INTRODUCTION

How do people carry out their activities of daily living in 21st-century Western urban societies? That is, how do they cope with food and eating, mobility and moving, health and caring, jobs and working, housing and inhabiting, education and learning? You might think, these questions should warm any sociologist’s heart and mind. Everyone has to meet their basic needs, and every day. The sociologist would thus engage in two of her fav hobbies: illuminating what has become of human life in a complex and changing social world, revealing the deep hidden social forces behind mundane things of the everyday that laypeople take for granted. Yet, there are scant sociological approaches to activities of daily living (hereinafter referred to as ADL). These issues have traditionally been tackled in psychology of motivation (Maslow, 1987 [1954]), development economics (Jolly, 1976), and medicine (Katz et al., 1963).

In this paper, I focus on eating and moving. Drawing from ethnographic fieldwork in Goutte d’Or, a mixed neighborhood in Paris, I argue that urban daily living is a matter of structure. This means, urban daily living is a structure made of constituent elements (i.e., observable knowledge, emotions, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors), is shaped by elements of social structure (at the urban and national scales), and is differentiated across social categories (which are proper to urban and national stratification systems). I develop a framework for sociological research on ADL, and provide information on data collection and analysis. I demonstrate that the poor multiplies foods and places: they get multiple foods by moving to multiple places. The working class partitions foods and places: they move to many places across working-class Paris and suburbs as means to get the foods they want.

* As in all ethnography, all inductive research, and all dissertation work, what’s in this paper has long been in the making, and has come under many kinds of drafts, including some I am now embarrassed about (well, I guess I may also be embarrassed about this one in the future). Among many others, Marco Oberti, Gary Alan Fine, Wendy Griswold, participants in the 14th MSFS-AISLF colloquium and the 2016 RC21-ISA conference, informants, and Bob Marley helped me develop what’s in this paper. Might thou all be warmly acknowledged. This paper is a (hopeful) early article draft. I am glad to receive your advice, criticism, comments, and attacks of all sorts at colineferrant2018@u.northwestern.edu or at the nearest kebab house.
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The middle class anchors foods and places: they want to get local foods in local places; yet, they cannot find everything that suit them in Goutte d'Or, so that they also end up moving to nearby middle-class places. I assess the context-boundedness and generalizability of these findings, and discuss how they speak to strands of scholarship in sociology, the social sciences, and health sciences, as well as to normative and policy issues.

EATING, MOVING, AND LIVING WITHIN URBAN CONTEXTS

ADL do pose puzzles for sociological reasoning. To conceptualize them as sociological objects, I make three choices. First, I do not analyze individual idiosyncrasies, but outcomes shared within, and differentiated across, social categories. In *The Rules of Sociological Method*, Emile Durkheim warns: “Thus it is not the fact that they are general which can serve to characterize sociological phenomena. Thoughts to be found in the consciousness of each individual and movements which are repeated by all individuals are not for this reason social facts.” (Durkheim, 2013 [1895]: 23) ADL are sociologically relevant not so much because everyone does them, but first and foremost because everyone does them differently, and these differences reflect and produce social categories.

Second, I do not conceptualize ADL as mind-body problems, but as structures of observable knowledge, emotions, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors, grounded in social contexts. As Emile Durkheim exposes in *The Rules of Sociological Method*: “Every individual drinks, sleeps, eats, or employs his reason, and society has every interest in seeing that these functions are regularly exercised. If therefore these facts were social ones, sociology would possess no subject matter peculiarly its own, and its domain would be confused with that of biology and psychology.” These “functions” are “organic” and “psychical,” having “no existence save in and through the individual consciousness” (Durkheim, 2013 [1895]: 21). I thus do not delve into bodies and minds. Rather, I investigate what people do to carry out their ADL (i.e., behaviors), how they do it given their living conditions (i.e., contexts), and why they do it the way they do it (i.e., knowledge, emotions, beliefs, values, and attitudes). There goes an olden trick in sociological analysis: demonstrating that seemingly intimate activities of human life can be objectified and accounted for as fundamentally social – as far back as Durkheim’s works on suicide (Durkheim, 2007 [1897]) and religion (Durkheim, 2001 [1912]).

