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ABSTRACT

The pandemic has caused important transformations in our everyday lives. Home has lost its central feature of being a daily cyclical station, becoming the only place for self-quarantine. At this point, home life intertwined with that of work. This study aims to establish the experiences with rhythmic phenomena, which explains the effect of the social practices on everyday life of a ‘house-academic’ during self-quarantine. In this regard, I examine my autoethnographic experiences during my three-month self-quarantine period with the rhythmanalytical view of Lefebvre, which allows me to express the effect of practices on everyday lives. I suggest that autoethnographic writing will enable me to give a perspective on my life transformed by Covid-19, based on body, performance, and experience. Home has transformed into a pre-school in the morning and a university in the evening, just contrary to the way of living before the pandemic. It acquired a syncopated rhythmic order, from arrhythmia to eurhythmia, thus staging the transformation of the spatial experience. In these unprecedented times, guest practices such as homeschooling and distance education, becoming henceforth a part of our lives, have turned everyday life into a stage of new struggles.
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1. Introduction

“Staying at home” is a statement that evokes some kind of a pause and interruption in mobilization of everyday life. The most decisive aspect of the home as an opening-closing system is that it constitutes a border between the outside world and us with its doors, windows, curtains, and security. During the pandemic, home meant being protected against the invisible danger from outside. However, the pandemic is not just a danger outside of the house. It threatens our physical health, presence, inner peace, and also everyday activities. The Coronavirus is the new invisible enemy which cannot be inhibited by security systems. Thus, home has found a new expression in this process, especially for those who are in self-quarantine, as a space of escapism. In this sense, home has been defined as a protective space which made it possible for people to be not only physically, but also socially isolated.

The pandemic raised some inequalities within the society, especially through the “staying home” practices. According to Lefebvre (2010b), everyday life is a distinction and intersection zone between social groups (p. 54). Cyclical time and rhythms are completely dominant in everyday life of those under domination (p. 61) and divided unequally. Work-life determined who had the opportunity to stay at home. Moreover, bio-politically categorized people like elderly people and children had to stay at home due to the governmental regulations in Turkey. Thus, in the modern urban setting, different social groups were negatively affected by the pandemic.

The stressful work-life of healthcare professionals (Yarrow & Pagan, 2020); seasonal agricultural workers (Zırh et al., 2020); the discrimination against elderly people (Rahman& Jahan, 2020) and minorities (Pang, 2020); homelessness (Tsai & Wilson, 2020); the domestic violence (Williamson & Lombard & Brooks-Hay, 2020; Kay, 2020) are among the discussed topics in the literature related to pandemics. The studies also provide an insight into how women working-from-home were affected by this period (Alpar, 2020; Ceuterick, 2020). Ceuterick (2020) argues that the pandemic is a crisis of capitalism and patriarchy, which made gender inequalities visible (p. 1). The domestic space is transformed by gendered power relations reproduced by structural inequalities (Massey, 1994; 2000 and Rose, 1993, as cited in Ceuterick, 2020, p.2). The juxtaposition of working life and domestic labour presented the gendered use of domestic space during the pandemic (Ceuterick, 2020, p. 3). Similarly, Alpar (2020) underlines the double burden of women working-from-home during the pandemic. The responsibilities of women in the household include ensuring the education of children, taking care of family members, domestic chores, working-from-home and dealing with the organization of work (p. 182). Bozkurt (2020) also shows that women who work online from...
home are more affected than their male counterparts. According to his research, the inability to receive external-paid-support for domestic work in self-quarantine increased the burden of women working online (p. 129).

I emphasize that focusing on lived experiences and practices of women will make it possible to have an insider perspective on power relations and gendered structures of everyday life reproduced by the pandemic. In this regard, various studies were conducted to analyze personal narratives (Boncori, 2020; Büyükbeşe, 2020; Guy & Arthur, 2020; Işıkker Bedir, 2020; Sağır, 2020, Topçu & Fišo, 2020; Yaman, 2020). In fact, the researchers who dealt with the pandemic period academically were affected by this process also in their personal lives. The distance education practice of academics, which started with the pandemic, also necessitated the transition of work to the domestic sphere (Ceuterick, 2020). The rhythmic gesture of everyday life gained a new form and differentiated from the pre-pandemic period due to the transformation of work-life. Women academics were also negatively affected by this transformation because of the domestic responsibilities and the lack of support. As a matter of fact, there are debates on the fact that women could publish less than their male counterparts in this period (Viglione, 2020). As a result of the consequences that I faced in my everyday life, I think it is important to establish my lived experiences as a woman in academia in self-quarantine.

