

Chapter 6

New Working Practices: Identity, Agency and the Emotional Experience of Remote Working

Jennifer Wilkinson and Carol Jarvis

Introduction

Within management studies remote working is becoming an increasingly popular topic and research within the area has grown over the last 10 years. However, little has been written about the emotional experience of remote working from the perspective of remote workers. This chapter develops critical debate about the emotional experience of remote workers and explores the interplay between identity and perceptions of agency, and the ensuing emotions. In the context of this chapter the notion of agency is explored in relation to how remote workers perceive their level of choice in whether, and/ or when, to work remotely.

Literature review

Terms such as Teleworking (e.g. Daniels, Lamond and Standen, 2001; Tietze, 2002; Baruch, 2001; DiMartino and Wirth, 1990), virtual office (e.g. Helms and Raiszadeh, 2002), virtual working (e.g. Jackson, 1999), telecommuting (e.g. Tomaskovic-Devey, and Risman, 1993), home working (e.g. Baruch and Nicholson, 1997; Tietze and Musson, 2002b), and location independence working (e.g. Shapiro, 2000), are used, often interchangeably, to depict a way of working that is carried out outside of the office of the employing organization.. Much of

the literature suggests that definitions rely on three core concepts: organization; location; and technology (e.g. DiMartino and Wirth, 1990; Baruch, 2001; Tietze, 2002). Daniels et al (2001) propose that a fourth core concept, knowledge, can be added as it identifies a specific type/ level of cerebral work that is undertaken. These four core concepts form the basis of how we use the term ‘remote worker’ in this chapter. This raises questions as to how remote workers know they work for an organization, bringing to the fore issues of identity.

Thompson (1995: 674) defines identity as “the quality or condition of being a specified person or thing” and as unique to individuals, whilst Knights and Willmott (1999: 19) state that “the identity of an individual (or a group) is dependent on how s/he is regarded and represented by others” suggesting not only that identity is unique but that it is also borne out of comparative interaction with others. Thus, who we are – our sense of self – is a product of the society and culture with which we engage (McLeod, 1994; 1999) where, identity is not fixed but rather constantly evolving (Hall, 2000). Changing the way work is organized requires remote workers to continually, to varying degrees, change the ‘culture’ and ‘society’ with which they engage. Thus for remote workers identity is under continual (re)construction.

At an organizational level Hall, Schneider, and Nygren, (1970) suggest that identity is achieved through personal and organization orientation being consistent. When remote workers compare their own orientation to that of the organization and conclude they ‘want the same things’ (have consistent orientation), it can be argued the remote worker perceives s/he has choice in “producing, understanding and transforming the social and natural world”

(Knights and Willmott, 1999: 163) of the organization. This perception of choice translates to agency when the power to act is present, for, as Giddens (1984: 9) notes:

Agency refers not to the intentions people have in doing things but to their capability of doing those things in the first place (which is why agency implies power...).

The change in work organisation brought about by adopting a remote working strategy leads remote workers to seek alternative cues through which to undertake identity work (cf. Fineman, Maitlis, and Panteli, 2007; Hall, 1996). Furthermore, literature (cf. Sanchez-Burks and Huy, 2009; Seo, Taylor and Hill, 2007) along with our own experiences and the experiences of remote workers, tell us this identity work elicits emotional responses; emotions are “a kind of ‘universal language’ that binds humanity together into a single family” (Evans, 2001: xiv) and are vital for survival. The embedded nature of emotions is also supported by Fineman (2000: 1) when he notes:

Workaday frustrations and passions – boredom, envy, fear, love, anger, guilt, infatuation, embarrassment, nostalgia, anxiety – are deeply woven into the way roles are enacted and learned, power is exercised, trust is held, commitment formed and decisions made. Emotions are not simply excisable from these, and many other, organizational processes; they both characterize and inform them.

This chapter explores the everyday emotions experienced by remote workers and their interplay with how participants perceive their level of choice in whether, and/ or when, to work remotely (different perceptions of agency).

Research approach

Purposive sampling (Bryman, 2008) was used to select participants and fifteen individuals who consider themselves remote workers volunteered to participate. Of these, nine were male and six were female. Five were employed within the public sector in specialist/ professional roles. The remaining ten worked within the private sector, where eight had sales based roles and two had technology based roles.

Participants attached a range of meaning to remote working. For all of them it meant working at home at some point coupled with working in a main office of the organisation and/ or client sites. The frequency with which remote working was undertaken ranged from happening twice a month (three participants), through three times a week (two participants), to being ‘all day, every day’ (ten participants).

