



## BOOK REVIEWS

Review editor: Francisco Muñoz-Pérez  
Assisted by Dominique Diguet of the INED Documentation Department

- É. CHARMES,  
M.-H. BACQUÉ (eds.)      *Mixité sociale, et après ?* [What does social mix lead to?]  
• Reviewed by Joanie Cayouette-Remblière ..... 528
- É. FELLER      *Du vieillard au retraité. La construction de la vieillesse dans la France du XX<sup>e</sup> siècle*  
[From elderly person to pensioner: The construction of old age in France over the twentieth century]  
• Reviewed by Pierre-Antoine Bilbaut..... 531
- J. KIVITS, F. BALARD,  
C. FOURNIER, M.  
WINANCE      *Les recherches qualitatives en santé*  
[Qualitative study of health]  
• Reviewed by Meoin Hagège ..... 534
- H.S. BECKER      *La bonne focale. De l'utilité des cas particuliers en sciences sociales* [French translation of *What about Mozart? What about Murder? Reasoning from Cases*]  
• Reviewed by Meoin Hagège ..... 536
- R. ROGERS,  
P. MOLINIER (eds.)      *Les femmes dans le monde académique. Perspectives comparatives* [Women in the academic world: comparative perspectives]  
• Reviewed by Mathieu Arbogast ..... 537
- P. PICHON, C. GIROLA,  
É. JOUVE (eds.)      *Au temps du sans-abrisme. Enquêtes de terrain et problème public* [In a time of homelessness: field studies on a public problem]  
• Reviewed by Pierre Eloy ..... 541

CHARMES Éric, BACQUÉ Marie-Hélène (eds.), 2016, *Mixité sociale, et après ? [What does social mix lead to?]*, Paris, Presses universitaires de France, La Vie des idées, 112 p.

The notion of social mix has been widely accepted since the 1980s<sup>(1)</sup> as a legitimate means of distributing populations in space. This collective work edited by Éric Charmes and Marie-Hélène Bacqué sets out to probe the effects of using the notion in public policy and working to achieve social mix. The five contributions are highly diverse but their coherence is clearly conveyed by the introduction, the conclusion and the brief presentations by the editors that precede the chapters.

In the first chapter, Marie-Hélène Bacqué asks how social mix as a public policy notion and aim affects common representations of *classe populaire* [working-class or relatively poor] neighbourhoods, critiquing the disqualification-naturalization of communities it entails. She begins by recalling Weber's definition of the community – “a group defined by a feeling of membership, belief in a common heritage, by a tradition or shared origin” (pp. 19-20) – then shows that communities develop on different bases (geographical, religious, work-related, etc.), and that a person may therefore belong to several of them. From this perspective, communities are not merely social groups that individuals can withdraw into; they also provide resources, generate critical consciousness and transmit a power to act. Naturalizing communities makes it impossible to conceive and understand social change, she explains, particularly the processes by which the *classe populaire* has become desegregated, processes linked to longer education and a wider range of cohabitation, interaction and co-presence situations of the sort described in detail by Olivier Schwartz<sup>(2)</sup>. For Bacqué, the notion of social mix misrepresents the real issues operative in working-class neighbourhoods, issues related not to withdrawal into a community but on the contrary the transformation of such neighbourhoods due to the increasing diversity and increasingly precarious situation of this social group.

In the second chapter the eminent American sociologist Robert Sampson offers a dense, detailed account of the theoretical framework of his *Great American City*. Sampson specializes in “the neighbourhood effect”; that is, the impact of neighbourhood characteristics on inhabitants' social trajectories and outcomes. He shows that “ecological concentration of the truly disadvantaged” (whose lives are characterized by poverty, unemployment, family breakups, racial segregation and other ills) does affect levels of violent crime and mutual assistance but that this effect is not mechanical. Sampson develops two concepts that complexify analysis of segregation. First, the notion of a “mirroring” neighbourhood whereby he can claim that shared perceptions of disorder predict how a neighbourhood will develop and change – notably by following what Jean-Claude Chamboredon

(1) See Palomares Élise, 2010, “Itinéraire du credo de la ‘mixité sociale’”, *Revue Projet*, 307(6), pp. 23-29.

(2) Schwartz, 1998, “La notion de ‘classes populaires’”, study presented for the habilitation to supervise doctoral research, Université Versailles Saint-Quentin.