Third, I do not assume ADL to be free-floating choices, but investigate how social contexts constrain and enable people in putting them together. I am inspired by Karl Marx’s theory of alienation (Marx, 1992 [1844]): how can people, especially the disadvantaged, realize their humanity given their living conditions? In this paper, I endeavor a sociological study about ADL that emphasizes human agency within social contexts. Indeed, current approximations in sociology, that is, accounts of the cultural lives of the disadvantaged, downplay agency and overemphasize domination (Grignon and Passeron, 1989). This way, I am inspired by humanism in sociology¹ and anthropology², as well as similar approaches in economics (the capability approach (Sen, 1999 [1985]), as opposed to utilitarianism and resourcism) and psychology (humanism³, as opposed to cognitive psychology and operant conditioning).
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Specifically, in this paper, I focus on food and eating, and mobility and moving. Scholarships on food and mobility have intriguing similarities. On the disciplinary front, while both have their own subfields in sociology (the sociology of food, the sociology of mobility), insights also come from interdisciplinary scholarships. The food scholarship encompasses nutrition, social epidemiology, agricultural economics, sociocultural anthropology, and philosophy. The mobility scholarship includes human geography, urban planning, and transportation economics.

These disciplines influence how we conceptualize eating and moving. Mobility scholars have called to move beyond approaches based on measuring movements in space to undertake broader investigations of how people use places (Orfeuil and Ripoll, 2015). This way, mobility can be conceived as both moving in place and remaining in place. Dominant approaches to food and eating consist in interpreting particular aspects, be they products – food as material culture (Petrick, 2008); practices – acquisition, preparation, and consumption (Régnier et al., 2006); tastes – the aesthetic judgement of food (Korsmeyer, 1999); and norms – relating to health, environment, and nutrition (Plessz et al., 2016). Yet, I argue that thinking about food and eating as separate chunks to be deeply and thickly interpreted is no empirical or scientific necessity, but due to the conceptual imprint of one and all disciplines across the food scholarship. Let us distinguish those that are approach-centered (i.e., which can apply their eye to everything), from those that are topic-centered (i.e., which define themselves by inquiring into selected parts of reality). Philosophy and sociocultural anthropology are approach-centered, and theirs is interpretation. Nutrition, social epidemiology, and agricultural economics select such topics as dietary intakes, health outcomes, and food and nutrient consumption. My discipline is sociology, which is an approach-centered discipline able to analyze everything that is human and social. My sociological conceptualization of eating and moving is, then, analytic rather than interpretive or metric. Rather than interpreting food or measuring mobility, I examine the structure and constituent elements of eating and moving, and how these are related to human and social life.

On the theoretical front, the sociology of food and the sociology of mobility are divided by a similar fault line: whether eating and moving are matters of postmodernist individual choices, or enduring differentiation across social categories. Regarding eating, individual choice theses contend that individuals, now freed from the constraints of collective belonging and enjoying the massification and diversification of supply, elaborate particularistic lifestyles (Poulain, 2010). Social differentiation scholars demonstrate that what is most striking, given the tremendous changes in Western stratification and food systems, is the long-term stability of class-based consumption patterns (Warde, 1997; Grignon and Grignon, 1999). As for moving, individual choice theses argue that city dwellers, taking advantage of the weakening of territorial anchorage and urban social structures, experience fluid and placeless identities (Urry, 1999). Social differentiation scholars find that mobility remains highly unequal, both in opportunities and outcomes (Orfeuil and Ripoll, 2015). For both eating and moving, social differentiation studies criticize individual choice propositions for often indulging in empirical lightness and theoretical speculation (Oberti and Prêteceille, 2004; Régnier et al., 2006).