In this research we are concerned with attempting to understand the experience of remote working from the participant’s own frame of reference, using interview; mind maps; and diaries. During interviews notes were taken in the form of a simple mind map (Mento, Martinelli, and Jones, 1999) that captured emergent themes and they were developed collaboratively (Reason, 1999) with the participant post interview. Away from participants,

template analysis and thematic coding (King, 2004) was undertaken in order to identify patterns within the data.

Data Collection and Analysis

Identity and Agency:

All participants in our research do, to varying degrees, work remotely, and thus have to cope with the less frequent physical presence of their colleagues; with not seeing them regularly. The removal of visual social cues and organization stimuli, paraphernalia or artefacts (Schein, 1985), means that remote workers have to speculate about what colleagues are doing and be more proactive in generating, or uncovering, organizational stimuli than those who work in a more traditional office environment. The following exchange in interview typifies, and succinctly captures, responses from participants:

Interviewer: How do you know that you work for your organization?

Duncan: How does anybody know that they work for an organization, good question, because you are mentioned in dispatches, because you are required to be involved; your businesses interacts with you. They pay you, so that must mean something [TANGIBLE SIGNS]. But as general rule you can become pretty anonymous [VISIBILITY]. But I guess it's just through interactivity really, you know you work for a business because people [SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS] have got demands on you, so that you know that you are part of an organization.

As highlighted in the quote above, three dominant themes emerged from the data in relation to identity: tangible signs, social relationships, and visibility. For remote workers, losing their ‘social barometer’ can leave them “feeling unsure of themselves and less confident in their abilities” (Mann, Varey and Button, 2000: 679). Consequently social cues - tangible signs, social relationships and visibility – take on increased importance for remote workers as they engage in identity work.

When discussing identity, participants embedded the issue of choice within discussion. Some participants perceived that they chose to work remotely, others perceived remote working as being imposed upon them, and some participants swayed between the two perceptions. We relate this to Giddens’ (1984) concept of agency, where he explicitly links agency to power, so that when participants perceive that they choose to work remotely we suggest they experience having agency in relation to remote working. As Sally puts it, for example:

Sally: Well it is my choice to work from home

When they perceive that remote working has been imposed upon them we suggest their experience is one of lacking agency in relation to remote working, for example Kieran comments:

Kieran: whilst we weren’t told the offices were going to shut we all pretty much believed that they were but we didn’t know what was going to happen to us

The following quote highlights explicitly how some remote workers sway between perceptions of remote working as choice and as imposition, which is our third participant group where their experience is one of having and lacking agency in relation to remote working:

Neil: When I was working at [a previous organisation] they decided in order to cut costs they would do away with the local area office and all the consultants would work from home...[later in interview]... You may live in a three bedroom property and you might not have a spare room and you have to work on the kitchen table because one of the guys has to do that and they were forced to do it as well but I mean, I have the choice you see, I can either work in the office or work from home so we decided that I would do two days in the office which is good, I mean I could do four days, three days

Patterns within the data between perceptions of choosing to work remotely (agency) and how participants engage in identity work started to emerge. The following tables provide a range of comments from participants in relation to perceptions of agency and the social cues remote workers engage with so as to undertake identity work:

[INSERT TABLE 6.1 HERE]

[INSERT TABLE 6.2 HERE]

[INSERT TABLE 6.3 HERE]

Clear patterns emerge in the social cues that are used most frequently by participants; those who perceive they have agency tend to make most reference to issues of visibility, whilst those who perceive they lack agency tend to pay more attention to social relationships and those who perceive they both have and lack agency tend to focus on tangible signs. We explore these patterns below.

Through the patterns which emerged from the data, intra-organization contact – as a form of ‘visibility’ - is mentioned extensively by those participants who perceive that they have agency in relation to the choice over whether and/ or when to remote work, whilst tangible signs and social relationships are not referenced to the same extent. For example, comments such as the following made by Sally indicate that for those who perceive that they have agency, visibility (via intra-organization contact) is very important to how they undertake identity work with the organization:

Sally: I think the key thing is to work with other people, you occasionally have a week where you are at home all week and it is fantastic because I can really get a lot of things done...but I would find by the end of the week that you sort of you need to speak to other people and you need to get some input... Even if you can speak to them on the phone it does help.

