de Madrid.

Sanchez, T. W., Shen, Q., & Peng, Z.-R. (2004). Transit mobility, jobs access and low-income: Labour participation in US metropolitan areas. *Urban studies*, 41, 1313-1331.

Sarasa, S., & Moreno, L. (1995). *El Estado del bienestar en la Europa del Sur*. Madrid: Consejo Superior de investigaciones científicas IESA.

Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City*. New York, London, Tokio: Princeton University Press.

Sastre Cantero, M. J. ez al. (2003). *Indicadores de calidad de vida. Un retrato del bienestar en España*. Cuadernos y Actitudes, 47, Madrid: CIS.

Savage, L. J. (1954). *The Foundations of Statistics*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Schaeffer, M. H., Street, S. W., Singer, J. E., & Baum, A. (1988). Effects of control on the stress reactions of commuters. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology,* 18 (11), 944-957.

Scheiner, J. (2005a). *Arbeitspapier Nr. 12: Lebensstile und Lebenslage: Sind Lebensstile "eigensinnig" oder strukturell abhängig?*

Scheiner, J. (2005b): *Arbeitspapier Nr. 13: Lebensstile, Standortbewertungen und Wohnmobilität.*

Scheiner, J. (2005c): *Arbeitspapier Nr. 14: Wohnen und Verkehr.*

Schlich, R., Schönfelder, S. Hanson, S., & Axhausen, K. W. (2004). The structures of leisure travel: Temporal and spatial variability. *Transport Reviews* 24 (4), 219-228.

Schmitz, S. (2001). Micro-analyse des mécanismes de la reprise démographiques des villages de l'Ardenne du Nord-Est: le cas de Burtonville. *Espaces, Populations et Sociétés*, 1-2, 171-179.

Schmitz, S. (2004). Nouvelles mobilités et réseaux sociaux locaux en milieu rural. In B. Montulet & V. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Mobilités, fluidités,...libertés ?* Bruxelles: Publication des Facultés Saint-Louis, 65.

Schneewind, K. (1999). *Familienpsychologie*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Schneider, B. (1999). Life in working families: views of parents and their children, *Chicago Sloan Conference*. Chicago, IL.

Schneider, N. F. (2002). Zur Lage und Zukunft der Familie in Deutschland. *Gesellschaft-Wirtschaft-Politik 4*, 511-544.

Schneider, N. F. (2003). *Berufsmobilität und ihre Folgen*, Symposium Teil 5, Düsseldorf,1-18.

Schneider, N. F. (2005). Leben an zwei Orten - die Folgen beruflicher Mobilität für Familie und Partnerschaft. *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung* (Sonderheft 5), 110-126.

Schneider, N. F., Limmer, R., & Ruckdeschel, K. (2002a). Berufsmobilität und Lebensform: sind berufliche Mobilitätserfordernisse in Zeiten der Globalisierung noch mit Familie vereinbar? *Schriftenreihe des Bundesministeriums für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend* (8-2001).

Schneider, N. F., Limmer, R., & Ruckdeschel, K. (2002b). *Mobil, flexibel, gebunden: Familie und Beruf in der mobilen Gesellschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Schönfelder, S. & Axhausen, K. W. (2003). Activity spaces: measures of social exclusion?. *Transport Policy* 10 (4), 273-286.

Schönfelder, S. & Axhausen, K. W. (2004). Structure and innovation of human activity spaces. *Arbeitsberichte Verkehrs- und Raumplanung, 258*. Zürich: IVT, ETH.

Schuler, M. et al**.** (1997). *Atlas structurel de la Suisse*. Zurich: Verlag Neue Zürcher Zeitung.

Schuler, M., & Kaufmann, V. (2006). Pendularité à longue distance, la vitesse des transports comme facteur structurant de l'urbain. *DISP* 126, Zürich.

Schuler, M., & Kaufmann, V. (2005). Les transports publics à l'épreuve des mutations de la pendularité. *DISP* 161, Zürich.

Schulz, F., & Blossfeld, H.-P. (2006): Wie verändert sich die häusliche Arbeitsteilung im Eheverlauf? Eine Längsschnittstudie der ersten 14 Ehejahre in Westdeutschland. *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 58 (1), 23-49

Schulz, U. (2003). *Die soziale Konstitution von Raum und Mobilität im jugendkulturellen Alltag*. Dortmund: Universität Dortmund, Dissertation.