(1985)<sup>(3)</sup> described as the dynamics of “social construction of populations” – and that individuals settle in neighbourhoods with inhabitants whose perceptions they share. The second concept is “collective efficacy”, namely effective social regulation: a means of keeping crime low and a possible resource, including in segregated neighbourhoods. Sampson thus highlights the fact that these kinds of neighbourhoods may be resources; his analysis of the neighbourhood effect goes beyond a critique of segregation.

In Chapter 3 the geographer Mathieu Giroud probes the ambivalent social effects of social mix in connection with the gentrification of *classe populaire* neighbourhoods. Promoting social mix in these neighbourhoods side-skirts the adverse effects that gentrification has on the most vulnerable components of the population. *Classe populaire* neighbourhoods get “rehabilitated” for the stated purpose of opening them up to the middle classes, but this relegates symbols of that group’s heritage to the category of aesthetics and has the effect of effacing the related, possibly conflictual social history of the place. Drawing on his study of a historically working-class neighbourhood of Grenoble, Giroud shows how social mix there is still marked by relations of domination and social control of the less advantaged group, though that group occasionally manages to put up “some resistance”.

In Chapter 4, Stéphane Tonnelat draws on a review of the American literature and his own interactionist research on relations between passers-by to probe the effects of social mix in public space. He begins with a strict definition of public space – a place of anonymous co-presence – that distinguishes it from both private and neighbourhood spaces, the latter made up of secondary relations with more or less distant acquaintances. Then, instead of merely postulating an idealized role for public space as a place that instils a sense of solidarity in citizens, he takes a closer look at how socialization actually works in and by way of these spaces. His analyses show that in socially mixed public places, people acquire behaviours that promote generalized accessibility founded on a sense of equality; for example, there is no discrimination against minorities. In other words, situations of co-presence among individuals of diverse social and ethnic or migration origins work to instil values of tolerance and respect for difference.

The last chapter is based on a collective study by Éric Charmes, Lydie Launey and Stéphanie Vermeersch. It is presented as a response to Jacques Lévy’s “urbanity gradient” theory, according to which spaces are hierarchically ordered by their functional and social diversity (or, in Tonnelat’s terms, their propensity to produce situations of anonymous co-presence). In that hierarchy, major metropolises stand opposed to peri-urban residential areas, the latter understood to foster attitudes of withdrawal into domestic space, private relations with similar persons and an overall exclusion of difference. On the basis of qualitative interviews with residents of the ninth arrondissement of Paris and residents of a well-to-do

---

(3) Chamboredon Jean-Claude, 1985, “Construction sociales des populations”, in Duby Georges (ed.), *Histoire de la France urbaine*, vol. 5, Paris, Le Seuil, pp. 441-472.

neighbourhood in a peri-urban town in the *département* of Yvelines, the authors conclude that “peri-urban areas are not a degraded version of cities”. They first show the diversity of peri-urban spaces, ranging from strongly *classe populaire* (areas likely to have noise pollution – airports, trains) to solidly middle-and upper-class districts. They then contend that while the peri-urban area they have studied is more socially homogeneous than most city centre neighbourhoods, the selective sociability of ninth-arrondissement residents tends to produce the same level of homogeneity. At the end of the chapter, Charmes and his colleagues note that no one is spared fear of the other. The discourse of ninth-arrondissement Paris residents proved more contemptuous and racist than that of peri-urban residents. The social mix characteristic of the city centre can therefore induce behaviour that is more segregational than in peri-urban areas.

Across the five chapters, then, the notion of social mix is handled in two ways. First, the book suggests different ways of thinking about the notion as a public policy lever. The social mix “credo” has been used to justify the disqualification (and renovation) of working-class neighbourhoods of the sort studied by Bacqué; also to promote gentrification of central working-class neighbourhoods and to reduce segregation in such neighbourhoods, including ones once characterized by strong “collective efficacy”. The book thus leads us to greater caution or circumspection about the effects of the social mix idea. But the various contributions also probe the effects of real social mix. Tonnelat, for example, shows that social mix in public places can foster the emergence of skills favourable to tolerance and respect for others, whereas Giroud highlights how the co-presence of socially different groups can engender domination and social control. The strength of the book lies in just this cautious and ambiguous conclusion and its demonstration that the question of the effects of social mix is far from closed and deserves our continued attention. For while it is obvious that a more balanced spatial distribution of people and groups is not enough to resolve social inequalities, it would be unfortunate to neglect how it contributes to social reconfigurations.

