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ABSTRACT: The old perception that time is the same for everyone is being shattered in the network society. As never before, the readings concerning its circumstances reveal the need for a new outlook on spatio-temporal coordinates in everyday life, encouraging an interdisciplinary dialogue that goes from the local to the global, from the particular to the universal, from chronos to kairos, from the biological to the social, from business to leisure.

In the multiple scenarios to which these transitions are opened, we situate the main arguments of the text that we present. Within it, we refer to reconciliation as an opportunity to build equity, as long as it goes beyond employment policies, co-responsibility in household chores, and time changes. Aware that these are challenges that demand full respect for human rights, regardless of gender, age, socio-economic status, etc., we advocate the urgent need to educate in school and society in order to reconcile. In the face of the inhibitions of the past, both curricular teachings and social education are called upon to become actively involved in the name of freedom, equity, cohesion and social justice. A mission in which social pedagogy can, and should have, a decisive role.
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1. Introduction

Time is invisible and impalpable. So said Vicente Verdú (1984: 14) in a special edition of Revista de Occidente devoted to leisure in summertime. A just and necessary time, which even Einstein believed to be universal in its convergences with space. It is not that, since then, time has acquired other dimensions. It is that, after much searching for them, other ways of showing and interpreting them have been found. As noted by Jacquard (1994: 7), “of all the concepts used in models that aim to represent the universe, “time” is undoubtedly the one that has undergone the most transformations throughout our century.”

He was referring to the past, although his gaze was fixed on a future of new realities, about which Aldous Huxley, in his particular utopia of a ‘happy world,’ had already warned about the risk of converting every human -from the ‘lower castes’- into a satisfied epsilon: casual and healthy, socially well-off and technologically advanced, but with such limited imagination and freedoms that even the ‘most beautiful attempts at liberation’ ended in repression, punishment and imprisonment. Jacquard (1994: 163) mentions, as an extreme example, education and the etymological meaning of this word: ‘E-ducere, to lead a child outside of himself, to incite him to self-build, to give him the means to do so [...] has been degraded to educare (to feed).’

In this process, time is the great maker: a time of times, whose supposed objectivity in mechanical clocks, timetables and calendars conceals ‘in reality, centuries of ideological debate and political dispute’ (Durán & Rogero, 2009: 11), of subjective interests and positions, revealing the power exercised by religions, states and production systems (Caride, 2012). Everyone at the same time does not equate to everyone’s time, whether their realities are physical or social, material or virtual.

We will dwell on some of its transitions: between the local and the global, the particular and the universal, chronos and kairós, the biological and the social, business and leisure. In relation to them, reconciliation may be an opportunity to build equity if it goes beyond employment policies, responsibilities shared by men and women or time changes. The challenges demand to be more consistent with human rights: in the face of the inhibitions of the past, we must educate -in school and society- in order to reconcile, emphasizing the importance of education based on and for freedom, equality and social justice.
2. ‘Modern times’: between the global and the local

The Industrial Revolution, with the transformations that began in the second half of the seventeenth century, brought with it the need for nations to harmonise their clocks. And, with this, the acceptance of a practice – synchronising times – that the Canadian engineer Sandford Fleming would use, in 1789, to divide the Earth into 24 time zones, defined from the Greenwich meridian, also known as the ‘prime meridian,’ and adopted at the International Meridian Conference held in Washington in 1884. Years later, in 1913, the Eiffel Tower would give a signal to 25 nations around the world to adjust their times to the time set by that meridian, from which the notion of Coordinated Universal Time (UTC), one of the main standards in global chronological regulation, emerged.

Although defined times already existed, due to functional or operational criteria, it was from this moment that the world adapted to a common standard that led to the social standardisation of time, to the detriment of local links. It is often said that everything started with trains, when in 1830 the Liverpool-Manchester line, the largest mechanical engineering project that had hitherto been undertaken (Garfield, 2017), was opened. In spite of the controversies caused by the introduction of a uniform regulation of time, all devices created to organise our lives, transport systems (land, sea and air), means of communication and, more recently, digital terminals all adopted it in little over a century.