However, those participants who perceive they lack agency in relation to the choice over whether and/or when to remote work do most of their identity work around social relationships, so supporting the argument made by Knights and Willmott (1985: 27) that social relationships are a necessity of identity and involve ‘a securing of self through an instrumental participation in social relations’. This is suggested by friendships (social relationships) being mentioned extensively by all of these participants in relation to, identity whilst tangible signs and visibility are not referenced to the same extent. For example, Elliott made the following comment:

Elliott: a number of my people, like college friends, would be working from home or working for themselves or a combination of the two and you might say well we’ll meet up and play 9 holes of golf one night in the week. Whereas if you were in the office you could never have done that

Moreover, those participants who move between having and lacking agency in relation to the choice over whether and/ or when to remote work do most of their identity work around tangible signs. This is suggested by the extent to which pay and office location/ furniture are referenced by these participants in relation to tangible signs, whilst social relationships and visibility are referenced to a lesser extent. For example Ivan highlights these in the following:

Ivan: Hopefully my monthly salary cheque keeps arriving that is the most definitive thing [knowing that I work for the organization], but also my travel subsistence gets paidI have one room, reserved a bedroom, for working from home, I have two filing cabinets, a desk, a

telephone, fax, a computer PC – a desktop and I also have a lap-top
when I am working away from home

In losing their social barometer (Mann et al, 2000), remote workers (re)create social cues and support identity work by re-establishing opportunities for comparison (Knights and Willmott, 1999). In this way we suggest that the identity work undertaken by remote workers varies in relation to the remote workers' perception of their agency over whether and/ or when to work remotely. This also highlighted a variety of emotions that they experienced in relation to perceptions of agency explored further in the following section.

Agency and the Emotional Experience of the Remote Worker

Understanding emotions as being a “‘universal language’ that binds humanity together into a single family” (Evans, 2001, p.xiv) embeds them in the fabric of society and organizational processes (Fineman, 2000). The following extract from a research interview captures four dominant emotions that emerged from the data and highlights the various emotions explored within this chapter (thematic coding in parenthesis):

Interviewer: How do you find it working with colleagues if you don't see them face to face?

Duncan: A little bit frustrating because...people can say no very easily across the telephone but face to face and you get that pressure and they can't find it quite as easy to say that, so perhaps a level of frustration to get them to do things for you [FRUSTRATION]...

...I think that many of my colleagues who are home based, we all share in that same experience when we come together, it is almost like we are ravenous to share information, and talk to each other about things because we haven't seen each other for ages it is like long lost friends and there can be often two or three weeks go by before we actually do see each other [ISOLATION]...

...perhaps for people who are office based it is about freedom isn't it? working from home [FREEDOM], but in actual fact it works the opposite way for me, I must feel guilty, but I have to sort of overwork to compensate for that [GUILT].

It is through the emotions of guilt; isolation; frustration; and freedom, which emerged from data, that the emotional experiences of remote workers are considered in relation to whether, for the remote worker, there is interplay between them and different perceptions of agency (Giddens, 1984). Participants are divided into two groups: have agency and lack agency, as outlined previously. During analysis of data in relation to emotional experience, it has been possible to identify emotions in relation to one or other of a participant's state of perceived agency. As such participants who were earlier interpreted as perceiving that they both have and lack agency appear in both groupings.

The patterns which emerged from the data suggest that guilt and isolation are experienced most often by those participants who have agency, and that frustration and freedom are experienced most often by those participants who lack agency.

In considering agency and guilt, it can be seen that whilst the participants perceived they had agency in deciding whether and/ or when to work remotely they also had a feeling that they were in some way misleading someone (ie the organization or partner) if they enact this agency and make a decision to do something other than work. As highlighted by Diane in the following:

Diane: [I] feel that finishing before 5 would be cheating the company and colleagues and there's lots to do! Basically [I] would feel guilty if [I] finished before 5

As such, clock-based temporal ordering (Tietze and Musson, 2003) was used by participants to avoid guilt where participants suggest that they keep a note of the hours that they worked and 'make sure' that they do more rather than less. For example, in her diary Diane mentioned that she attended a hospital appointment but notes:

Diane: 'don't feel guilty re this as 'owed' time'

Furthermore, the relationship between guilt and agency was noted explicitly by Sally who, post interview, stated that:

Sally: it's important that it's your own decision to work from home and that it's not forced: that stops feelings of guilt; I have chosen to do this

Taken alone Sally's comment above appears to contradict the claim that feelings of guilt are heightened for participants who perceive they have agency in deciding whether and/ or when to work remotely. However, the context in which it was mentioned refers to how remote working enables her to do more work than if she were in the office in turn enabling her to attend to non-work commitments:

Sally: Working from home...you don't get distracted by lots of things and you can get on ... Like when I went out to [my daughters] assembly you can sort of fit those sorts of things in which is good.