Joanie CAYOJETTE-REMBLIÈRE

FELLER Élise, 2017, *Du vieillard au retraité. La construction de la vieillesse dans la France du xx<sup>e</sup> siècle* [From elderly person to pensioner: the construction of old age in France in the twentieth century], Paris, L'Harmattan, 438 p.

In this ambitious work, Élise Feller clearly and methodically deconstructs the idea that the condition of old age only began to be institutionalized in France after World War II. Directly confronting this myopic perspective, widespread in studies of old age, she draws on multiple sources and viewpoints to demonstrate that the first half of the twentieth century was a crucial period in the evolution of representations of old age. And the institutionalization of retirement entirely transformed the French understanding of the life cycle.

The first part of the book covers the “figures” and “words” used to represent old age over the period under study. Ageing was first perceived as a threat to French national power, particularly when the country compared its situation to that of its European neighbours. In fact it was the low birth rate and the persistence of child mortality, rather than longer life expectancy, that explained the rising proportion of older generations in the French population at the time. As the author succinctly puts it: “France aged in the first half of the twentieth century but it was only in the second that French people themselves aged” (p. 60). Her analysis here is highly stimulating as it helps explain why demographic discourse at the time so often took on an ideological tone: denunciation of the low birth rate actually expressed “a desire to bring a segment of the population characterized by lax morals back to the values of family and work that represented the nation’s strength” (p. 38). The analysis of women’s situation here reveals that old age was seen not solely in terms of biological change (the supposed age at which one attains old age); representations were also shaped by moral considerations. Women (as well as confirmed old bachelors and spinsters) became old people earlier in life than fathers, heads of families. The scientific arguments were very slow to evolve: demographic fatalism was still being stressed as late as 1948, on the occasion of a three-day conference entitled “Scientific study of ageing in the population”. In the second chapter Feller takes up popular representations of old age. Here the author draws on a great variety of sources to show how little those representations themselves varied: old people were undesirable figures, excluded, for example, from the nascent art of cinema in favour of the first (young) screen stars. This review of discourses on old age also highlights how loosely the notion was linked to the real age variable: gender, occupational category and marital status were all factors understood to accelerate or slow entry into old age.

Part II takes up the question of medical views and approaches to old age in the early twentieth century. While there were signs in the nineteenth that a specialized medical approach to old age was taking shape, the political preoccupations of the early twentieth put a stop to this development. In the aftermath of World War I, youth and young people became a priority for medicine. The only subjects studied in connection with ageing and the elderly were

menopause and tuberculosis. And the motivations behind this research tell us much about physicians' priorities: for menopause, the aim was to understand when and how female fertility ended in order to prolong it and increase birth numbers; with regard to tuberculosis, the aim was to isolate infected older persons from the rest of the population to avoid contagion. Last, extremely poor old persons were relegated to hospices alongside indigents. At first, and until around 1930, these institutions were relatively effective in meeting old people's needs: with the law of 1905, assistance became compulsory and arguments in favour of solidarity – *solidarisme* – were applied directly when it came to managing these establishments; religious works too played a major role in them. Hygiene theories were also applied to improve living conditions for this segment of the population. Presenting many detailed local examples, the author illustrates the hospice's "golden age" in the 1920s. However, increasing demand and limited resources due to the 1930s economic crisis later turned these places into *mouroirs* (dying rooms) for the poor and underprivileged old.

The last part of the book and the most fully developed takes up the social construction of old age in France, a process in which the early twentieth century constitutes a key moment. "In half a century, France progressed from private management of old age centred around the family, private means or charity, to collective management, at first only partial, centred around the figure of the indigent old person, and later much more thorough and centred around the figure of the pensioner" (p. 165). France was a more rural country than its European neighbours and ageing in private circumstances was considered the most desirable experience there. In direct contrast to this often over-idealized situation, indigent older persons were the first to benefit from social legislation (law of 1905). This first image of institutionalized old age highlights that state solidarity was structured first and foremost by the notion of assistance. Though the first forms of it were clearly insufficient, the structures implemented (for example, benevolent organization canvassing of local needs) worked to change representations. Alongside this development, retirement through capitalization systems began to develop and flourish through the "mutual benefit" movement – *mutualisme* – where unearned income to be used in old age was insured through accounts taken out with the national pension fund and, for state pensioners, a new pension system. Though the amounts deposited were absurdly low – notably given the level of inflation, which ruined individuals with unearned incomes – the idea of collectively managing retirement pensions was gradually making inroads. The working classes remained largely excluded from this development, as demonstrated by the early failure of worker and farmer retirement pensions (law of 1910). The majority of workers rejected the system, which they saw as a potential means of re-establishing on-going control over their mobility and behaviour. Moreover, the system was still conceived in insurance terms – inconceivable for workers, whose income did not allow them to save, who had difficulty thinking of themselves as permanent employees, and who at that time were not even likely to live to legal retirement age. In the 1930s, when social