The invention of the telegraph or photography situated humanity in a new dimension of time-space relations, ‘with another decisive factor, unsettling today, appearing: the simultaneous’ (Dominguez, 2017: 2). This experience, which started in the late nineteenth century, would change the sense of the contemporary; that which happened in near space, and which it was only possible to learn about later. The sinking of the Titanic on the night of 14 to 15 April 1912 is often cited as the first disaster that was broadcast telegraphically: space no longer necessarily implies the mediation of time for us to find out about an event.

They were not the only noteworthy events. Nor the most decisive. Citing the title of the feature film written and directed by, and starring, Charlie Chaplin in 1936, the main allies of ‘modern times’ were the discovery of electricity, the incandescent lamp (1879) and the various artefacts that promoted its commercialisation, generating social, economic and cultural impacts unthinkable at that time in history.

Time, which almost all knowledge imagined ‘uniform,’ is deformed, giving it a radical twist to the rhythms that guide the day-to-day lives of people; the logics that underlie competition and growth would be two of the main forces that promote social acceleration (Beriaín, 2008), and, with it, alienation and a permanent subordination of individuals to the dictates of time, to which we become prisoners or slaves (Mundadas, 2016; Rosa, 2016; Wacjman, 2017). With globalised markets and electronic capitalism, it is difficult to distinguish the apparent from the real in space-time coordinates, ‘between people and places, and between organisations, institutions, nations and cultures’ (Elliot & Urry, 2010: 87).

The circumstances that surround our presence in the world have changed – in a seemingly definitive way – the ways of perceiving and comprehending – physically, psychologically and culturally – biological and social times, both in their most visible or manifest expressions and in their most subtle and intangible: the debate on social times and on temporal representations of collective life, on the capacities of choice and individual ethical orientation attributed to them, has never been as intense or demanding as in recent years’ (Tabboni, 2006: 5).

3. Time transformed: between the particular and the universal

The ethical consistency attributed to the ideas that evoked freedom, autonomy or emancipation in the origins of progressive thinking, legitimising their political options, is increasingly defeated by the ‘liquidity’ of late modernity (Bauman, 2007). Citizens, unable to face in all of their complexity the changes that affect them, experience in their own skin the helplessness – fear, uncertainty, etc. – induced by the collapse of social and democratic states of law. The intended culture of innovation and social change is submerged in what Vargas Llosa (2012) identified as the civilisation of spectacle, distraction and entertainment, with all of the metamorphoses that result: unlike what happened a few years before, ‘the lapse of time that passes between invention and innovation reflects a society’s capacity to progress and its observation allows us to glimpse the logic of evolution’ (Hervada, 2016: 19).

If, from the designs of the machines that Leonardo da Vinci imagined until their realisation, it took almost four centuries, today, it can be done in hours, or even minutes. Time, as Francis Bacon noted in the sixteenth century, will induce changes that only become significant centuries later. Or, at least, that is how it was until the ’age of electricity’.
The expression is attributed to Herbert Marsall McLuhan in his attempt to generalise and expand, from the second half of the twentieth century, the use of complex information and communication systems: the transistor, television, wireless telegraphy, computing, robotics, digital electronics, microprocessors, superconductivity, and telecommunications. A path towards total interconnection, which does not need the establishing of physical links between two points to transmit information between them. The Internet and technological networks have transformed interpersonal relationship times, incorporating two fundamental changes: the understanding of time and the relativisation of space. The balances that sustained the planet are unbalanced. Time changes the notion of space, just as it has changed the perceptions that are built on it (Adam, 1990; Nowotny, 1992).