Autoethnography allows my personal experiences to turn into an object of rhythmanalysis, and also offers me the opportunity to put my own voice within the research (Bektaş Ata, 2016; Ettorre, 2005; Richard, 2016; Wall, 2006). In this study, based on the Rhythmanalysis of Lefebvre (2004), by the means of autoethnographic writing I problematize the transformation of everyday life and the role of new social practices in this period. Therefore, I focus on my three-month self-quarantine period. In this chapter, I address the following points: first, I explain the methodological perspective of my project, i.e. autoethnography; then I summarize my basic theoretical framework, Lefebvre’s views on rhythm and everyday life, and finally, I introduce my personal narrative analytically within the scope of two main guest practices performed during self-quarantine: distance education and homeschooling.

2. Writing Own Experience: Autoethnography

Autoethnography is a qualitative method in which a researcher puts ‘self’ at the centre of the research. It reveals a multi-layered consciousness linking the personal to the cultural (Ellis & Bochner, 2000, p. 739) and refers to the combination of ethnography (society) and autobiography (self) (Reed-Danahay 1997, p. 2). In this regard, it is basically the ethnography
of personal life, concerning mainly autobiography, which “is a process of recreating, reviewing and making sense of the biographic past” (Alexander, 1999, p. 309). Therefore, the researcher describes his/her personal experiences and establishes a relationship between the experiences and the social context in which s/he is located. Autoethnography, which is the methodology of expressing self and the “other”, considers performance as a critical reflection of culture. Reflexivity of the experience as a specific cultural location includes a social and cultural critique (Alexander, 2005, p. 423). In this way, reflections and understandings are shared with others (Adams, Holman Jones, Ellis, 2015, p. 103). Everyday life performances are an important dimension of ethnography which enables the understanding of social interactions and experiences. In ethnographic research, the researcher problematizes his/her position through the observation of participation (self-reflection) in the field (Brettell, 1997). The dimension of ethnography that leads the observation and experience emerges in autoethnography through the life world of the researcher. An important aspect of autoethnography is that an autoethnographer is both the object and the subject of the analysis by acknowledging ‘self’ as a part of the society s/he lives in (Denzin, 2014).

On the other hand, autoethnographic writing has its limitations. The character of autoethnography that puts the researcher into the center is criticized for being “fiction” (Wallford, 2004, p. 411) because of the subjective ambiguity of the relationship between researcher and his/her research. In this context, the personal experience may undergo some deviations in autoethnographic writing as researchers’ own interpretation of their memory. It is argued that this situation may carry the risk of “excessive comments”. The idea that it has a solipsist side that has its roots in the self-reflection character of autoethnography (Ploder & Stadlbauer, 2013, p.381). It is also criticized that it may cause ethical problems as it also means disclosure of the researcher and his/her social environment (Mendez, 2013, p. 282-283; Delamont, 2009, p. 59). In this regard, a self-quarantine experience covering a period of 3 months brought along many psychological struggles. In this period, not leaving home and not socializing outside of digital media required an emotional challenge. Although it is necessary to include individual resistance mechanisms and self-reflexive reactions in the autoethnographic writing, focusing on guest practices as hierarchical privileged regulators of quarantine life made it difficult to mention the psychological processes during the self-quarantine. Furthermore, Delamont (2009) argues that autoethnography “focuses on people on the wrong side” (p. 59). That means, autoethnographers as privileged academics from a particular social milieu, make evaluations from their own perspective by centering their experiences (Ploder & Stadlbauer, 2013, p.382). It is necessary to consider the uniqueness
of the self-quarantine experience when variables, such as the size of the house, the presence of the study room, partner support, and the number of children are taken into account. The researcher’s living standards, the specificity of the family structure and the expectations of work-life cannot be generalized to the experiences of all women who have various other conditions. In this context, this study should be considered as a woman’s narrative, but it should be underlined that it does not claim to be the voice of all women’s groups.