insurance became generalized in France, retirement gradually came to be considered by the population at large as a normal period in the life cycle. So though it was first “conceived by employers as a means of social control, it later came to be perceived by employees as a time of freedom and independence following the constraint of working” (p. 339). Surveys conducted after World War II – notably by INED – clearly show a revolution in mentalities that reflects “the integration of the retirement period into the individual and family life cycle” (p. 349).

In the last chapter, Élise Feller presents the main conclusions of her study of archived retirement files of employees of the Paris transport system. Through her analysis of over 600 files on workers born between 1860 and 1880, we see the emergence and consolidation of a “special” regime for this category of workers. Up against the demands of modernizing urban transport techniques, the highest priorities were work force stability and competence. While the retirement system made it possible to maintain the work force and to let go of senior workers without difficulty, employees too adopted the new system and made it their own. Retirement thus became a full-fledged period of the life cycle, involving new residential projects (returning to settle in the region of one’s birth, for example, or purchasing a free-standing home on the outskirts of Paris).

The author offers us a particularly complete, nuanced panorama of the history of old age in France in the early twentieth century. It may seem regrettable that she chose to organize the work thematically, which results in some repetition. It is also unfortunate to have separated the case study of transport workers’ special retirement regime: the links between its advent and the more general movement underway in French society could have been studied in greater depth. However, these criticisms weigh little against the high quality of the research and its presentation. As Vincent Caradec writes in his afterword, Élise Feller’s book will be of great interest to the disciplines of history and the human sciences, as it fills in a considerable gap in our knowledge of old age.

Pierre-Antoine BILBAUT

KIVITS Joëlle, BALARD Frédéric, FOURNIER Cécile, WINANCE Myriam, 2016, *Les recherches qualitatives en santé* [Qualitative study of health], Paris, Armand Colin, 329 p.

This collectively written work – 29 contributions – is designed for students, teachers and researchers interested in conducting qualitative studies in the area of health. It is multidisciplinary, and contributors include French-speaking academics working for the most part in the social sciences and public health, physicians, educational science professors and specialists of communication. The material is also accessible to non-specialists wishing to understand and possibly conduct qualitative surveys, and it is enriched with interdisciplinary dialogue and field study experiences. The book skilfully instructs readers in how to carry out surveys or studies with rigour and forethought.

It opens with a reminder of the fundamental methodological principles of the social sciences (Part I) and proceeds to show how they may be applied in part to studies on health subjects (Part II). The first chapters take up the ethics-related issues of research into medical questions and present interview and observation methods as well as how to use documents, including internet material (e-health studies). Part III presents examples of qualitative studies on health that illustrate the specific issues involved in conducting research into medical and public health subjects as well as working within theoretical frameworks such as phenomenology or applying particular methods such as focus groups and mixed methods.

The notion of “qualitative research” adopted here is quite broad and defined in opposition, as it were, to research based on health databases. The last chapter suggests that in this intensely multidisciplinary field, the qual/quant opposition is methodologically and epistemologically inoperative. However, distinct disciplines and approaches – which researchers are not always fully familiar with – do come into play, and interactions between them are necessary. The authors put forward three recommendations for “good” practice of qualitative health studies, practice in which researchers can work effectively together: 1) grounding the research in a theoretical framework that researchers are familiar with and know how to apply; 2) making a point of interacting with other disciplines – this constitutes a research objective in itself; 3) acquiring a better understanding of the approaches and strengths of other disciplines so as to facilitate multidisciplinary dialogue and publications.