The theory of relativity formulated by Einstein in the early twentieth century—that of special relativity published in 1905 and that of general relativity in 1915—would help to anchor in scientific knowledge the hypothesis that the location of physical events, either in time or space, is relative to the state of movement of the observer. Time, which was believed to be a constant, would become considered as a variable; space also is, since both depend, in the new vision, on gravity and speed. With Einstein, new readings of the space-time continuum in which we live emerged. The ‘absolute’ conception in the explanation of the universe crumbles, with important repercussions for the development of physical and social sciences.

In the former, the idea of an unalterable universe is replaced by that of a dynamic and expanding universe. This paradigm shift would open up a new reading of time in cosmological, astrophysical and psychological terms, in relation to which Stephen Hawking (1988) would occupy a prominent place.

In the latter, numerous contribusions from philosophy, history, anthropology and psychology would place time in the most recurring debates of classical and contemporary thought. To these, Ramos Torre (1992) refers, emphasising the value of time in social order and social studies. As does Vicente Huici (2007), turning to authors especially recognised in the spatio-temporal analysis of social processes: Durkheim, Mauss, Halbwachs, Gurtvitch, Foucault and Bourdieu. There are many others that could be mentioned—Merton, Piaget, Ricoeur, Maturana, Le Goff, Beck, Bau- man, Nowotny, Giddens and Durán—to highlight an indisputable truth: time influences everything, from work to economics, information to language, biology to education, etc., determining our lives, which are, themselves, temporal (Mataix, 2014).

and, as Safranski would say (2017: 201), ‘time is the material of which we are made. We cannot only say that everything has its time, but also that each one has his own time.’

4. The timeless society: between chronos and kairos

The concern to socially illustrate the forms of time, objectifying and subjectifying its realities (Valencia, 2007; Marramao, 2008), has, in chronos and kairos, two of the main quantitative and qualitative references in social bonds. Castells (1998: 44) alludes to them when he argues about ‘the historical emergence of new forms of social interaction, control and change.’ In his opinion, in the era of timeless time, new information technologies facilitate liberation of the capital of time and flight from the culture of the clock, causing a profound and paradoxical transformation. Nevertheless, liberation is ultimately a subtle imposition of new ways of being in time (Cruz, 2016), making immediacy, presentism, simultaneity and instantaneousness appear among the identifying features of capitalism and globalisation (Hartog, 2007; Marramao, 2011; Concheiro, 2016; Muntadas, 2016; Burdick, 2018).

Amparo Lasén (2000: XIII), in her approach to the study of juvenile temporalities, sums up its state of affairs by recognising that ‘the conception of time is one of the aspects of the social construction of reality. Determination of what time is constitutes a form of orientation in the world and in the evolution that brings into play social and physical processes.’ In them, time occupies a central place in conscience and in science, in happenings and in the experiences of subjects (Ramos, 2008: 107): ‘before being imagined, conceived or thought, time is something that is lived because it is embedded, enmeshed and amalgamated in all experience (interior and exterior).’ Hence the complexity inherent in the continuous transits that go from one’s own personal and non-transferable time to the time of and with others. But also the importance of placing in the foreground not only the geographic, socio-economic, cultural and historical context to which individuals belong, but also their age, gender, family status, education, social class, etc.

It cannot be ignored that the political authorities, following the dictates of the economy—for example, when they invoke energy savings to change the time twice a year—make decisions that involve the coexistence of an official and a solar time: their interventionism in daily chronology is another manifestation ‘that the time domain represents a correlate of political power’ (Miguel &
Miguel, 2014: 30). In contemporary societies, the obsession with time, which Garfield (2017: 18) explores with witty and curious anecdotes, has gone from showing itself to be a passive subject to being an aggressive subject; ‘technology accelerates everything and, as we know that things will go even faster in the future, we deduce that today nothing is fast enough.’ The desire to control, measure, sell, record, immortalise, make sense of, etc., is significantly limiting or restructuring our lives. Never so many words, which in intellectual endeavours served to think and reflect historically on time, on what we say and interpret about it (Gasparini, 1998; Valencia & Olivera, 2005).