Schulze, G. (1993). *Die Erlebnisgesellschaft. Kultursoziologie der Gegenwart*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Schumacher, J., Klaiberg, A., & Brähler, E. (2003). Diagnostik von Lebensqualität und Wohlbefinden. Eine Einführung. In J. Schumacher, A. Klaiberg & E. Brähler (Eds.), *Diagnostische Verfahren zu Lebensqualität und Wohlbefinden* (1-18), Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Schumacher, J., Laubach, W., & Brähler, E. (1995). Wie zufrieden sind wir mit unserem Leben? Soziodemographische und psychologische Prädiktoren der allgemeinen und bereichsspezifischen Lebenszufriedenheit. *Zeitschrift für Medizinische Psychologie*, 1, 17-25.

Schwanen, T., Dieleman, F. M., & Dijst, M. (2001). Travel behaviour in Dutch monocentric and polycentric urban systems. *Journal of Transport Geography,* 9, 173-186.

Schwanen, T., Dieleman, F.M., & Dijst, M. (2004a). The Impact of metropolitan structures on commute behaviour in the Netherlands: a multi-level approach, *Growth and Change,* 35 ( 3), 304-333.

Schwanen, T.,  Dijst, M., & Dieleman, F. M. (2004b) Policies for urban form and their impact on travel: The Netherlands experience. *Urban Studies,* 41 (3), 579-603.

Sencebe, Y. (2004). Etre ici, être d'ici, les formes d'appartenances dans le Diois (Drôme). *Ethnologie française*, 4-1, 23-29.

Sencébé, Y. (2006). Mobilités quotidiennes et ancrages périurbains : attrait pour la campagne ou retrait de la ville? In M. Bonnet & P. Aubertel (Eds.), *La ville aux limites de la mobilité*. PUF, Paris, 153-160.

Sennett, R. (1998). *Der flexible Mensch. Die Kultur des neuen Kapitalismus*. Berlin: Berlin-Verlag.

Sheller, M. (2003). *Consuming the Carebbean*. London, New York: Routledge.

Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and Planning A,* (forthcoming).

Sieber, S. D. (1974). Toward a theory of role accumulation. *American Sociological Review*, 39, 567-78.

Simmel, G. (1900). Persönliche und sachliche Kultur. *Neue Deutsche Rundschau (Freie Bühne)*, 11-2 (1900, 3rd/4th quarter), 7, 700–712.

Simmel, G. (1903). Die Grosstädte und das Geistesleben. In Th. Petermann (Ed.), *Die Grossstadt. Vorträge und Aufsätze zur Städteausstellung*. Dresden, 9, 185–206.

Simmel, G. (1992). *Soziologie. Untersuchung über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung*. 11. Edition, edited by Rammstedt, O., Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Simmel, G. (1995). *Schriften zur Soziologie. Eine Auswahl*. edited by Dahme, H.-J., & Rammstedt, O., Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Simmel, G. (2000). *Philosophie des Geldes*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, (orig. 1901).

Simón Alfonso, L., & Rejado, M. (2000). *Familias y bienestar social*. Valencia: Tirant lo Blanch.

Simon, H. A. (1957). A behavioral model of Rational Choice. In H. A. Simon (Ed.), *Models of man. Social and rational*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Simon, H. A. (1982). *Models of bounded rationality*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

Simon, H. A. (1991). *Models of my life*. New York: Basic Books.

Singly, F. de. (2000). *Libres ensemble. L'individualisme dans la vie commune*. Paris: Nathan.

Singly, F. de. (2003). *Les uns et les autres. Quand l'individualisme crée du lien*. Armand Colin, Paris.

Sjaastad, L. A. (1962). The costs and returns of human migration. *Journal of Political Economy*, 70, 80–93.

Sklair, L. (1991). *Sociology of the Global System*. London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Slany, K. (1997). Gotowość wyjazdowa Polaków. Portret demograficzny i psycho-społeczny potencjalnego emigranta [The migration inclinations of Poles. The demographic and socio-psychological portrait of the migrant to be]. In J. Zamojski (Ed.), *Migracje i Społeczeństwo. Zbiór studiów*. 2. *[Migrations and Society. The collection of studies]*. Warszawa: IH PAN.

Slany, K. (1997). *Orientacje emigracyjne Polaków [The emigration orientations of Poles]*. Kraków: WUJ.