The main reason for the use of autoethnographic writing in this study is to include personal narrative, which enables the expression of social experiences, in the literature of pandemic and to take a look on the effects of this process on micro level. I consider autoethnography, in which the practice of performing culture is the expression of our everyday life, as critical praxis (Alexander, 1999, p. 307). The dual identity of autoethnographer as a “boundary-crosser” helps me to analyze the intertwining feature of the boundaries between the layered nature of the personal and social life (Reed-Danahay, 1997, p. 2). Instead of a methodology that separates my personal life and academic interests, I prefer, as a boundary-crosser, to intersect both by using autoethnographical methodology.

After giving my last lecture on Friday, March 13, I could not return to the campus as a lecturer. The distance education started after the suspension of formal education at the university. Since then, home has become the only site for social practices in the absence of social spaces (campus, school, library, park, cafe, etc.). My self-quarantine was exactly the intertwining of work-life and personal life under the roof of domestic space. In this sense, I problematize my 3-month self-quarantine experience between 16th March and 14th June 2020.

My aim here is to deal with the rhythmic notion of everyday life during self-quarantine. Hence, in this study I conceptualize the distance education and homeschooling experiences as guest practices. I argue that these practices are performed within gendered time and space. Defining my position as a ‘house-academic’ (Ağca-Varoğlu, 2020) which refers to the intertwining gendered role of being a ‘housewife’ (Davis, 1983; Ferguson, 2020) and being an academic enables me to take a look at inequalities in domestic sphere. Being a house-academic is a new performative identity acquired by the academic working-from-home and striving for meeting the situated gendered expectations at home, which are historically, socially and politically constructed. Especially regarding the feminist epistemology debate (Brettell, 1997; Collins, 2003; Haraway, 2003; Harding 2020; Narayan, 2020; Nencel, 2014; Visweswaran, 2003), getting out of the male-dominated conceptions of writing and expressing the situated position of the experience can make it possible to problematize the gendered sense-making processes in everyday life and power relations in knowledge production. Autoethnography,
in this respect, offers an insider look at sense-making, which shows why everyday experience is important and transformative. It reveals how people make sense of their experience and practice (Adams, Holman Jones, Ellis, 2015, p. 27). At this point, autoethnography as a critical perspective allows me to examine the appearance of my everyday life in the pandemic by centering my own voice as a house-academic.

3. Theoretical Framework: Rhythms of Everyday Life

“rhythms – historical, but also everyday, at the heart of the lived” (Lefebvre, 2004, 87)

In “Rhythmanalysis: Space, Time and Everyday Life” Lefebvre (2004) focuses on the rhythmic aspects of time and space, and suggests the method “Rhythmanalysis” for an understanding of everyday life. Lefebvre (2010b) claims that everyday life is a mixture of fields of work, family and leisure. The analyses of the interaction of those together might be essential to grasp the alienation in modern urban life. Work-life is shaped by particular time and space expectations of capitalist daily routines (p. 60). Quantitative time that penetrated into our social practices with the invention of the clock has become an important measure of everyday life. The time of everydayness, providing “the measure of the time of work” (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 73), determines our daily practices like eating, sleeping, family relationships, and leisure. For this reason, the analysis of everyday life shows the relationship of social time with the processes imposed by the socio-economic organization of product (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 73). According to Lefebvre (2004), the basic rhythms and cycles capture everyday life while the time of clocks (quantified time) imposes monotonous repetitions. However, the use of time has turned into a field of struggle. Natural rhythms change for technological or socio-economic reasons. For example, night, as well as day, has become a component of work-life in the pandemic. Quantified time is divided into fragments uniformly: transportation networks, various forms of work and leisure. Thus, “there is not time to do everything, but every ‘doing’ has its time.” In the hierarchy of these fragments, work is still the reference point in the modern urban setting (p. 74).