This context suggests that, for Sally, the opportunity to complete more work than she would if she were to go to the office is stopping feelings of guilt arising rather than the choice over whether to remote work stopping feelings of guilt.

The freedom afforded through the structural flexibility of working from home is a reason for which remote working is often undertaken, yet it is this very freedom that can leave remote workers feeling guilty and that they need to 'justify' or 'prove' that they are doing their job, especially if they enact their agency and take time off to undertake personal tasks at times where they think 'other' people would expect them to be 'at work'. The following extract supports the notion that remote workers feel that they need to prove (and be believed) that they are at work when they are at home:

Duncan: you get sick of listening to that: 'Sorry to bother you, you must be out in the garden or a similar story'. Perhaps for people who are office based it is about freedom, isn't it, working from home; but in actual fact it works the opposite way for me, I must feel guilty, but I

have to sort of overwork to compensate for that...[to] dismiss that feeling of guilt when you do a little bit of work when you do your DIY or whatever.

Pervasive throughout explicit and implicit references to guilt is the idea that somehow participants are misleading someone, and it is this sense of misleading which elicits the feelings of guilt. Moreover, it is possible to suggest that guilt is the tension the remote worker appears to be holding between the home-work interface (e.g. see Tietze, 2002; Tietze and Musson, 2002a, 2002b, 2003; Baruch, 2001; Harris, 2003; Helms and Raiszadeh, 2002), and their perception that through working at home they are doing something 'wrong'. It can be argued that the emotions remote workers experience when they feel they should not be doing something they are, for example, they should not: be finishing before 5; looking after the kids; be assembling a bike, is tempered through the emotions they experience because they are doing something they want to, for example, they are: finishing before 5; looking after the kids; assembling a bike. Thus remote working can heighten the tension between home/work interface increasing the possibility of feelings of guilt and our findings suggest that this happens most for those remote workers who perceive they have agency. Of course, this also raises some really interesting questions around self regulation at work (Knights and McCabe, 2003), the 'Protestant' work ethic (Weber, 1930), and whether work should ever be fun! Moreover, it also raises the possibility that by choosing to work in a way that is perceived as more enjoyable (and that potentially may provide more autonomy) the rules must somehow be being broken and remote workers are experiencing 'guilty pleasures' borne out of their work organisation. However, this is for further, future, exploration

In considering agency and isolation, it can be seen that participants grouped together as perceiving that they had agency in deciding to work remotely felt that there was an imbalance between the way they were treated by the organization and the way non-remote workers were treated by the organisation. For example the perception that they may not be getting as much information as non-remote workers was highlighted by Duncan in the following extract from interview:

Duncan: From the wider business perspective I think ‘out of sight out of mind’ is definitely applicable, you see things that bypass you, that just because you are not there they tend to forget about you..... so visibility is probably an issue

And also by Justin in the following:

Justin: When we first started I found you were quite isolated and so you feel unsupported you feel; you miss that comradeship as well sometimes that you get in an office

The notion that there is some imbalance between the way remote workers and non-remote workers are treated is supported by the suggestion that remote workers can experience social and professional isolation as a result of the ‘loss of the social barometer’ (Mann et al, 2000) through the practice of remote working, and also by Baruch and Nicholson (1997: 23) when they refer to remote workers as feeling that “out-of-sight means out-of-mind”. This interaction between agency and isolation is outlined by Julie in the following extract:

Julie: it is not something I would want to do all the time [would want to have agency] ... I think that there is a lot said for that kind of

comradeship and plus it is nice to all come together in meeting and put your own thoughts on stuff that is happening and coming up, so I think that you would feel isolated... well I would feel isolated

Thus for remote workers, the practice of remote working can create a perception of imbalance between the treatment of remote workers and non-remote workers resulting in feelings of isolation. Findings suggest that this appears more often for those participants that perceive they have agency. This could be a reaction to an under-fulfilled psychological contract (Sparrow and Hilltrop, 1994), as in choosing to work remotely; especially if the organisation has 'sold it' to their employees as a positive way of organizing work. Hence it is possible that they did not expect to experience feelings of loss thus giving rise to feelings of isolation. However, this is speculative and requires further research.