This paper falls into the social differentiation scholarship, to the extent that I conceptualize eating and moving as differentiated across social categories and shaped by social structure, and that I design and conduct an empirical case study.
I am inspired by community studies in American, French, and Italian urban and rural sociology: studying social practices in place, accounting for people’s daily routines on the ground (Anderson, 1998 [1923]; Drake and Cayton, 2015 [1943]; Morin, 1967; Pizzorno, 2010 [1960]). In observing knowledge, emotions, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors, I adopt the analytical proposition of cultural sociologist Robert Wuthnow: turning away from delving deep into intractable subjective meanings and rather focusing on observable facts that can be empirically accounted for (Wuthnow, 1987). In conceptualizing social contexts, I blend analytical principles in urban research and cultural sociology. First, contexts are social structures constituted by elements of various kinds, as proposed by research on place in American urban sociology (Molotch, 2002; Brown-Saracino, 2015). Second, contexts are singular, as stressed by non-American urban research (Maloutas and Fujita, 2012): elements that matter in American contexts may not matter in other urban contexts. Third, contexts are located at three scales: nation-states and urban metropolises, wherein key elements of social structure take shape, and local communities, wherein people live on a daily basis. Being attentive to how neighborhood life is embedded in broader spatial scales is characteristic of recent Chicago school research (Bennett, 2010). Lastly, in investigating how eating and moving are grounded in social contexts, I draw from cultural sociologist Wendy Griswold’s method: cultural objects are not bound to abstract and speculative interpreting, but can be explained through a scientific framework that considers elements and their linkages (Griswold, 1987).

I investigate Goutte d’Or, a mixed neighborhood in Paris, France. This case selection allows to study different social categories while holding constant the urban context and its elements of social structure. In addition, it permits to shed light on social structure and daily life in one emblematic neighborhood of one great metropolis of one major Western nation-state.

In Paris, quantitative evidence reports that residential segregation is way below the levels encountered in American metropolises. The highest dissimilarity index between native French born in mainland France and an immigrant category (the Turks) is 47.0 (1999), compared to around 80.0 between blacks and whites in Chicago or New York (Préteceille, 2012, p. 162). Although ethno-racial segregation is higher than class segregation, most ethno-racial minorities live in mixed neighborhoods. The upper class is the most segregated; most working-class people live in mixed neighborhoods (Préteceille, 2012). There is no evidence of food deserts as investigated in the United Kingdom and the United States, wherein lack of access to healthy, affordable food in deprived neighborhoods can have negative effects on individual outcomes (weight, fruit and vegetable consumption, fast food consumption), over the effects of individual factors (Beaulac et al., 2009; Hilmers et al., 2012). Paris’s food retail structure is composed of, by increasing order of area, groceries, mini-markets, supermarkets, and hypermarkets. The public transportation network is one of the densest in the world, in terms of territorial coverage, diversity of modes, and numbers of passengers (Haywood and Koning, 2013). Goutte d’Or is located in northern Paris. Historically a working-class neighborhood, it has undergone a process of gentrification and is nowadays a mixed neighborhood (Bacqué et al., 2011). Goutte d’Or has a significant immigrant population, mostly from Maghreb (since the 1950s) and Sub-
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Saharan Africa (since the 1970s). Its retail structure includes Barbès, one of the cheapest street markets in the Paris metropolis (Lallement, 2010), as well as two immigrant clusters: one Maghrebian, eponymously named Goutte d’Or (Toubon and Messamah, 1990), and one Sub-Saharan African, Château Rouge (Chabrol, 2011). Goutte d’Or occupies a central position in Paris’s transportation network.