Everyday life is a field of exchange, a stage of social rhythms. Rhythm is a tool for the analysis of everyday life that can be evaluated as the dimension of the interaction of localized time and temporalized space (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 89). So, it is important to think of space and time together as they have a dialectic relation. For Lefebvre, people reproduce the space that they live in. Repetitions are important for Lefebvre’s rhythmanalysis because he suggests that everyday life is a set of repetitions. Only if a rhythmanalyst aims to understand
these repetitions, is it possible to discover everyday life? But it should not mean that the repetitions introduce “the same”. The “difference” always brings out something novel (p. 6). In this context, Lefebvre describes two important factors that determine rhythms. These are “repetition” and “difference”. Everyday life is the scene of the surprising differences of monotonous repetitions. There are two groups of repetitions: cyclical repetitions and linear repetitions. The cyclical repetitions come from nature like day and night, seasons etc. Linear repetitions are in social practice, especially work-related human actions. Cyclical repetitions continue for a while and start again naturally. Yet, the dialectical relationship between the cyclical and the linear sometimes causes confusion (p. 90).

Lefebvre (2004) demonstrates within his framework to analyze the rhythm of our experiences in space layered by the needs of modern capitalist urban life. He emphasizes that “everywhere where there is interaction between a place, a time and an expenditure of energy, there is rhythm” (p. 15). There are different categories of rhythms in everyday life like polyrhythmia, eurhythmia, arrhythmia (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 67-68.). The togetherness and combination of diverse rhythms are called polyrhythmia, while the polyrhythmic interaction between multiple rhythms without conflict is eurhythmia (Evans & Franklin, 2010, p. 177). Lefebvre (2004) emphasizes that the rhythms in the healthy body might be a good example, as multiple rhythms (such as heart rhythm, rhythm of organs) interact in the body and maintain a healthy body system. Besides these rhythms, arrhythmia introduces the conflict and incompatibility between multiple rhythms. In arrhythmia, synchronization breaks down and changes. This contradiction is, for example, a consequence and a precursor of the disease in the body and it is pathological. The eurhythmia of the body is replaced by an arrhythmia with this disorder (pp.67-68).

According to Lefebvre (2004), knowledge and experience of the body is the basis of the theory of rhythms (p. 67). In order “to grasp a rhythm it is necessary to have been grasped by it; one must let oneself go, give oneself over, abandon oneself to its duration.” (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 27) At this point, the rhythm analyst starts from his/her own body and then turns to outer rhythms, but s/he also learns them from his/her own body. It means that the body functions as a “metronome” (pp. 19-22). Rhythm analyst should “listen’ to a house, a street, a town, as an audience listens to a symphony.” (p. 22) In this way, s/he understands the interaction patterns of everyday life. Thus, in this study, I try to grasp the juxtaposing rhythms of home and work-life during self-quarantine to understand the contradictions and compromises in the everyday life. Rhythmanalysis gives me a framework in this study regarding the ‘guest practices’, which turned everydayness into a home-centred feature during the pandemic.
4. An Autoethnography of Staying at Home

“Everydayness lies in practices that weave contexts together; only practices make it visible.” (Sheringham, 2006, 360)

There was a great uncertainty at the beginning of the pandemic. My inability to predict when the unprecedented times would end caused the rhythm of my daily routines to inordinate. At the first step, I was informed that there was a three-week break. It was not possible to adapt to this situation immediately. From the second week on, I started to think about how to manage this crisis. Before the pandemic, I had given my students ethnographic homework where they should describe everyday life interaction in lived space after visiting public spaces, like tea-houses, mosques, cafes etc. However, due to the physical distancing, I had to revise their task and asked them to write an autoethnographic essay in which they would express their experiences regarding the spatial-temporal changes in their everyday lives.

My self-quarantine has started with the suspension of education. Thus, I assumed the same responsibility as my students, and started my autoethnographic research on my self-quarantine experience as a house-academic. Listening to the rhythm of our bodies is very important during this pandemic period. Detection of any arrhythmic condition is vital. It becomes more important whom we met with or which streets we visited. Listening to our body also means listening to the outside world. The easiest way to manage this process was to “stay at home”. With the sudden transformation of everyday life, home has become the only place to socialize and it has lost its edge of the daily circle.