In considering agency and frustration, it can be seen that participants perceived as lacking agency in the decision over whether to work remotely have, in someway, had their hopes disappointed (Thompson, 1995). For example, Duncan was aware when he took the job that it would mean working remotely however, he notes that when he moved south the only jobs he could apply for were all home based yet he would rather be office based, in this sense he lacks agency:

Interviewer: How do you find remote working?

Duncan: A little bit frustrating because...people can say no very easily across the telephone but face to face and you get that pressure and

they can't find it quite as easy to say that, so perhaps a level of frustration to get them to do things for you'

The above suggests that his hopes for his working relationships have been disappointed thus leading to feelings of frustration. This is supported in the following story from Kieran who was forced to work remotely through the organization changing their working practice, thus lacks agency:

Kieran: about three years ago it became apparent that the present company [the organisation] were going to close the offices that we had in Bristol and make us all work remotely and I thought, I immediately had this big emotional connection with when I worked for [previous organisation] and working at home and how I hated it ...

Giving rise to feelings of frustration:

Kieran: ...and I think that it has made us feel a little bit lower class in some degree really in the organization, and so there are things like that are impacting on us as a team because we don't have the strength of seeing each other on a daily basis to either reinforce the idea that things aren't as good as they could be or to enforce possibly that they are better than we perceive they are, and because of that I think that is another reason that no one should be a 'home worker' particularly when you have been forced into being a 'home worker'.

And also by Mike:

Mike: Many times when I have not been in working from my own branch, a day or so, and I come back to my own branch to the head office and I am expected to know stuff that has been dropped in quite casually...it does become frustrating.

The above suggest how the practice of remote working can leave remote workers feeling as though the hopes for their working life have been disappointed resulting in feelings of frustration. Findings suggest that this appears more often for those participants who perceive they lack agency.

In considering agency and freedom, it can be seen that participants who lacked agency experienced feelings of freedom through the perceived structural flexibility of the remote working practice. For example, Elliott perceives remote working as imposed by the organization therefore he is interpreted as lacking agency:

Elliott: I'm fortunate enough that whilst I work from home I am probably away from home 2 or 3 days a week so the days I work from home I can probably do a couple of hours work, then one child's got a nursery 2 minutes away, then the eldest's school is three minutes away, so I can walk to school, cycle to school and I can leave home at five to nine and be home at quarter past nine having done the school run, which is, not that I have to because my wife's at home, but that

flexibility...from my perspective there are huge advantages in the flexibility it gives you'

As does Neil:

Neil: It [remote working] is great, I love it; it is the freedom, the freedom to do what you want, when you want, within reason.

Moving towards a consideration of the interplay between how remote workers undertake identity work along with their perceptions of agency. Our findings suggest that the group of participants that experience guilt and isolation the most are those that have agency. Moreover, this is also the group of participants that attempt to re create comparative opportunities in order to benchmark themselves with others (Knights and Willmott, 1999) and they do this through the identity work they undertake via intra-organization contact so as to create visibility within their organization.

Furthermore, the group of participants who experience frustration and freedom the most are those that lack agency. Moreover, this is also the group that attempt to re-establish their social barometer (Mann et al, 2000) through the identity work they undertake via friendships and inter-organization relationships so as to (re) establish social relationships.

Conclusion

In seeking to develop critical debate around the emotional experience of the remote worker from the perspective of the remote worker, we suggest that there appears to be some interplay between the way in which remote workers undertake identity work and their perceptions of

agency in the choice over whether or not to work remotely. We also suggest that their perception of agency, and thus the way in which they undertake identity work, interplays with the emotions they experience. However, future work is required to develop the emergent ideas presented. In particular we suggest further research which identifies remote workers' states of agency in relation to undertaking identity work, and also research which looks at mapping the identity work undertaken by remote workers onto their emotional experience.

References

Baruch, Y. (2001). The status of research on teleworking and an agenda for future research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Vol.3, Issue 2, p.113-129.

Baruch, Y. and Nicholson, N. (1997). Home, Sweet Work: Requirements for Effective Home Working. *Journal of General Management*, Vol.23, No.2. pp.15 – 30.

Bryman, A. (2008). *Social Research Methods* (3rd ed). Oxford: OUP

Daniels, K., Lamond, D., and Standen, P. (2001). Teleworking: Frameworks for Organizational Research. *Journal of Management Studies*, 38: 8, pp 1151-1185

Di Martino, V. and Wirth, L. (1990). Telework: A new way of working and living. *International Labour Review*, Vol.129, No.5. p. 529-554.

