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# Family Time

Family time has not been a breakthrough topic in time use research. Most work regarding family time has been focusing around time spent with children under the prism of childcare (Smeeding & Marchand, 2004). The title of Folbre and Bittman’s book “Family time, the social organization of care” (2004b) exemplify this reduction of family time to care and in particular childcare. Studies have investigated a large range of issues impacting time caring for children such as the structure of the welfare state or public policies (Baxter, 2010; Craig & Bittman, 2008; Craig, Mullan, & Blaxland, 2010; Craig & Mullan, 2011). The growing importance of the concept of ‘human capital’ have played a role in leading researchers to investigate its acquisition in early childhood (Bianchi & Robinson, 1997; Bonke & Esping-Andersen, 2009; Cardoso, Fontainha, & Monfardini, 2010). The question of childcare is intimately tied to the allocation of time between partners and *de facto* raises the question of gender. Historical variations in childcare and more generally in the changing of gender relationship have come under extensive scrutiny in time use research (Bryant & Zick, 1996; Gauthier, Smeeding, & Furstenberg, 2004; Gershuny & Sullivan, 2003; Gershuny, 2005; Kan, Sullivan, & Gershuny, 2011; Sullivan, 2006). The question of father’s involvement in care has draw particular attention too (Craig, 2006; Sullivan, Billari, & Altintas, 2014; Sullivan, Coltrane, McAnnally, & Altintas, 2009). In a nutshell, family time or family relationships have been mostly studied in its relations to childcare and gender issues.

Time spent with one’s own personal network, has not been theorized or studied for itself. No historical variations have been attempted yet for example. Time use diaries provide three main types of information. The most extensive information provided by diaries are activities. However, diaries provide also information about with whom people have spent their time and the location of activities. The information mostly considered by time use researchers is the one of the activities. When socializing is studied for example, is it mostly through ‘social activities’ (R Patulny, 2011). Very rarely the information about with whomrespondents have spent their time has been considered (Cornwell, 2015).

Early uses of the neglected with *whom field* information can be track back to the 70s (Robinson, 1977; Stone, 1972). Vague analysis of time spent with the partner or time spent alone can be found in report made by national statistical institutes (ABS, 2006). For example, Statistic Finland found that time alone during the last decade rose dramatically (Riitta, 2009). Notable uses of the with whom information should be acknowledged in the field of anthropology, where researchers studied transforming relationships in Mali under the pressure of globalization (Sauvain-Dugerdil & Claudine Roulin, 2010) or even in psychology (Fahrenberg, Myrtek, Pawlik, & Perrez, 2007).

Kingston and Nock are the first sociologists to have investigated seriously variations in time spent together in a family or in a couple. Their three milestone pieces have analyzed the impact of what they called the “family work day” on conjugal relations, including on time spent together (Kingston & Nock, 1985, 1987; Nock & Kingston, 1984). The concept of “family work day” refers to the patterns of work schedules for both partners. They emphasized the three dimensions of working arrangement, namely the total hours worked by both partners, the length of the working day (the beginning and the end of the working day for both partners) and the off-scheduling, the time that one partner is working and the other is not (Nock & Kingston, 1984). Their approach was innovative in the sense that they took the couple has unit of analysis, taking into account the impact of both partner’s “working day” on family life. They discovered that family life is not majorly disrupt by off-scheduling or long hours, even though women are the one adapting themselves the most to men work schedule and are still heavily caring the burden of domestic work (Nock & Kingston, 1984). The effect of off-scheduling is well documented for having an impact of gender division of labor inside the household as well on marital stability (Presser, 1994, 2000). They also investigated variations in time spent together in a marriage. They looked primarily at the effects of paid work on togetherness. Their theoretical framework was based on the one of Berger and Kellner (1964), which emphasize the importance of the daily construction of marital reality through conversation and time shared together. Even though shared activities cannot expose the subjective meanings of shared time, time is still necessary to produce these subjective meanings and it could be assume that the more time (as a resource) is available, the “greater the production of such meanings” (Kingston & Nock, 1987, p. 391). Dual earners face then particular problems with work scheduling. They found that dual earner couples, compared to single earner couples, spend less time together in core areas of domestic life such as meals, tv watching and active leisure. The level of companionship is clearly reduced for dual earner couples. They also found, controlling for other parameters, that time together increases marital quality (even though coefficients were modest). Especially when time together is spent in activities like eating, playing and talking (Kingston & Nock, 1987). However, they examined whether marital quality affects shared time and found a positive effect, leading them to conclude that satisfaction and togetherness are related but the direction of effects cannot be clearly assessed. They concluded that because of the growing numbers of dual earner couples daily intimacy faces a real challenge. The problem of desynchronized schedules exposed by Nock and Kingston has drawn some attention along the years. Studies have highlighted that couples where actively looking for simultaneity of schedules and time together (Hallberg, 2003; Hamermesh, 2000). Coordination of time, and in particular in leisure, provides more enjoyment than scattered activities (Sullivan, 1996). However, children could make this coordination more difficult (Barnet-Verzat, Pailhé, & Solaz, 2010).