Slany, K. (2002). *Alternatywne formy życia małżeńsko rodzinnego w ponowoczesnym świecie [The alternative forms of partnership and parenthood in the postmodern world]*. Kraków: Nomos.

Słodczyk, J., & Rajchel, D. (2004). *Przemiany demograficzne i jakość życia ludności miast [The demographic changes and the quality if life of the urban dwellerst.* Opole: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Opolskiego.

Smith, A. (1776). *An inquiry into the nature and causes of the wealth of nations*. 4. Edition, Edinburgh.

Soens, N., Buyens, D., De Vos, A., Heylen, L., Kuppens, A., Mortelmans, D., & Van Puyvelde, I. (2005). *Belgische loopbanen in kaart: traditioneel of transitioneel?* Gent: Academia Press

Solga, B. (2002). *Migracje polsko-niemieckie i ich konsekwencje społeczno-ekonomiczne na obszarach wiejskich Śląska Opolskiego [The polish – german migrations and their consequences for the rural areas of Opolskie Silesia]*. Opole: Instytut Śląski.

Spector, P. E., Cooper, C. L., & Sanchez, J. I. (2001). Do national levels of individualism and internal locus of control relate to well-being: an ecological level international study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 22*, 815–832.

Spranger, E. (1914). *Lebensformen. Ein Entwurf*. Halle: Niemeyer.

Stadler, P., Fastenmeier, W., Gstalter, H., & Lau, J. (2000). Beeinträchtigt der Berufsverkehr das Wohlbefinden und die Gesundheit von Berufstätigen? Eine empirische Studie zu Belastungsfolgen durch den Berufsverkehr. *Zeitschrift für Verkehrssicherheit, 46*, 56–66.

Stanfield, J. B. (1996). *Married with careers: coping with role strain*. Aldershot, England: Avebury Ashgate Publishing Limited.

Stassen, J.-F. (2001). La pertinence du questionnement sur la sexuation du contexte à l'épreuve du fonctionnement familial. In *Famille contemporaines en Suisse: cohésion, régulation et conflits*. Programme prioritaire FNSRS "Demain la Suisse".

Steg, L., & Kalfs, N. (2000). *Altijd weer die auto! Sociaal- en gedragswetenschappelijk onderzoek en het verkeers- en vervoerbeleid*. Den Haag: Sociaal en Cultureel Planbureau & Adviesdienst Verkeer en Vervoer.

Steyaert, J. (2003). Je chat met de hele wereld, maar kent je buurman niet meer. In J. de Haan & J. Steyaert (Eds.), *ICT en samenleving, jaarboek 2003*. Amsterdam: Boom.

Stilwell, D., Liden, R., Parsons, C., & Deconinck, J. (1998). Transfer decision making: different decision models depending on the transfer conditions? *Journal of organizational behavior*, 19, 539-557.

Strauss, W., & Howe, N. (1991). *Generations: The history of America's future, 1584 to 2069*. New York: William Morrow Publisher.

Stutzer, A., & Frey, B. S. (2004). *Stress that doesn't pay: The commuting paradox*. Retrieved May 15, 2006, from http://www.iew.unizh.ch/wp/iewwp151.pdf

Susino, J. (2006). *Movilidad residencial: procesos demográficos, estrategias familiares y estructura social*. Madrid: Centro de Investigaciones Sociológicas. (En prensa).

Sygnowski, G. ( 2004). Gotowość migracyjna studentów państwowych szkół wyższych [The migration readiness of the Polish public universities students]. In *Migracje zarobkowe*

*polskiej młodzieży. Badania i analizy [Economic migrations of the Polish youth. The research and analysis]*. Warszawa: Urząd Komitetu Integracji Europejskiej. Departament Analiz Ekonomicznych i Społecznych.

Szajnowska-Wysocka, A. (1999). *Zachowania przestrzenne ludności konurbacji górnośląskiej [The spatial behaviour of the urban Upper Silesia]*. Katowice: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Szewczyk, A. (2004). *Informacja w walce z bezrobociem [Information on fighting unemployment]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Szymańska, D. (Ed.). (1998). *Ruchliwość przestrzenna ludności w okresie przemian ustrojowych [The spatial mobility of people in the period of transformation]*. Toruń: Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika.

Tacken, M. (1998). Mobility of the elderly in time and space in the Netherlands: An analysis of the Dutch National Travel Survey. *Transportation 25*, 379–393.