One major contribution of this work is its well-argued plea for rigorous practice of social science methods. In the field of health it is particularly important for researchers to master methodologies (methods and their theoretical frameworks) because of the ineluctable confrontation between qualitative research approaches and the framework of biomedical thinking. For example, the importance of the notion of representativeness in that framework may lead those researchers to doubt the scientificity or robustness of the social sciences. Having solid knowledge of social science methodologies and epistemological foundations will prevent this and enable researchers doing qualitative studies to assert themselves as



scientists both in the field and when writing up their findings. As the authors recall, doing social science of health through field studies and as part of a research team requires being well-versed in one's own discipline; this is what will make it possible to interact constructively with practitioners of other disciplines.

Meoïñ HAGÈGE

BECKER Howard S., 2016, *La bonne focale. De l'utilité des cas particuliers en sciences sociales*, originally published as *What about Mozart? What about Murder? Reasoning from Cases*, trans. Christine Merllié-Young, Paris, La Découverte, Grands repères, 272 p.

This is a French translation of Howard Becker's *What about Mozart? What about Murder? Reasoning from Cases*, published in 2013 by the University of Chicago Press – the latest work by one of the most renowned sociologists of the second Chicago school. Becker is the author of fundamental studies on discrimination, deviance and art (*Outsiders*, *Art Worlds*) and extremely useful works on methodology (*Sociological Work: Method and Substance*, *Tricks of the Trade: How to Think about Your Research while You're Doing It*).

The book's seven chapters lay down the crucial components of the method: analysing cases so as to develop more general hypotheses on social processes by way of analogy. What Becker calls “black boxes” and their inputs and outputs are the central means of comparing cases and thereby gradually coming to understand the principles of social structure. Social processes, he argues, can be elucidated by analysing what goes into and what comes out of those boxes. Comparing similar cases will enable the researcher gradually to define their cogs and gearwheels.

The book puts forward a plea for reasoning by analogy in social science research while attesting to the viability of this approach. Becker describes precisely and instructively why and how he uses specific cases to generalize and gradually develop sociological theories. The cases are extremely varied. He draws on his own work and that of others, notably in the field of American pragmatic sociology, as well as personal experiences, anecdotes and fictional cases. He draws on some of his own articles on the effects of drugs and lay knowledge to illustrate his “black box” notion, citing passages of “Consciousness, Power and Drug Effects” (1973) and “Drugs and Politics” (1977) to explain how reasoning can be applied step by step to open the “black box” wherein some users are transformed into deviants – a highly instructive demonstration of how sociological theories can be elaborated on the basis of empirical observations and scientific study.

Becker calls for a sociology grounded in wide-ranging general culture rather than limited to specialized sociological studies. Finding different, inspiring cases, including imaginary ones, is, as he sees it, the best way of breathing fresh air into the discipline and sustaining scientific curiosity so that sociology remains an innovative science.

While the translation is clumsy in places and some of the content has been published elsewhere, this book will prove highly useful to social science students seeking practical advice on how to produce rigorous, innovative sociological studies. And it is a timely reminder of how crucial it is for sociology to remain open to the world surrounding it.

Meoïñ HAGÈGE

ROGERS Rebecca, MOLINIER Pascale (eds.), 2016, *Les femmes dans le monde académique. Perspectives comparatives* [Women in the academic world: comparative perspectives], Rennes, Presses universitaires de Rennes, 228 p.

This is a book of proceedings from an international conference on women in academic institutions held in March 2015 at the University of Paris 13 and organized by the University of the Sorbonne Paris-Cité with support from the Institut Émilie de Châtelet and the European Union TRIGGER project. The fact that it was selected for the EU's Seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development is proof of the Union's support for research on these topics. This general context, more favourable than previously though there are still some points of vulnerability, made it possible to hold such an ambitious three-day conference.

The book contains a considerable proportion (13) of the contributions to the 2015 conference along with three short sections summarizing the 36 papers. Some of the papers had already been published. The volume is divided into three parts: pioneers, current academic careers, institutional changes and the levers thereof. But the chapters can also be subdivided into historical studies, sociological studies and personal accounts. The nature of the contributions differs considerably. Some present archive findings, others original surveys, and then there are more or less personal narratives. The volume focuses primarily on France but six of the thirteen chapters discuss a foreign country or province: Belgium, Germany, Ivory Coast, Haiti, Quebec and Switzerland. The disciplines represented are quite diverse: history, sociology, psychology, philosophy and educational science. This geographical, disciplinary and historical variety, together with the different scales studied, ranging from the individual to the structure, evidence the strong ambitions of the conference, and the volume is quite complete. The three examples of pioneering institutions and groups of women academics – female medievalist historians at the École Pratique des Hautes Études of Paris, Toulouse universities from 1912 to 1968, and medical and scientific faculties in Paris from 1869 to 1939 – were all drawn from French university history. They reveal three situations. First, being a foreign female student made it easier to gain admission to these institutions. Second, the fact that a woman established a precedent in being hired did not mean another would be recruited for a comparable position; often it took many long years. And third, being endorsed by a man in a high position within the given institution was a major advantage – the mark of an essentially patriarchal system.