There are new answers with disparate approaches -from neuroscience to anthropology or pedagogy, dissemination or self-help- which ensure alternatives to the runaway time in which we have installed ourselves; praise slowness (Honoré, 2004), go slowly through life (Novo, 2010) and educate for it (Domènech, 2009), confront time that flies (Burdick, 2018), value waiting as time gifted (Köhler, 2018), reconcile professional, family and personal life so that we are masters of our destiny (Chinchilla and Moragas, 2007), linger in the scents of time (Han, 2014), or reinvent leisure as a way to happiness (Schnabel, 2011), etc., are some of them. The arrow of time, which Hawking (1988: 221) used to reason how ‘time became a more personal concept, relative to the observer who measured it,’ forces us to reconquer opportune time from temperament and the propitious mixture: ‘the potential angle of convergence between two time dimensions that today appear dramatically separated and opposing: the time of life and the time of the world, or, if you prefer, private time and public time’ (Marramao, 2008: 17).

Variability in the ways of relating to time, individually and socially, throughout our life cycle is part of our contemporaneity (Durán, 2007); and even then, the larger or smaller units, which are used to compute it, continue to be imachable. Without them, life becomes impossible or chaotic. Objective time and the ways of quantifying it, however, are, in reality, the product of subjective definitions and decisions which insist on observing it as a ‘phenomenological dimension’ (Hargreaves, 1996: 125), different in the ways of manifesting itself for each person, contradicting the monochrome of time ruled by clocks. Asking about each person’s life means, inevitably, asking about their times (Savater, 1999: 243): ‘no one will be able to talk about himself, about his life, about what he wants or fears, about what surrounds him, without referring immediately to time. Without chronological indications of some kind, we are unintelligible and inexplicable.’

5. The clocks of life: between biological times and social times

The changes that people experience in the perception of time, according to their emotional state or the circumstances with which they interact, have placed a good part of their recent contributions on chronobiology and chronopsychology, or, expressed in another way, on analysis of biological rhythms, organic clocks and biorhythms (a word banished by researchers in this field), attributing to them regularities and/or alterations activated by endogenous (heartbeat, respiratory movements, processes metabolic, etc.) or exogenous mechanisms, which function as environmental synchronisers (light, temperature, seasonal changes, etc.). If life needs to synchronise and/or adjust its development to certain rhythmic modulators, everything indicates that knowledge of its factors, devices, systems, etc., allows its temporal orientation, with it being ‘a cardinal activity of living organisms’ (Esteller, 2009: 19).

Circadian rhythms (a 24-hour physiological pattern dependent on the suprachiasmatic nucleus located in the hypothalamus), ultradian rhythms (biological activities that occur in cycles of 20 hours or less, ranging from minutes to seconds) and infradian rhythms (with periods longer than 24 hours, monthly, annual, etc.) represent some of its variations. From a biological and psychological point of view, they make us aware of the relationships we have with time and the necessary accumulation of its memories, varying according to who we are, how old we are, what we have experienced and what we are experiencing.

Although the study of biological rhythms is relatively recent, its observation in nature and in living beings is part of historical, mythical and mythological accounts. They reflect the old concern for harmonising the internal temporal order with its external regulators (day and night, seasonal cycles, tides, etc.), increasingly influenced by scientific and technological advances and their impact on human health: in the regulation of sleep, eating behaviour, cognitive activity, memory formation, blood pressure and body temperature (Valdez, 2015).

The so-called chronosciences, which focus their attention on the importance of biological and psychophysiological rhythms -in areas such as chronodiagnostics, chronophysiology, chronopathology and chronopharmacology- warn of its importance for the performance of medical tests and the administration of treatments, their effectiveness and side effects. The contributions of the American researchers Hall, Rosbash and Young, who were awarded the 2017 Nobel Prize in
Physiology or Medicine, deserve special mention for their discovery of the molecular mechanisms that control circadian rhythm. In their opinion, verified after several years of isolation of the gene that controls the daily biological rhythm of plants, animals and humans, we cannot escape the need to synchronise ourselves with the rotation of the planet Earth. So-called jet lag, a syndrome caused by a rapid change of time zone when making long flights, shows the importance of the internal clock and its imbalances.