One of the most significant contributions on the exploration of family time is still that the one of Lesnard. The point of departure of his theory that “domestic solidarity” has shifted during the 20th century towards “interpersonal relationships” (Lesnard, 2008). Following Berger and Kellner (1960), he argues that the main “source of solidarity for contemporary families is time spent together” (Lesnard, 2008, p. 449). He analyzed the effects of off scheduling (as an indirect consequence of the structure of the market rather than strictly rational allocation of time (Becker, 1965)) on possible time available for families to spend together. Using the *with whom* information of the diaries, Lesnard included in his definition of family time three type of shared time: Conjugal time (with the partner), Parents-child time (with the partner and at least one child) and Parent-child time (alone with at least one child). He concluded that off scheduling had serious impact on time together, especially when it occurred during the evening, which is a special moment for family cohesion he argues. He pointed out that off scheduling is not randomly distributed across the social scale but located down on the social ladder (Lesnard, 2009, p. 143).

# Social Capital

Personal trust and Generalized trust (Fafchamps, 2006)

"The willingness to deal with strangers is precisely what we have called generalized trust (Fafchamps, 2006, p. 1186). Contact with strangers.

Personalized trust (clubs, associations) is not needed anymore when generalized trust is high (think of the loneliness of Scandinavian).

Discipline (paying taxes) – legitimacy of the state and degree of public involvement in policy making (Fafchamps, 2006, p. 1187).

(Fafchamps, 2006, p. 1188) SC demands time and ressources. Poor have time but no resources. SC is correlated with high income. As mettre en relation avec Sullivan.

Does SC only benefit those who belongs to the clubs or associations ?

The concepts of social capital and social cohesion have received a lot of attention from sociologists, epidemiologists and economists these last two decades. Numerous studies have attempted to demonstrate the social benefits not only of individual but also of ecological social capital (neighborhood, ward, country). Social capital has been held accountable for health status (Kawachi, Kennedy, & Glass, 1999; Kennelly, O’Shea, & Garvey, 2003; Mohan, Twigg, Barnard, & Jones, 2005), for bringing down crime (Kawachi, Kennedy, & Wilkinson, 1999), reducing mortality (Kennedy, Kawachi, & Brainerd, 1998), buffering the stress and mental health issues (Berkman & Glass, 2000; Szreter & Woolcock, 2004) and much more (Wilkinson, 2002).

The work of Robert Putnam strongly influenced the uses of the concept of social capital in the social sciences. His definition of social capital focused on the benefits of social capital for the functioning of politics and emphasized that democracy needs an active civil society to function properly (Putnam, 1994, 2000). Putnam’s conception of social capital had a strong impact on the way researchers have measured this concept, with the particular focus on trust, club meeting or civic participation (Folland, 2007; Poortinga, 2006) at the expense of the dimensions of emotional or physical support from friends or family and more generally from *social contacts.* However, it seems that beside his conception of a nation's "stock" of social capital (Portes, 2000), intimate social interactions do matter for Putnam. "The broader social significance, however, lies in the social interaction and even occasionally civic conversations […], bowling teams illustrate yet another vanishing form of social capital" (Putnam, 1995, p. 72). This "broader social significance" explains why he titled his book *Bowling alone* (Putnam, 2000)*.* We can sense that there is something more than just the disentanglement of civic association that bothers Putnam. It becomes clearer when he links the technological transformation of leisure, television in particular, and the process of individualization or privatization (Putnam, 1995, p. 74). He seems worried about the unbinding of social relations and the "loosening of bonds within the family" (Putnam, 1995, p. 73). Although, an important question comes to mind: how does he know that people are actually bowling *alone*? From where does he draw the idea that social interactions are loosening?

Despite this very large and diverse body of research around social capital, no one has ever used as an indicator of social capital the actual *social interactions* that people have in modern societies. Even though *social interaction* seems to be one of the core concepts of sociology, very few attempts have been made to operationalize this concept in a quantitative fashion. Social capital as social interaction is actually much closer to the conception of Coleman and his idea of *closure* (Coleman, 1988; Portes, 1998). In a certain sense, social capital as social interaction is also linked to the sociology of Bourdieu without being actually connected to his definition of social capital, but, rather, to his conception of socialization (Bourdieu & Wacquant, 1992; Bourdieu, 1980). The social interactions that we have with others, and especially with the family members, are going to shape the *habitus* that we develop. So in Bourdieu’s theory, social capital conceived as social interaction is actually part of cultural capital rather than social capital. Putnam himself emphasized that "the most fundamental form of social capital is family" (Putnam, 1995, p. 73). Family and more generally significant others are resources but also a means of socialization.

Researchers tend to equate social capital and social cohesion (Kawachi & Kennedy, 1997; Putnam, 1994). These researchers never really integrated or knew how to integrate actual social interactions into the study of social cohesion. Nevertheless, measuring social cohesion by people's social interactions seems a coherent and self-evident idea. In doing so, we are moving towards a conception directly connected to the work of Emile Durkheim (Durkheim, 1976, 2013). It is peculiar that such a central question has received so little attention. What do social interactions *within* and *across* different nations look like? What is the frequency, the diversity and most importantly who are the persons that people *really* spend time with? Some researchers have been very close of answering this question but could not sufficiently distance themselves from the civic approach of Putnam (Roger Patulny, 2009). This research aims to fill the gap.
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