Part II is more sociological and examines the mechanisms at work in greater detail. Drawing on data from the European Union GARCIA project, Nicky Le Feuvre offers a detailed account of the theoretical and methodological issues involved in this research field. She begins by observing slippage over time from an argument formulated in terms of social justice to one emphasizing women as a factor for efficiency in academic institutions, and she stresses the need for attention to context and taking into account status and pay differences between

universities of different countries. The impact of having a child is not the same everywhere either. The author's review of the international literature covers individual and social factors of inequality but also institutional ones. In this connection, she mentions the importance of identifying "gatekeepers" who filter information and the positive impact of raising their awareness.

Drawing on qualitative interviews with Belgian post-doctoral researchers of both sexes, Pascal Barbier and Bernard Fusulier describe the tensions between parenthood and the demands of this particular professional world. They distinguish between reinforcement (parenthood experienced as a factor that improves research work), the positive effect of shifting priorities toward the family, and conflict between the constraints of the two spheres, a conflict reported only by the mothers in their sample.

Alban Jacquemart and François Sarfati explore data from an internet survey on how university personnel feel about their work. Despite a general sense of being socially useful, women have a more negative attitude toward their work than men. And administrative staff and technicians have a more negative view than academics.

Sophie Lhenry draws on survey data to discuss the question of the "masculine success norm" among teacher-researchers. Using Howard Becker's concept of career, she deconstructs the dominant perception that the academic institution is egalitarian and meritocratic and that any and all problems concern individuals. The fact is that only women are questioned on how they balance private life and work. As it turns out, women's ambition is readily stigmatized, and being available for the institution gets turned against mothers, who are generally expected to take care of their children. The standard of success is therefore heavily gender-specific.

Anne-Sophie Godfroy also focuses on the gender aspect of university excellence norms, this time drawing on data from the EU GenderTime research project. Meanwhile, Marguerite Akossi-Mvongo and Hassan Guy Roger-Tieffi's study of the University Houphouët-Boigny in Abidjan, Ivory Coast, confirms Lhenry's analyses, despite the doubts the authors express at the outset about the relevance of applying Western analyses of inequality to non-Western situations. Women began to win approval for studying science in high school and attending university as early as 1965 and particularly after 1980. But they are still concentrated at subaltern levels and social roles are intensely gendered. It is true that women now work outside the home (the housewife model is currently viewed as "exotic") but they are still expected to do the domestic work. Families are therefore reluctant to support female doctoral students in an activity that draws them away from domestic tasks, and once those students become researchers they do not have the same amount of free time as male researchers.

The last chapters come close to being personal accounts. Francine Descarries observes that despite the vitality of gender studies in Quebec since the early date of 1965, their legitimacy is constantly called into question. Meanwhile Danièle

Magloire points to the low number of second-level university term papers on these themes at the State University of Haiti; gender studies only began to be taught there in 2009 and the course is not offered every year. Meike Hilgemann and Jennifer Niegel cite data from triennial reports on the gender situation in academia in Germany. Hiring procedures there are opaque and tend to reproduce a situation of masculine homosociality. The authors conclude that the “black box” of hiring needs to be opened. Farinaz Fassa, meanwhile, emphasizes factors of real change by further developing Le Feuvre’s analyses of the GARCIA Project. Policies in Switzerland emphasize detecting and accompanying women of high potential (targeting, mentoring) as well as making it easier for them to balance family and work lives through provision of day care facilities and work schedule flexibility. These measures do not call into question either the male-centred “gender regime” (see Raewyn Connell) or the general emphasis on excellence norms.