In a society that is open 24 hours a day, contrary to the rhythms of nature, the human body must assume the risks associated with disturbing biological times; it is estimated that approximately 20% of workers in industrialised countries work shifts, which causes disorders that affect their body clocks. State of health and homeostatic balance are no longer only considered to be the result of adequate reactivity to different internal or environmental stressors, but also a way of harmonising vital rhythms with physiological functions.

Although psychological time is personal and non-transferable, physical time has regularities that are the same for everyone. Hence, they continue to challenge knowledge, experience and the experience of time in each individual and in the cosmos. However much they change, rhythmic imperatives continue to be ‘the essence of life, health and harmony, and the key to the well-being of man is achieving synchrony with the rhythms of the environment and the people around us’ (Ayensu & Whitfield, 1984: 169). Time policies try to respond to this challenge (Torns, Borrás, Moreno & Recio, 2006) with more equitable distribution and the overcoming of their inherited dichotomies: individual-society, public-private, production-reproduction, male-female, etc. Influencing the relationships between time and well-being, they promote transversal, interdisciplinary and multiprofessional action or intervention in daily life, activating awareness and social participation, together with new forms of governance to blend ‘different areas and different ways of defining the experiences of various social groups’ (Legarreta, 2010: 45).

6. The everyday life of social arrhythmmas: between business and leisure

The first reflections on the leisure-work relationship are rooted in classical Greco-Roman thought (Segura & Cuenca, 2007). Since then, what Elias & Dunning (1992: 88) identified as ‘the conventional polarisation of work and leisure,’ contrasting the latter (otium) with the former (negotium), has acquired numerous, controversial meanings: in ways of thinking and doing, in morality and economics, in words and deeds. Those who plan, from neoliberal thinking, the way out of financial and fiscal crises are very aware of what this represents in capitalist societies, ‘buying time’ (Streeck, 2016): first through inflation, then through debt, later expanding private credit markets and acquiring bank liabilities, etc., with what should be the redistribution of wealth leading to eviction, despair or the collapse of public finances.

If, in the beginning, practices associated with leisure and business represented a functional rather than structural differentiation, with the net, everything has changed: on the one hand, leisure has become a business of immeasurable material and virtual dimensions; on the other, business has made leisure one of its main symbolic and experiential supports. The 21st century ‘is witness to a transformation in the concept of leisure, with a significant increase in activities with economic importance... [as an increasingly important sector] in the development of regions with structural problems that threaten their traditional production sectors’ (Álvarez & Fernández-Villarán, 2012: 351-352).

Utopia, consisting of dreaming of a ‘total reconciliation of work and leisure in a single creative activity’ (Domenach, 1971: 216), today, has horizons that nobody could have anticipated: not studies aimed at analysing the leisure class (Veblen, 1988) as an economic factor of modern life, nor the wise use of leisure that offsets the obsession with efficiency (Russell, 1986), nor the search for balance between time, work and leisure (Grazi, 1966). Perhaps if to presage that building a civilisation of leisure (Dumazedier, 1964) is impossible if the problems of work are not taken into account, since both influence each other.

The rigid or flexible barriers of time link production to consumption in such a way that both practices are inseparable both for the satisfaction of the most basic needs and for those that appeal to human well-being and quality of life, increasingly subordinated to consumption and the capacity to consume. In the culture of work ‘it is usual to consider leisure as a state of inactivity that follows work and prepares us to continue working... we do not work to enjoy leisure, but, on the contrary, we have leisure to be able to work and consume’ (Segura & Cuenca, 2007: 16). Jesús Ibáñez argued with irony (1984: 65), noting that free time is not lost time: ‘you earn: if you work hard you can earn a more luxurious holiday, if you buy a fast car you can earn time that you can use to watch TV adverts for even faster cars.’