According to Goffman (1956), everyday life is a stage of social interactions, like a theatre. In everyday life, actors perform different roles, which are socially defined expectations followed by a person with a given status or social position. Audience expects the actor to perform the role appropriate to his/her social status. While in self-quarantine, it was obligatory to perform my different roles at home. Thus, being a house-academic means an inappropriate intertwining of home and work-life to me. I was to keep on my ‘housewife’ role while also giving online lectures. This new identity, which is a combination of practices of being a housewife and an academic, was a house-academic identity. In this context, the pandemic is a process where the performances that should take place in different social spaces are performed on the same stage, that is, at home. This situation caused some problems in the differentiation of regions, which are the front region as the performance area of me (the actor) and the back region where I can be like myself and which I aim to keep hidden from the audience (Goffman, 1956, p. 70). With the transition to online education, my work-life incorporated its
own rhythm into my private space, home. The rhythm of the work-life was now interwoven with the rhythm of our home. I was confused between my responsibilities as an academic and my chores as a ‘housewife’. For this reason, it was not always easy to properly fulfil the performances expected of my role. To prevent these problems, it was necessary to use various impression control techniques. The suitable stage for the performances that were brought by the changing roles was achieved by using the rooms of the house (kitchen, study room, hall) for different purposes. The temporal schedule is also arranged in such a way that the front (academic) and back stages (house) do not affect each other.

The situation we found ourselves in made it necessary to face the difficulties of home-centred life. Thus, the decisive power of the work-life showed itself in our daily rhythm. According to Lefebvre (2010a), relationships with the family and leisure are the activities that are used in the remaining time from work. He describes this situation as a “vicious circle” in which “we work to earn our leisure, and leisure has only one meaning: to get away from work.” (p.46) In self-quarantine, the interwoven spatial-temporal experience made it impossible to stay out of the work-life. The boundaries have become blurred when the professional roles infiltrated into home, i.e. my former non-work area. This situation caused a syncopated appearance in everyday life. Lefebvre (1971) differentiated the time of everyday life in the modern society into three categories: “pledged time (professional work), free time (leisure) and compulsive time (the various demands other than work such as transport, official formalities, etc.)” (p.53). The self-quarantine time-schedules that organized the daily circle became inexplicable and interfered with each other.

Through the homogenization of the space, the rhythm of the “others” also entered my personal life, and the emotional meaning of the home space turned into a semi-rational function. As Lefebvre (2004) argues, the practical and social life finds expression through how the rhythm of the self and the other is determined (p. 99). The new organization of everyday life required to reconsider exchanges, struggles, roles, and responsibilities. Everyday life was interrupted for a while and then it gained its own mediocrity. This period brought a hierarchical construction of social practices, whereby it could be possible to maintain the rhythmic continuity of home-centred private and work-life.

Social practices, which “are made up of rhythms” (Lefebvre, 1991, p. 206), are constitutive elements that reproduce everyday life. Social practices transform spatial-temporal rhythms of nature (p. 117) and also address social interactions, tendencies, and social structure. Our practices reveal the quality of everyday life, namely work-related human actions in quantified fragments (the measure of time). At this point, I categorize these practices into two groups,
which are visible in my experience field as a house-academic. The first of these is domestic practices, and the other is guest practices that draw attention with their specificity to the pandemic period. Domestic practices are like cooking, childcare, cleaning, etc. that I have internalized throughout socialization and reperform in gendered space. As the time passed by, these practices became more difficult to deal with in self-quarantine. Lefebvre (2004) states that it is possible to approach gender by considering the use of time and social rhythms (pp.74-75). In this context, rhythm analysis of self-quarantine can give an idea about the everydayness of white-collar women working-from-home. The ‘guest practices’ that I conceptualize in this study, are specific to the pandemic period such as homeschooling and distance education. They will disappear from our lives to a great extent with the normalization of the post-pandemic period.