Evans, D. (2001). *Emotion: the Science of Sentiment*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fineman, S. (2000). *Emotion in Organizations*. London: Sage

Fineman, S., Maitlis, S., and Panteli, N. (2007). Virtuality and emotion, *Human Relations*.
Vol. 60 (4): 555-560

Giddens, A. (1984). *The constitution of society: outline of the theory of structuration*.
Cambridge: Polity.

Hall, S. (1996). Who needs identity? In Hall, S., and du Gay, P. (eds) *Questions of Cultural Identity*. London: Sage

Hall, S. (2000). Who need identity? In du Gay, P. Evans, J. and Redman, P. (eds) *Identity: a reader*. London: Sage

Hall, D., Schneider, B. and Nygren, H. (1970). Personal Factors in Organizational Identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. Vol.15, Issue 2, pp176-190

Harris, L. (2003). Home-based Teleworking and the Employment Relationship: Managerial Challenges and Dilemmas. *Personnel Review*. Vol.32, No.4, pp.422 – 437.

Helms, M. and Raiszadeh, F. (2002). Virtual Offices: Understanding and Managing what you cannot see. *Work Study*, Vol 51. No.5. pp. 240 – 247.

Jackson, P. (1999) *Virtual Working: Social and Organizational Dynamics*. London: Routledge

Knights, D. and McCabe, D. (2003). Governing through Teamwork: Reconstituting Subjectivity in a Call Centre. *Journal of Management Studies* 40:7 p1587-1619

Knights, D. and Willmott, H. (1985). Power and Identity in theory and Practice. *Sociological Review*. 33:1 pp22-46

Knights, D and Willmott. (1999). *Management Lives: Power and Identity in Work Organizations*. London: Sage

King, N. (2004). Using Templates in the Thematic Analysis of Text. In Cassell, C. and Symon, G. (2004) *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*. London: Sage

Mann, S., Varey, R., and Button, W. (2000). An Exploration of the Emotional Impact of Teleworking via Computer-Mediated Communication. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15: 7/8, pp 668 – 691.

McLeod, J. (1994) *Doing Counselling Research*. London: Sage.

McLeod, J. (1999) 'Counselling as a social process'. *Counselling*, 10 (3), 217-222.

Mento, A., Martinelli, P. and Jones, R. (1999). Mind mapping in executive education: applications and outcomes. *Journal of Management Development*, Vol. 18, No.4, (pp. 390-407).

Reason, P. (1999). Integrating Action and Reflection through Cooperative inquiry. *Management Learning*. Vol. 30. No. 2. pp207-26

Sanchez-Burks, J., and Huy, Q N. (2009). Emotional Aperture and Strategic Change: The Accurate Recognition of Collective Emotions. *Organization Science*, Vol. 20 Issue 1, p22-34

Schein, E. (1985). *Organizational Culture and Leadership*. (2nd ed). San Francisco: Jossey Bass

Seo, M-G., Taylor, M S. and Hill, N S. (2007). The Role of Affect and Leadership During Radical Organizational Change. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, p1-6.

Shapiro, G. (2000). ‘Good Practice Case Study’: Introducing Location Independent Working with RM Consulting. Centrim, University of Brighton.

Sparrow, P. and Hiltrop, J-M. (1994). *European Human Resource Management in Transition*. Prentice- Hall: London

Thompson, D. (ed). (1995). The Concise Oxford Dictionary: English. (9th ed). Oxford: Clarendon

Tietze, S. (2002). When 'Work' Comes 'Home': Coping Strategies of Teleworkers and their Families. *Journal of Business Ethics*, Vol 41, Part 3 (Dec), Issue 4, pp.385 – 396.

Tietze, S. and Musson, G. (2002a). Working from Home and Managing Guilt. *Organizations & People*. Vol 9, No.1, pp.34 – 39.

Tietze, S. and Musson, G. (2002b). When 'Work' Meets 'Home': Temporal Flexibility as Lived Experience. *Time & Society*, Vol 11, No.2/3, pp.315 – 334.

Tietze, S. and Musson, G. (2003). The Times and Temporalities of Home-based Work. *Personnel Review*, Vol 32, No.4, pp.438 – 455

Tomaskovic-Devey, D. and Risman, B. (1993). Telecommuting innovation and organization: a contingency theory of labor process change. *Social Science Quarterly*, Vol.74. No. 2, pp.367-385.

Weber, M. (1930). The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism. London: Unwin Univeristy Book