The passage from universal time to social time, and from this to personal time (which is often
privatised), explains how both individuals and social groups enjoy greater versatility and heterogeneity in ways of relating activity to rest, occupation to recreation. Diversity in ways of experiencing and inhabiting social time – we agree with Prieto, Ramos & Callejo (2008: 367) – expresses ‘the centrality of time in the formation of social order,’ which is not limited exclusively to the area of what is ‘lived’ individually. If the different positions occupied in the employment market and in the domestic/family order influence the different ways of experiencing time, it is precisely because time is an element of first order in employment conditions and in the lives of people.

Temporary constructions are, as never before, ‘a bricolage of multiple times in the rhythmic articulation of the everyday, but also of different cultural models’ (Lasén, 2000: 246). Inside, what this author considers as the ‘arrhythmia of modern societies’ (ibid.: 45) has precipitated the otium/negotium dialectic towards a disturbing and unpredictable evolution in which the new ‘ecology of temporalities’ (Sousa, 2005: 164) shows how politics has succumbed to the economy of the markets, turning everything it touches into merchandise. Moreover, any reading done on ‘busy,’ ‘free’ or ‘liberated’ times cannot ignore the impacts caused by demographic changes (migrations or the ageing of the population), mass unemployment, remuneration and employment precariousness, intergenerational disputes, and the enormous inequalities that exist in the uses of time for economic, gender, educational or cultural reasons.

7. Reconciliation does not solve equity, but helps build it

In dictionaries, the word ‘reconciliation’ continues to favour its legal and even religious connotations over all others. Moreover, expressly referring to work and family life, this term continues to be used to refer to the compatibility between two or more things. This obviates the ideological, social, ethical and economic background in which the demands on equity are being projected or, at least, on balanced participation of women and men in family life, work, social roles, etc. And, undoubtedly, in the achievement of full equality in differential access to time (Aguinaga & Comas, 1997: 219-220), not only to ‘eliminate the difference by making women access the time of men, but also the other way round, that is to say, making the times interchangeable, keeping two different types of time, but without a time format inevitably being assigned to each of the genders.’

As is known, the advances that have taken place in the discourses – and in the initiatives carried out by feminist political, cultural, economic and social movements – around time and the emancipation of women are among the indicators that best reveal gender inequalities, with a dual scope, descriptive and explanatory (Torns, Borràs, Moreno & Recio, 2006: 22): on the one hand, as ‘a key element to making domestic/family work visible,’ and on the other hand, as ‘a fundamental dimension to making daily life emerge,’ and, with it, the viability – or not – of a well-being that reaches the entire population, respectful of their citizenship rights.

Roberto San Salvador (2009: 24) warned that ‘men and women do not live equally for a single minute of their lives. Equality is reaching different orders of life, but time refuses to reflect it. Double schedules, inside and outside the home, put pressure on most women by making every second of every minutes a demonstration of a high rate of productivity.’ If it is true that time speaks, it is also true that it uses different accents (Beriain, 2009), as surveys on the use of time confirm repeatedly, emphasising that gender inequalities are present in all daily practices, in the distribution of overall workload and in the participation of women and men, both in terms of remuneration and in domestic/family life. As analysed by Prieto, Ramos & Callejo (2008), transformations in working time and their social perception – with the competitive flexibility of companies and business hours, the provision of services and their adjustments to the life of the people – are decidedly marked by gender. Disputes cannot be interpreted separately from mechanisms of power, emerging risks, the wage relationship and gender relations (Perán, 2014; Martín & Prieto, 2015).