Talbot, J. (2001). Les déplacements domicile-travail. De plus en plus d'actifs travaillent loin de chez eux. *Insee Première*, 767, avril.

Tarrius, A. (2000). *Les nouveaux cosmopolitismes. Mobilités, identités, territoires*. Eds. de l'Aube.

Thiry, C. (2004). Virtualités et logique spatio-temporelles. In B. Montulet & V. Kaufmann (Eds.), *Mobilités, fluidités,... libertés ?*. Bruxelles, Publication des Facultés Saint-Louis, 121-135.

Thomas, W., & Znaniecki, F. (1976). *Chłop polski w Europie i Ameryce [Polish peasant in Europe and America]. 4. Dezorganizacja i reorganizacja w Polsce [Disorganizartion and reorganization in Poland]*. Warszawa : Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.

Thomas, W., & Znaniecki, F. (1976). *Chłop polski w Europie i Ameryce[Polish peasant in Europe and America] 2. Organizacja grupy pierwotnej [Organization of the primary group]*. Warszawa: Ludowa Spółdzielnia Wydawnicza.

Thomsin, L. (2002). *Télétravail et mobilités*. Liège: Editions de l'Université de Liège.

Thrift, N. (2004). *Movement-Space: The development of new kinds of spatial awareness. Vortrag auf der Konferenz "Alternative Mobilities Futures"*, Januar. Lancaster.

Thurow, L. C. (2004). *Die Zukunft der Weltwirtschaft*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Tobío, C. (2005). *Madres que trabajan. Dilemas y estrategias*. Madrid: Cátedra.

Toffler, A. (1980). *The Third Wave*. New York: William Morrow and Company.

Tönnies, F. (1988). *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft*. Grundbegriffe der reinen Soziologie. Darmstadt, (orig. 1887).

Touraine, A. (1969). *La société postindustrielle.* Paris: Denoel.

Trendence (Institut für Personalmarketing), (2005). *Das Absolventbarometer* - Deutsche Law Edition.

Trinidad, A. (2005). *La realidad económica y social de las personas mayores: los jubilados tradicionales y los nuevos jubilados*. Madrid: Instituto de Estudios Económicos.

Tully, C. J. (Ed.) (1999). *Erziehung zu Mobilität. Jugendliche in der automobilen Gesellschaft.* Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Turner, T., & Niemeier, D. (1997). Travel to work and household responsibility: new evidence. *Transportation*, 24, 397-419.

Tylor, E. B. (1974). *Primitive culture: researches into the development of mythology, philosophy, religion, art, and custom*. New York: Gordon Press.

Tyrell, H. (1988). Ehe und Familie − Institutionalisierung und Deinstitutionalisierung. In K. Lüscher, F. Schultheiß & M. Wehrspaun (Eds.). *Die "postmoderne" Familie*. Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 145−156.

Ugoiti, J. M. (1999). *Infraestructuras y crecimiento económico*. Madrid: Fundación para el Análisis y los Estudios Sociales. (Papeles de la Fundación, 52).

Urry, J. (1990). *The Tourist Gaze*. London: Sage.

Urry, J. (2000a). *Sociology beyond societies. Mobilities for the 21ˢᵗ Century*. London: Routledge.

Urry, J. (2000b). Mobile sociology. *British Journal of Sociology*, 1, 185−203.

Urry, J. (2003a). Social networks, travel and talk. *British Journal of Sociology,* 54 (2), 155-175.

Urry, J. (2003b). *Global complexity*. Cambridge: Policy Press.

Urry, J. (2004). The new mobilities paradigm. In W. Bonß, S. Kesselring & G. Vogl (Eds.), *Mobility and the cosmopolitan perspective. Documentation of a workshop at the Reflexive Modernization Research Centre* (SFB 536, 25−36). Retrieved August 1, 2006, from http://www.cosmobilities.net

Van Ommeren, J. (1998). On-the-job search behavior: the importance of commuting time. *Land Economics*, 74, 526.

Van Ommeren, J., Rietveld, P., & Nijkamp, P. (1997). Commuting: in search of jobs and residences. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 42, 402.

Van Rij, C., Pol, M., Linderhof, V., & Meurs, H. (2002). *Mobiliteit door de tijd*. Rotterdam: Rijkswaterstaat.