I conduct neighborhood-based fieldwork, using naturalistic ethnographic methods: observing in public (streets, parks) and semi-public (stores, community organizations) places as well as in informants’ homes; in-depth interviewing with an open-ended, conversational format (including, during more than one hour, 36 inhabitants, and 13 community actors in retail, policy, and social work); mapping using my own field data and public databases; and analyzing primary sources such as written press, blogs, and administrative documents. I also get additional insights from evidence-based scholarship. A detailed description of my data is available upon request.

I was on the field intensively in the academic year 2014-2015, more extensively in 2015-2016. I investigated all kinds of people and in all sorts of places, and every day of the week, every hour of the day, every hour of the night, to the extent that time schedules are differentiated across social categories (Lesnard and De Saint Pol, 2009).

THREE SHARED STRUCTURES: MULTIPLYING, PARTITIONING, AND ANCHORING

Two theoretical principles guide data analysis: analytic ethnography and contextual generalizability. Canonically, ethnography is interpretive: the ethnographer collects data on informants’ meaning-making, then, analysis consists in uncovering these meanings. My ethnography is analytic. I collect data on observable knowledge, emotions, values, beliefs, attitudes, behaviors, and contexts, and analyze them by examining how they are interrelated. I am inspired by the methodology of analytic narratives in political science and history, that is, coupling in-depth case studies with an explanatory framework for causal inference and generalizable theory-building (Bates et al., 1998). In a similar fashion, my in-depth case study consists in ethnographic fieldwork in Goutte d’Or, and my explanatory framework for causal inference consists in handling three contextual scales: neighborhood, metropolis, and nation-state. By contextual generalizability, I mean connecting the aim for generalizability that characterizes American sociology on the one hand, with on the other hand both the demand for context-boundedness proper to European urban research and the contextual logic of inference proper to ethnographic and case-study research.

Then, three strategic principles drive my working on a daily basis. The first is “persistence and method” (Lofland, 2006 [1971]) (a.k.a. the ethnographer as a meticulous stakhanovist). I proceed in an inductive, iterative way. I collect data on the field; I expand fieldnotes, transcribe interviews, order data, write (analytical and reading notes, methodological and theoretical memos), and journal (on the progress and failures of the research). The second strategy is spacing out (a.k.a. the ethnographer as a
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long-distance runner). This paper is an early output of a dissertation research about food and eating among the immigrant working-class in Chicago and Paris, through ethnographic fieldwork in neighborhoods that are either mixed (Goutte d’Or and Pilsen) or disadvantaged (Aulnay-Nord and Gage Park). This long-term, comparative project allows a fair amount of time and perspective to interweave data collection and analysis across the four fields, and to fine-tune the research design and questions drawing from various strands of scholarship. The third strategy is big picture and flexibility (a.k.a. the ethnographer as a polycultural peasant). I rely on memoing more than coding, which allows to maintain a holistic approach to data, to experiment various analytical techniques, and to keep track of how I advance and clean up claims throughout.

The aim of the analysis is, inductively, to find out structures of eating and moving, constituted by knowledge, emotions, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors, which are shared within social categories, and to isolate the elements of social structure that constrain and enable them. First, I engage in open-ended memoing. Second, I identify informants’ socio-demographic characteristics; knowledge, emotions, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors; and elements of social structure. Third, I construct structures that are shared within social categories, proceeding iteratively to ensure validity and parsimony.

As results of the analysis, the social category that differentiates eating and moving is social class, along three categories: poor, working-class, and middle class. Three constructs account for the structures of eating and moving shared within each category, respectively: multiplying, partitioning, and anchoring.

In the following three sections, I demonstrate these multiplying, partitioning, and anchoring structures. While they are collectively shared, I detail one strikingly representative case per each social category. This kind of production of evidence and scientific writing, usual in ethnographies of daily life (Hochschild and Machung, 2003 [1989]; Lareau, 2011 [2003]), allows for a complex and humane reconstitution of social and human life. For better flow and readability, I integrate fieldnote and informant talk materials into the body of the text. I edit some extracts for length and clarity. Fieldwork is carried out in French; untranslated, unedited extracts are available upon request.