Gender gaps, projected in the ‘time’ dimension, are reflected in salaries, the care of children and family members, domestic chores, cultural activities, leisure and volunteering. Depending on the statistics and based on different variables – age, education, length of service, occupation, type of contract and working day, activity and size of company – a woman earns between 13% and more than 30% less than a man in similar jobs (Anghel, Conde-Ruiz & Marra de Artiñano, 2018). As the newspaper El País recently reported, using data from the Spanish Statistical Office’s Living Conditions Survey, women spend more time in unpaid work than men in all life circumstances (Gómez & Delgado, 2018); with or without a partner, with or without children, with or without paid employment, etc., and this situation only becomes equal when the grandchildren arrive; at this time, grandfathers and grandmothers dedicate the same time to the children of their children: an average of 16 hours a week. Carlos Prieto (2007), in his analysis...
of employment-gender-social time relations, noted that tension between salaried and non-salaried time acquires very different degrees and characters depending on the distribution, without forgetting that the historical assignment of roles ‘made men a being for work and women a being for the home’ (Prieto, Ramos & Callejo, 2008: XXIV).

Gender inequalities in the distribution and occupation of social time activate ‘the need to rethink them as a whole, with an equitable approach in the distribution and assumption of tasks, as well as family responsibilities’ (Gradaillé & Merelas, 2011: 60). As expressed in two slogans of an institutional campaign of the Regional Government of Catalonia aimed at raising awareness among the population of a more rational organisation of the general public’s time, ‘finding time within time’ or ‘adding time to our lives’ require a change in the cultural conception of time, not just time reform.

In this context, work and family life reconciliation policies are answers –or, simply, emergency exits– to an unjust and unjustifiable situation that is covered by legislative provisions: in the Spanish case, Law 39/1999 of 6 November concerning work and family life reconciliation, and Organic Law 3/2007 of 22 March concerning the achievement of effective equality between men and women, as well as other regional and local regulations. Their potentialities and those of other complementary, sectoral and/or cross-cutting measures, however, are still far from what is desirable and necessary, with two circumstances that affect them:

a) Reconciling still seems an impossible mission (Fernández, 2018), which cannot be approached exclusively from the female perspective; it requires institutional and social co-responsibility. However, neither public policies nor employment dynamics are specifying their proposals in the daily life of people, although it has been shown that free time is as relevant –in terms of well-being, quality of life, democratic health, etc.– as that of work, and that the greater the satisfaction with productive tasks, the more satisfied and involved workers feel with the entities, companies, etc. in which they are employed. More time to enjoy life is profitable, in such a way that the help to reconcile work and family life offered by certain public and private organisations is effective for their ‘balances,’ especially when they offer services or allow their employees to resolve everyday situations (administrative bureaucracy, looking after children and elderly relatives, doctors’ appointments or managing the provision of services, etc.).

b) Reconciling work and family life cannot be reduced to a matter of human resources, when in reality it is a direct appeal to human rights, subordinating their achievements to the demands of the employment market and employability; ‘it does not respond to the exercise of the right to equality of women and men in private and public life. It responds to the need to use the talent and labour force of women and men in a society with growing demands for consumption’ (Díaz & Dema, 2006: 155). For Judith Astelaria (2006), the fact that reconciliation policies have drifted towards employment promotion policies signifies a move from the logics of equality to the logics of productivity, but also –she points out– a ‘process of co-optation, from feminist proposals to conversion and application as public policies’ (ibid.: 162).

Without extending ourselves in the arguments, and concurring with that expressed by Gradaillé & Merelas (2011: 57-58), the fact that reconciliation is necessary does not mean that it is sufficient ‘to achieve a democratic distribution of time, and can even become dangerous when its meaning is restricted to organising –in the best possible way– the dual presence of women, that is to say, facilitating their transition from the reproductive to the productive world, serving patriarchal and capitalist interests jointly.’ A reflection that led Rosa Cobo (2016: 46) to note that ‘in our societies, the general public has sex, because the general public of women is seriously weighed down by the weight of family and domestic life, in the first place, and by the patriarchal structure of society, after... And democracy cannot be legitimate if it is built on two general publics, one first and the other second-class.’ Admitting that reconciliation or other measures aimed at equalising the opportunities of men and women in a society characterised by deep social inequalities do not resolve those that exist between the two sexes, but it can help build an alternative future (Carrasco, 2003). In this task, education and all educations are called upon to assume a decisive role.