In her conclusion to the book, Catherine Marry is critical of some aspects of the proceedings and sees the findings as disappointing. She is against calling the issue of professional life/motherhood reconciliation “cursed” and against its being a constant focus of research because, as she points out, women’s careers develop more slowly and are not as “accomplished” as men’s whether they have children or not. Moreover, she says that fixating on the idea of reconciliation or balancing has the effect of leaving academics’ life partners out of the research, “in this work as in most of the publications mentioned”. Marry’s text is less of a conclusion to the book than a critical assessment of the last fifteen years of research on the subject.

At this point I would add that neither the contributions nor the references they cite and on which the demonstrations are based really discuss the implications of the extreme variety of academic institutions, at least in France. There are implicit hierarchies between disciplines and universities and between universities, professional schools and elite training institutions, and work contexts in those different institutions vary. There are also hierarchical distinctions between political science institutes and technological institutes, two types of structures attached to universities in France (with the exception of Science Po, Paris). Likewise, it is in high school facilities that students in France take *classes préparatoires* (preparing them to apply to elite training institutions) and earn degrees in technical disciplines; i.e., their teachers there are officially secondary school teachers – and were recruited at that level – though they are in fact training students for post-secondary levels, a situation that makes the skein of hierarchies and hiring channels even more complex.

This is of course a welcome work, as the subject is not handled very frequently in French-language social sciences. It stands at the intersection of sociology of gender, science studies, and the field of gender-related occupational inequalities. The proceedings of a research day jointly organized in 2007 by the Association Nationale des Études Féministes (ANEF) and Efigies (an association promoting

solidarity among male and female students and researchers doing feminist, gender and sexuality studies) and entitled “Les femmes à l’université: rapports de pouvoir et discriminations” [Women in the university: power relations and discrimination] already took up the question of structural actions and provided figures on the situation. Contrary to the work under review, the 2007 conference did not take into account foreign countries or pioneering groups or institutions, but it did examine the relations and attitudes toward the institution of female doctoral students – a specific category of researcher with unstable employment – and included two papers on sexual harassment. All these research studies – wide-ranging EU projects and individual research studies alike – continue to be pursued. Moreover, several of the organizers and contributors to the 2015 conference took part in the 9th European Conference on Gender Equality in Higher Education held in Paris from 12 to 14 September 2016 – proof that the dynamic is still going strong.

The book itself runs into two stumbling blocks, due in part to the delicate exercise of publishing conference papers. The first is that fewer than half of the papers are included, which is often the case when talks are not assessed for publication before the conference. Second, many chapters are quite brief, corresponding to the length of time allotted for the talk; while this makes it possible to cover several topic areas quickly at the conference, it deprives later readers of precious details. These two problems often arise at conferences, and they indirectly reflect the difficulty of raising funds for scientific assemblies. Barbier and Fusulier’s chapter, for example, is actually a synthesis of an article submitted before the conference and published since in *Sociologie et sociétés*. And Alain Chenu and Olivier Martin’s paper on the trajectories of female teacher-researchers in the disciplines of sociology and demography was not included in the book but published instead in the journal *Travail, genre et sociétés*. Last, the substantial file on gender and work/life interferences in scientific careers, co-edited by Bernard Fusulier and published in Spring 2017 in the *European Educational Research Journal*, has no equivalent in French; it comprises 14 articles, only one of which focuses, and only partially, on France. Clearly the gap between French and international production has not been filled.

Mathieu ARBOGAST

PICHON Pascale, GIROLA Claudia, JOUVE Élodie (eds.), 2016, *Au temps du sans-abrisme. Enquêtes de terrain et problème public* [In a time of homelessness: field studies on a public problem], Presses universitaires de Saint-Étienne, 454 p.

This work brings together twenty of the papers delivered at an international conference held in Saint-Étienne in 2012 entitled “Public space and homelessness: a presentation of research”. The authors work in both French and foreign universities and in a wide range of disciplines including sociology, educational science, history, anthropology, ethnology and political science. The field studies were done in France (Paris and Saint-Étienne), Tokyo, Montreal and Buenos Aires.

The authors analyse the public policies for combating exclusion implemented over the last twenty years and their effects on homeless populations as well as citizen mobilizations against homelessness. Their work comes together around two main ideas: the usefulness of continuing to amass research on these realities, and the relevance of the comparative perspective. Field studies and surveys play a major role in this research by way of analytic description and in connection with “epistemological scope”.