Vendramin, P. (2004). Temps, travail, inégalités : les parents et les autres. *Tempos*, 2.

Vendramin P. (2005). Rythmes de travail, temps et genre − Pour une approche collective et novatrice du temps. Collectif, *L'ère du temps*. Bruxelles: Couleurs livre, 43-64.

Vermeulen, W. (2003). *A model for Dutch commuting*. CPB Report 2003/1.

Verstraete, G., & Cresswell, T. (2002). Mobilizing place, placing mobility. *Thamyris, intersecting*. 9, Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Verwiebe, R., & Müller, M. C. (2006). Gelungene Integration in den Arbeitsmarkt? Die flexiblen Biographien transnational mobiler Europäer zu Beginn des 21. Jahrhunderts. *Berliner Journal*, 10 (1), 95-114.

Vigar, G. (2002). *The Politics of Mobility*. London: Spon.

Vignal, C. (2002). Mobilités, migrations et ancrages face à la délocalisation de l'emploi. Paper presented at the AISLF conférence *Mobilités familiales au quotidien*, October 10-12, Lausanne.

Vignal, C. (2005a). Injonctions à la mobilité, arbitrages résidentiels et délocalisation de l'emploi. *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, CXVIII, 101-117.

Vignal, C. (2005b). Logiques professionnelles et logiques familiales: une articulation contrainte par la délocalisation de l'emploi. *Sociologie du travail*, 47, 153-169.

Vignal C. (2005c). Les espaces familiaux à l'épreuve de la délocalisation de l'emploi: ancrages et mobilités de salariés de l'industrie. *Espaces et Sociétés,* 120-121.

Villeneuve-Gokalp, C. (1997). Vivre en couple chacun chez soi. *Population*, 5, 1052-1082.

Voß, G. G., & Pongratz, H. J. (1998). Der Arbeitskraftunternehmer. Eine neue Grundform der Ware Arbeitskraft? *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie*, 50, 131–158.

Voydanoff, P. (2005). Work demands and work-to-family and family-to-work conflict: Direct and indirect relationships. *Journal of family issues*, 26, 707-726.

Vrooman, J. C. (Ed.) (2001). *Netwerken en Sociaal Kapitaal*. SISWO/NSV-reeks.

Wagner, M. (1989). *Räumliche Mobilität im Lebensverlauf: eine empirische Untersuchung sozialer Bedingungen der Migration*. Stuttgart: Enke.

Walby (1997). *Gender Transformations*. London: Routledge.

Ward, R. A. (1993). Marital happiness and household equity in later life. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 427.

Waters, M. (1995). *Globalization*. London: Routledge.

Weber, E. G. (2005). Geographic relocation frequency, resilience, and military adolescent behavior. *Military medicine*, 170, 638-642.

Weber, M. (1980). *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. Grundriß der verstehenden Soziologie*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, (orig. 1921).

Weiß, A. (2005). The transnationalization of social inequality. Conceptualizing social positions on a wolrd scale. *Current Sociology*, 52 (4), 707-728.

Wel, F. van, & Knijn, T. (2006). Transitional phase or a new balance? Working and caring by mothers with young children in the Netherlands, *Journal of Family Issues,* 27 (5), 633-651.

Wellman, B. (2001). Physical place and cyberplace: the rise of personalised networking. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 25 (2), 227-252.

Wellman, B. (2002). Little boxes, glocalization, and networked individualism. In M. Tanabe, P. van den Besselaar & T. Ishida (Eds.), *Digital cities II: computational and sociological approaches*. Berlin: Springer.

Wellman, B., & Haythornthwaite, C. (Eds.) (2002). *Internet in everyday life*. London: Blackwell.

Wendl, P. (2004). *Fern-Beziehungen - Krise und gelingende Partnerschaft? Eine Problemstudie. Orientierungen für die seelsorgerliche Begleitung von Soldaten und deren Partnern bei Fern-Beziehungen (Auslandseinsatz und Wochenendbeziehung)*: KMBA-ZFG.

Wendl, P. (2005a). Herausforderung Fern-Beziehung? Partnerschaft auf Distanz von Soldaten und deren Partnern bei Auslandseinsätzen. In G. Kümmel (Ed.), *Diener zweier Herren. Soldaten zwischen Bundeswehr und Familie* (123-147). Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Wendl, P. (2005b). *Gelingende Fernbeziehung. Entfernt zusammen wachsen*. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder.