THE POOR: MULTIPLYING FOODS AND PLACES

In Goutte d’Or, the poor are immigrants (many being undocumented) as well as native-born French people. Household types are singles, couples, and single- and two-parent families. Occupations are both in the formal sector (i.e., service-work jobs) and in the informal sector (i.e., hawkers, drug dealers). Incomes are below the poverty threshold and oftentimes irregular. Housing arrangements include sleeping rough, shelters, and substandard housing.

I detail the case of Omar, a thirty-year-old man from countryside Algeria. He makes (little) money hawking smuggled cigarettes. Since immigrating to France, Omar has been experiencing a chequered residential trajectory: a stint at an acquaintance's apartment in a middle-sized city of
Northern France, a year sleeping on a construction site in Goutte d’Or, a shared rental in the inner suburbs of Paris. He is willing to return to Algeria. Yet, his passport is retained for asylum review at the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless People (in France, because asylum petitioners are legally protected against deportation while their request is under review, some illegal migrants strategically lodge an application to gain a small length of relief). With Omar, I conducted several in-depth interviews in cafés and on the streets, had meals, coffee and beers, chatted during hawking or begging, and assisted in paperwork.

Omar claims to be “alone.” No relative of his lives in France: “I don't have no friends. It causes problems. I avoid that.” His local acquaintances annoy him when deterring from drinking alcohol. Whenever Omar suggests that we have a beer, we head to a café just on the edge of the neighborhood: “In Goutte d’Or, we are all brothers and sisters... There is respect. If you drink a beer, there is alcohol, in Islam, this is entirely sin. I am not a practicing Muslim, I wish, one day... But this is lack of respect in front of a sir who prays, who went to Mecca... and in Goutte d’Or, there are plenty of them.” During Ramadan, Omar stops selling tobacco and begs for alms. Several families invite him: he reactivates some preparation practices: “That's how I make tea: put a lemon slice, then pour the tea, wait three minutes, leave it a little bit... A sir invited me to his place the last day of Ramadan to prepare a tea. I said yes, that would be a great pleasure to prepare tea. Each person in his own way prepares tea, we compared, we had fun.”

His earnings are low, irregular, and unpredictable. Omar supplies himself with smuggled tobacco from a semi-wholesaler in the inner suburbs of Paris, and from middlemen in Goutte d’Or. Deprived of accommodation, he cannot stock cartons of cigarettes. Yet, buying in bulk would minimize the number of public transport trips – which are lengthy, nerve-racking, hazardous (Omar does not have a travel card and fears fines due to his undocumented status), and sometimes pointless (the semi-wholesaler often cancels appointments). Omar conceals his cartons either under truck chassis, or in the nooks and crannies of the Barbès metro station – and they fall prey to police seizures and robberies by other hawkers. Two other factors add to the uncertainty. The first is the uneven quality of the goods: “The Russian L&M, we sell them 3.5 euros, because they are crappy. The Belgian Marlboro, we sell them 4 euros. And the Algerian Marlboro, 5 euros. Because they are from Algeria, this has more class.” The second is the constant bargaining of the customers: “They always lack 5 cents, 15 cents, 20 cents... So that at the end of the day...”

Omar occasionally meets with other hawkers at the neighborhood’s restaurants, which provide services to their undocumented customers. At the Café Royal, Omar stocks Kabyle breads, chats with the waiter, is exempted from paying, and buys goods to middlemen. He eats under the availability of goods and money: “Sometimes, I spend a whole day without eating and without smoking. When I don’t have goods. When I have goods, all goes well, I do sell. But otherwise... nothing. No goods, no money, haha! In this case, as usual, I wake up at 7 am at the construction site. Then I walk down the streets, I ask cigarettes to people, I ask coffee at cafés. At a Moroccan café, at the Arabic cafés, in Goutte d’Or. Because at the French cafés, they don't give.” Whenever he can do without these local resources, Omar leaves Goutte d’Or, which he deems “dangerous” and “dirty.” With his acquaintances, he picnics at a nearby neighborhood park – olives, cheese, biscuits, and soft drinks. He
grabs coffee and buys Kabyle breads at a bakery close to his semi-wholesaler: “There aren't in Goutte d'Or, there the bakeries, only Tunisian.”