The eight chapters are divided into three parts. In the first, the authors present their ideas on the practice of field studies and examine the role of researchers and other outside figures in such studies. The first chapter contextualizes the emergence of the public problem of homelessness over the twentieth century. Using a socio-historical approach, Axelle Brodriez and Bertrand Ravon describe the arrangements initially put in place, the effect of which was to render this marginal population invisible. In the second chapter, Daniel Cefai draws us directly into the urgent social problem of homelessness, presenting a field study conducted with France’s municipal humanitarian emergency service, the Samu Social. In the next chapter, Marine Maurin analyses public policies around the “housing first” demand through case studies of a programme in Quebec and a city initiative in Saint-Étienne.

Part II focuses on researchers’ involvement in and commitment to these studies, from the work of restoring research findings to the homeless population in question to the issue of what role artists should play in the debate on homelessness. Claudia Girola begins the first chapter of this section by stressing the importance of reflexivity when doing research with homeless people. In her text, Dalhia Namian demonstrates the relevance of irony and metaphor in studying “itinerance” and the end of life: incorporating them into the research helps better define and approach the practice of surveying a population on the margins of society and the epistemological and methodological difficulties this raises for researchers. In the next chapter, Jérôme Beauchez moves beyond the epistemology question, giving an account of tensions between “involvement” in the situation under study and “self-distancing” in a survey of groups of “punks, skinheads and squatters”. Beauchez stresses the importance of life history interviews, as does Christophe Blanchard in his account of a field study of young homeless persons with dogs; fieldwork is combined with an autobiographical sketch and a

reflexive look at the use of sociological categories and concepts. The focus of the following text, by Fabrice Fernandez, is a group of drug-users “roaming the city”. Fernandez narrates how he proceeded as a researcher, meeting first with a crack-smoker who became his guide and introduced him into a field whose rules and frameworks are determined by drug-users rather than institutions. The last chapter describes proposed public policy solutions. Shirley Roy’s study of homelessness in Quebec shows the difficulties and potential of conducting research in partnership. Elodie Jouve and Claire Lemarchand concentrate on relations between research and public policy, analysing the effects of calling on artists to critique the living conditions of the homeless and showing the positive impact of artistic creations and “inventive, polemical or innovative” arrangements. This part ends with an article by Etienne Tassin on the role of designers whose aim is not so much to provide solutions as to elicit constructive thinking about the problem.

Part III centres on ethnographic description. The aim is to account for the “metamorphoses of this social issue” on the basis of international examples from France, Italy, Japan and Argentina. The first articles discuss the settlement of homeless people in public space in precarious housing such as tents or shacks. Gaspard Lion describes in fine detail the experience of men living in the woods around Paris, a group he kept up with for four years. He stresses their resistance against the difficulties they encounter, including in their continual negotiations with the authorities and all the way up to their eviction. In similar fashion, Lucas Graeff presents a mobilization of the Enfants de Don Quichotte [Children of Don Quixote], a French association for defending the homeless, showing that the creation in France of a legal right to decent housing (and the right to sue to obtain it) has reinforced “the naturalization of categorical representations”. In Estelle Degouys’ study of clusters of tents for the homeless in Tokyo public parks, a chapter that echoes Gaspard Lion’s, we observe “the daily struggle to inhabit” and efforts to create organization that will facilitate “living together”. Griselda Pelleres and Paula Rosa study the presence of homeless people in public space in the city of Buenos Aires, where a recent law grants them use rights. The researchers critique the assistance-centred approach of the law, which many homeless persons cannot accept. Marie-Thérèse Têtu further exposes the limitations of this approach in her article on squats inhabited by homeless undocumented migrants. While homeless citizens of the country can claim a right to housing or shelter, undocumented migrants cannot. Here squats become places for mobilizing to demand “the right to be here”, mobilizations than can result in arrangements with institutional or association actors; also places for transmitting a kind of knowledge, as Maurizio Bergamaschi shows in connection with the hiring of former homeless people as *au pair* workers in Italy.

It is regrettable that the studies of situations in France do not show how diversified the homeless population has become in recent years (increased



numbers of women, children and foreigners)<sup>(1)</sup> and the impact these changes should have on how the public problem, and responses to it, are constructed. Nonetheless, this collective work constitutes a useful overview of research into homelessness; the chapters analyse local situations and stakes while situating them in a historical and international perspective.

Pierre ELOY

---

(1) See F. Yaouancq and M. Duée, 2014, “Les sans-domicile en 2012 : une grande diversité de situations”, INSEE, *France, portrait social*.