Gil Viry,
Vincent Kaufmann, and
Eric Widmer

Literature on Job Mobility in Switzerland

State-of-the-Art of Mobility Research, Chapter 8

Job Mobilities Working Paper No. 2006-01, Chapter 8

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 Spatial restrictions of the recent past have been replaced by strategic choices and differentiation between types of mobility.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)[1].

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

---

[1] 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).