Home, work, and leisure activities were interwoven in the pandemic and presented a layered time-space. However, I suggest that the guest practices served as a regulator of the arrhythmia of everyday life at home. Although home is the stage of various guest practices in self-quarantine, I will evaluate two practices that I have classified as ‘regulatory guest practices’ in this study. The first of these guest practices is homeschooling, and the other is distance education. Their common feature is that they are (or have to be) hierarchically prominent in the rhythmic order of my everyday life. In addition, they contain a solid relation to work-life and include especially a work-related repetition order.

Because of the suspension of school activities all over the country, home turned into a kind of education site. Before the pandemic, the kindergarten was the most important station in the everyday life of my son. During self-quarantine, we had to carry out his education at home to keep his learning process on the track. At the same time, all of my responsibilities as a house-academic (domestic practices and guest practices) were an important part of the daily schedule. The home was the only space of these practices from kindergarten to university. The encounter with these practices caused an ‘arrhythmia’. The daily function of different social rhythms without conflict required to establish ‘eurhythmia’. My son, my students, and I got involved in natural rhythms of our bodies, emotions, and work-related social practices in the cyclical and linear repetitions, which “interfere with one another constantly.” (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 8) Before the pandemic, this compliance had been reproduced by repeating the daily cycle through spatial differentiation (home, school, workplace etc.) in polyrhythmia of urban rhythms. However, it was now obligatory to reuse home space; reorganize calendars, programs, and to harmonize the practices with our rhythms and also everyday life.
4.1. Homeschooling

This study describes homeschooling as the situation in which children receive education under the guidance of their families at home. Although the pedagogical significance of preschool education is often emphasized, kindergarten is also of great importance for the participation of parents - especially for the emancipation of women - in working life. Kindergarten, which is one of the daily stations of a child, functions as a supporting institution. At this point, it would not be wrong to say that the child’s everyday life outside the home is regulated by working life. This means that a child participates in the daily cycle in relation to the parent’s ‘pledged and compulsive time’, which represents work-life according to Lefebvre (1971) and is opposed to ‘free time’. In this context, the child is positioned within the modern urban rhythm as an extension of the working parents.

Before the pandemic, I used to take my son to school at 8.30 a.m. every day and pick him up at 5 pm. The children have their own natural rhythms (sleep, hunger etc.), which are ‘educated’ by social life (Lefebvre, 2004, p. 43) There, in the ‘conceived space’ (Lefebvre, 1991), my son was with the educators who planned his whole day on his behalf. According to Lefebvre (2004), children mostly reject being altered by rhythms of dressage and disciplining their body in the rhythmic order that requires many years (p. 75). In this sense, the school is a place where the child’s discipline and compliance to the quantified pledged use are provided. While Lefebvre emphasizes the importance of repetition in education, he also underlines the role of rhythms in disciplining the body. Certain rhythmic movements and repetitions are important dimensions of the body and mental training (dressage) (pp. 38-46). Thereby, it is possible to grasp the importance of daily routines in school for the modern capitalist urban life. Routine is a predetermined action pattern that is seen during the performance and will perhaps be displayed or played in other situations (Goffman, 1956, p. 8-9). Performing these routines at home during self-quarantine caused a challenge. Because -as mentioned before- school is one of the social spaces not only to discipline the body, but also one of the main elements to organize everyday life.

In self-quarantine, we had to explore homeschooling with my son, which forced us to schedule the whole day. After waking up in the early morning, we went to kitchen to prepare breakfast and started to go through our daily program, which had already been determined by his teachers at school. Hence, we struggled to adapt ourselves to the external social rhythms at home. Homeschooling was one of the most challenging elements of the spatial-temporal transformation and an important dimension of self-quarantine. Home was reproduced through social needs and practices, and some regulations were required in the quantified time. In this
sense, as a house-academic, I was adopting the duties assumed, for example, by the cooks in the kindergarten or at the university. Thus, I was spending more time in the kitchen as a gendered space. Family meetings in the kitchen were a meaningful indicator of the end of the daily cycle before the pandemic. It was the space of reunion time for the whole family. The kitchen was not only a meeting space for dinner after a long day any more. But it also became a space where gender roles were reproduced through compelling circumstances.