Werner, H. (2002). Korreferat. In L. Bellmann & J. Velling (Eds.), *Arbeitsmärkte für Hochqualifizierte* (311-316). Nürnberg.

West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1993). Power, inequality, and the accomplishment of gender: an ethnomethodological view. In P. England (Ed.), *Theory on gender/Feminism on Theory* (151-174). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

West, C., & Zimmerman, Don H. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender & Society*, 1, 125–151.

West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender and Society*, 9, 8-37.

Widmer, E. D., Kellerhals, J., & Levy, R. (2003). *Couples contemporains: Cohésion, régulation et conflits. Une enquête sociologique.* Zurich: Seismo.

Widmer, E. D., Kellerhals, J., & Levy, R. (2004a). Quelle pluralisation des relations familiales? Conflits, styles d'interactions conjugales et milieu social. *Revue française de Sociologie,* 45 (1), 37-67.

Widmer, E. D., Kellerhals, J., & Levy, R. (2004b). Types of conjugal networks, conjugal conflict and conjugal quality. *European Sociological Review*, 20 (1), 63-77.

Widmer, E. D., Kellerhals, J., & Levy, R. (2006). Types of conjugal interactions and conjugal conflict: A longitudinal assessment. *European Sociological Review*, 22 (1), 79-89.

Wilkie, J. R., Ferree, M. M., & Ratcliff, K. S. (1998). Gender and fairness: Marital satisfaction in two-earner couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 60, 577-594.

Williams, M. A., & Hall, C. M. (2000). Tourism and Migration: New relationships between production and consumption. *Tourism Geographies* 2 (1), 5-27.

Williams, M.A., King, R., Warnes, A., & Patters, G. (2000). Tourism and international retirement migration: New forms of an old relationship in Southern Europe. *Tourism Geographies* 2 (1), 28-49.

Winkelmann, R. (2002). Die Nachfrage nach international hoch qualifizierten Beschäftigten - Ergebnisse des IZA International Employer Surveys 2000. In L. Bellmann & J. Velling (Eds.), *Arbeitsmärkte für Hochqualifizierte*. Nürnberg: Institut für Arbeitsmarkt- und Berufsforschung der Bundesanstalt für Arbeit, 283-316.

Wittel, A. (2001). Toward a network sociality. *Theory, Culture & Society,* 18 (6), 51-76.

Wojtan, D. (1997). *Sytuacja wychowawcza w rodzinie z czasową nieobecnością ojca [The upbringing situation in the family where father is temporarily absent]*. Unpublished M.A. thesis, Stalowa Wola: filia WNS KUL.

Wolff, F. C., & Attias-Donfut, C. (2005). L'impact des transferts intergénérationnels sur les choix immobiliers. *Revue Française des affaires sociales*, 4, oct-déc.

Wolpert, J. (1965). Behavioral aspects of the decision to migrate. *Papers and proceedings of the Regional Science Association*, 15, 159-169.

Wolter, A. (1997). *Globalisierung der Beschäftigung: multinationale Unternehmen als Kanal der Wanderung Höherqualifizierter innerhalb Europas*. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verl.-Gesellschaft.

Wyborcza (2006). Kto ma szanse na duże pieniądze w Europie? [Who has got chances for big money in Europe?] Gazeta Praca. *Gazeta Wyborcza,* 24, 638.

Wyly, E. K. (1998). Containment and mismatch: gender differences in commuting in metropolitan labor markets. *Urban Geography*, 19, 395.

Wyly, E. K. (1999). Local labor markets and occupational sex segregation in an American metropolis. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 21, 1.

Yankow, J. J. (2003). Migration, job change, and wage growth: A new perspective on the pecuniary return to geographic mobility. *Journal of regional science*, 43, 483-516.

Zax, J. S. (1991). The substitution between moves and quits. *The economic journal*, 101, 1510-1521.

Zax, J. S., & Kain, J. F. (1996). Moving to the suburbs: Do relocation companies leave their black employees behind? *Journal of labor economics*, 14, 472-504.

Zühlke, S. (2000). *Beschäftigungschancen durch berufliche Mobilität: Arbeitslosigkeit, Weiterbildung und Berufswechsel in Ostdeutschland*. Berlin: edition sigma.

Zürn, M. (1998). *Regieren jenseits des Nationalstaates*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.