8. Epilogue: in the face of inhibition, educate to reconcile

Transcending reconciliation and guiding its actions –in public policies, social institutions, daily life, etc.– towards co-responsibility and effective equality, not merely formal, requires an unequivocal commitment to education, whether school, family and/or social. An education that emphasises ‘the promotion and articulation of
comprehensive systems of rationalisation of social times from a gender perspective’ (Gradaillé & Merelas, 2011: 60). It involves problematising time not only in political, but also in pedagogical and social terms.

It is not often done. In fact, in Law 39/1999 of 5 November, to promote the reconciliation of family and work life of working people, there is no reference to education. In Royal Decree/Law 3/2012 of 10 February concerning urgent measures to reform the employment market, education is only mentioned when referring to the need to promote the reconciliation of personal, family and work life. From what we can see, the commitment of educational systems – from schools to universities – to ‘train’ for work has little or nothing to do with the fact that social and employment policies are concerned with one aspect that is so transcendental for people and the achievement of effective equality between men and women.

At school, beyond some studies that compare the impact of the modalities of a single school day versus a departure in the daily life of children and families, noting that ‘reconciling’ is an inescapable necessity in school terms, reconciliation is neither taught nor practised. Without learning that socialises and/or makes it possible to become aware of realities, added to the concerns expressed by parents’ associations, and – to a lesser extent – by teachers’ groups, school education is still inhibited by one of the problems that most disrupts the day to day in the temporal organisation of families and mothers with children at school age, from nursery education to compulsory secondary education. In the curriculum, reconciliation does not exist, nor is it expected.

In the ‘other educations,’ including what we call ‘social education,’ reconciliation does not occupy education – none or very little in the study programmes of the degree and masters courses taught in our universities – nor preoccupy, at least explicitly, their professionals. Being a relevant issue for equal opportunities between men and women, which involves all social groups, everything indicates that we are obliged to change course, sooner rather than later. We should take note of some experiences, among others: those promoted by the policies of time (Torns, Borrás, Moreno & Recio, 2006; Legarreta, 2010); actions orientated towards changing its social uses to foster social cohesion, quality of life and sustainability; and urban initiatives orientated towards shared time, the optimisation of public spaces, exchange through time banks, innovation in companies, etc. (Mückenberger, 2007; Recio, Méndez & Altés, 2009; Quintana, 2010; Maroñas, Caride & Gradaillé, 2015).

In socio-educational research, it is a minor issue which barely attracts the interest of some research groups, with a scarce albeit growing social projection in publications and the transfer of knowledge to society. If ‘time ages quickly,’ a great metaphor coined by Tabucci (2010), to make a tale of nine stories of characters determined to confront time that escapes and stops, that turns on itself, hiding and reappearing... it urges that education and its pedagogies devote more effort to investigating, experiencing and reconciling it with everyday realities. Also social pedagogy in its permanent eagerness to extend the search for its purpose, for its lost spaces and ‘times.’ An exploration to which, with Proustian resonances and other motivations, Professor José Ortega (1997) invited us more than twenty years ago. In all that ‘educate to reconcile’ can and should be, never will time be wasted.
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1 The work presented takes as a reference a research project that, within the framework of the calls of the National R&D Plan, is being funded by the Spanish Government’s Ministry of the Economy and Competitiveness and the EU’s European Regional Development Fund. Under the title ‘Educating leisure: realities and perspectives in intergenerational, comprehensive and inclusive terms in a network society’ (EDU2015-65638-C6-1), and the acronym ENREDOS, it is linked to a line of research on ‘educational and social times’ which is being carried out by the University of Santiago de Compostela’s Social Pedagogy and Environmental Education Research Group (SEPA-interesa).