Repetitions towards breakfast, homeschooling, and lunch afterwards required the use of the quantified time in a similar way as before the pandemic. At this point, home presented a micro reflection of everyday life centered around the pledged time, free time and compulsive time. Family activities (watching a movie at the cinema, going shopping, travelling at the weekend, meeting with friends) were no longer ‘leisure’ framed by the work-related boundaries. Family time or leisure was not only in the evenings during weekdays or a day at weekends. It became a part of homeschooling during the week.

New schedules brought by this situation emerged as a difficulty of organizing home life. Our bodies had to keep biological and social time in line with the rhythm of a six-year-old and to realize the repetitions and differences required by that rhythm. After the first month of self-quarantine, we experienced a break with the work-related arrangement of the quantified time. Now the days of the week were the same. In the use of time-space, the needs were determined, not the cyclical repetitions like days or hours. In the pre-pandemic period, arriving to class in the morning session and then ending the lecture in lunchtime was entailing following the daily fragments (quantified organization of work-life). However, the mood of my son during the day, the physical and mental needs of the household, chores at home, or homeschooling practices were decisive for the new organization.

4.2. Distance Education

The day presented fragments that were important for the rhythm of the child’s body. In the mornings, the intertwining practices of mine and my son caused arrhythmia. After my first week in self-quarantine, I discovered that night served as the most appropriate working-time for being an academic. The use of night for work-life was an important dimension of the transformation of my daily cycle. Arrhythmia was also regulated in this way. According to Lefebvre (2004), the night is a cyclical repetition, in which rhythms slow down, and sounds can be captured. Night is the remaining time from work, it is short and alike. It offers a temporality associated with home or leisure. But during self-quarantine what is left from the day was compressed into the night. Night gained a new rhythmic feature where the daily rhythm was not interrupted and flowed without any interruption. Distance education lectures
and academic meetings were the guest practices of the night. Cyclical repetitions (like day and night) were outlined by linear rhythms of the guest practices. Therefore, the formal office hours were changed and transferred to the night.

Distance education during the self-quarantine period had three important sides. One of these sides is the lecturer, that is me, the other is the participants, and the last one is the virtual space, which was my only interaction space with my students. As the exchange of repetitions and differences with the social practices of our lives are very important, the rhythmic harmony of all sides would determine the efficiency of distance education and also quality of this new everyday life practice.

We started our lectures at 9 p.m., due to my circumstances and those of the participants. Our meeting schedule offered a suitable temporality in which the participants, mostly female students, had completed their gendered repetitive daily practices before the session. But after a while, we had to revise our schedule with the arrival of Ramadan, which is the fasting month for Muslims. Due to the intense religious rituals practiced in Ramadan, the rhythm of everyday life turns into a new characteristic. The rhythm slows partially down during the day till iftar (fasting break) with sunset and then, the social rhythm gains momentum again. The dialectic of cyclical and linear rhythms becomes visible through religious rituals (iftar, sahur, tarawih prayer etc.) that require the reorganization of everyday life in Ramadan, which is also a cyclical repetition as a sacred month for everyday lived Islam. Thus, social acceptance of the religious rite often alters bureaucratic mind. In this sense, Ramadan fasting affects the speed and usage of “pledged time”. Thus, we scheduled our online sessions according to the fasting cycle, which is an important ritual in the lives of my students and then, we started our lectures at night, after the fasting ceremonies ended.

The silence of the night offered a suitable meeting condition for us. But it was also important for me to organize our sessions in accordance with the schedule of the online communication system, which I shared with my colleagues from the department. At this point, the organization of the lectures on virtual space as the third side of distance education was a new practice for me and my students. So, when I had to do one of my online lectures in the afternoon, the participation was very low because of the disharmony between the daily rhythm of the female students and our virtual space sessions. The reason for the limited number of participants in the online lectures was mainly everyday life responsibilities of the students, like taking care of family members and guests, doing household chores, or doing farm work etc. This gendered temporality caused arrhythmia in their everyday lives. This situation gives us the opportunity to have an idea of gendered time as well as gendered space.
The fact that the virtual social space, which is determined by planners and schedules, was the only opportunity for social interaction during self-quarantine has brought out different dimensions. In this regard, it could be valid to establish virtual social space as a conceived space. According to Lefebvre (1991), the relation of a person to space includes his/her relation to the body (p. 40). Virtual space disciplines the body and draws the boundaries of our interactions. It is an important example that during the online lectures, we had to stand still to avoid leaving the camera’s viewpoint. During these sessions, mental activities accelerated, and physical activities slowed down. The virtual space was chaordic through rhythms of the body and mind. Besides, it became the stage of rhythmic disorders with the interruptions in communication caused by the internet outage. Therefore, some disadvantaged students could not attend the online lectures due to the lack of technological tools. Cyclical repetitions such as seasonal transitions, rain, and wind have also had an effect on our education practice through internet outages. At that point, I argue that the differentiation of space (center and periphery dichotomy) in modern urban planning was rebuilt in virtual space by intersecting inequalities.

5. Conclusion

The pandemic has affected our lives at different levels. With the concept of physical distancing everyday interactions and our relation to social space have changed. Home has lost its meaning as a start and end point of the daily cycle of urban life. It gained a new meaning as the only place in our everyday lives during self-quarantine. Home is described as a space of escapism, which became the only site of both work and family life. In this way we experienced the transition of the work-life into the private space and the boundaries between differentiated time-space and roles concerning performances were now blurred. In this study I examined my 3-month self-quarantine in regard to dealing with the rhythmic aspect of everyday life of Lefebvre (2004). The rhythm as a tool enables to analyze the transformation of everyday temporal structures and social practices (Edensor, 2010). Everyday rhythms emerge at the intersection of social practices in different categories. In this chapter, I defined distance education and homeschooling that got involved into my house-academic life with the pandemic as guest practices.

Distance education being the practice of the night, and homeschooling being the practice of the day organized the home space as guest practices. They regulated rhythmic disruption (arrhythmia) occurred at the beginning of self-quarantine. These practices shaped everyday life, and they were spatially organized around the kitchen and the living room (as
the kindergarten) and the study (as the university). Quantified repetitions of time and linear repetitions of our social practices have found their own rhythm in the interaction of time and space. These practices have demonstrated a regulatory power. This exchange is inevitable in everyday life. In this regard, the home space has been reorganized with its work-related meanings, and it has been reproduced with its polyrhythmic features, in which rhythms affect each other (Edensor, 2010, p. 14). Even though it was complicated to have eurhythmia at the beginning, the spatial-temporal organization of our practices presented a “syncopated rhythm with polyrhythmic assemblage of everyday life” (Conlon, 2010, p. 14). Guest practices and domestic practices mutually grasp the “dynamic co-existence and impact of the multiple beats” (p. 73) that transform home space during pandemic.

Gender roles came into the question through my experiences as a house-academic in self-quarantine. Motherhood is one of the key dimensions of these practices, which was embodied through homeschooling, and the distance education schedule was rebuilt by gendered time and space and reproduced power relations. Before the suspension of activities at the university, the campus life was offering, especially for my female students, an opportunity to organize their daily routines partly by the means of their educational responsibilities, not patriarchal structures. Due to the lack of campus access, the gendered temporality caused arrhythmia in their lives as well as mine.

The rhythm of everyday life, which divides cyclical repetitions into fragments, is disrupted during self-quarantine. The modern people have a technique and ideology of “relaxation” (Lefebvre, 2010a, p. 39). This requires free time out of work and family, away from tension. Leisure should look like a break from everyday life. The boundaries between weekend and workday have become blurry in self-quarantine, especially when one of my distance education classes was on Saturday. That Saturday evening was no longer a special time reserved for a family activity and leisure, yet it became a part of work-life. At this point, the work-centered urban life manifested itself through reorganization of home space. The self-quarantine situation staged the exchange of dualities such as day and night, kitchen and study room. Now, everyday life excludes the world of leisure not only ideologically, but also compulsorily with the effect of the pandemic. My self-quarantine period, when the pledged time and the free time were interwoven, also presented the trialectics of work, family, and leisure. At this point, the home presented a variety of social practices unlike its position in the modern urban life of the pre-pandemic period.
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