When short of money, Omar engage in coffee sipping, tobacco smoking, soda drinking, hash puffing, and alcohol taking. These practices have multiple advantages: local availability, price, consumption times, no need to stock up or prepare, potential for sharing, recreational and appetite suppressant qualities: “A sir walks by and gives me a cigarette, a pot, a euro. With one euro, at the cafés in Goutte d’Or, we can buy a coffee, a can. I take that quickly with some friend, and then I keep on selling cigarettes.” Omar appreciates the sensations produced by the mixes: “Coffee, alcohol, sugar, and hash... It creates a nice reaction. I am not hungry anymore, I feel good.” Besides, he accepts what he is given: “I eat everything. I am offered a coffee, you drink the coffee. I am offered a glass of water, you drink the glass of water.” He resorts to a soup kitchen at a nearby neighborhood: “pasta, a cake, a sandwich, a bottle of water.”

These foods contradict his values and tastes. Regarding alcohol, coffee, and soft drinks, Omar reckons: “The best for the body is water. Not alcohol, not hot drinks... fresh water.” Concerning tobacco, hash, and alcohol, “this is sin. If my dad saw me, he would kill me.” His health has deteriorated. Omar is very skinny. He asks whether I could show him a health structure, “because... hum... my urine is red, and my stomach hurts badly.” He speaks at length about his ways of preparing fresh fruit and vegetables back in Algeria: “When I am home, in Algeria, I take a tomato, I put a little oil and vinegar dressing, I eat it like a fruit. At the construction site, how could I do that! No, anything that is fruit, fresh, this is not possible...”

Omar craves meat. The emotions he attributes to it – prodigality and sociability –, ward off the financial and relational precariousness from which he suffers. At lunch at a restaurant, Omar suggests that we leave, although there are still grains of semolina in his plate: “I am sick. I am not hungry anymore. I should not eat spicy like this.” Yet, there is not a sole microgram of chicken left. Throughout the meal, Omar dissects and polishes each bone, each sinew, and each cartilage: “I love to have meat like this. Being able to be seated, in company, having grilled steak, put salt on it... Actually I should not go to restaurants, the meat, the spiciness, my stomach hurts... But you eat well. At least, in some restaurants. There are others, final destination, the hospital.”

He praises “stuff that is really Algerian, Kabyle.” His father is a cattle trader; his mother stays at home. Omar did some high school; he was a cleric in Algiers. He bears the “natural” products of his home village against the “chemical” products of the soup kitchen: “In Algeria, it is only natural! Your garden, there are potatoes, carrots, salad. All the vegetables. Back home, there are no chemical products. My mom, she does everything. Milk, we have two cows, for the entire house. Everything!” He opposes the “machine-like” couscous of Goutte d’Or restaurants to the healthy, tasty couscous of his mother: “This couscous, this is mechanical couscous, this is industrial couscous, a machine did it, and it shows, no hand did it. This is not real couscous. True couscous is that of my mommy! No machine did it, but a human being. And my mom... high class when it comes to cooking. All the neighbors would come to us! Why? For my mom's cooking. She cooks couscous, it is a medicine, it is an antibiotic. I love when my parents are cooking, they argue. Then when I come, they are like: "But wait, have you heard what he told me!" Haha! In the village, in Algeria, my dad: "how is it going, at work, things are going well?" From Algiers to Kabylia, some hundred kilometers, I come back on
Wednesday evening, my dad is like: "Are you tired my son?" "A little bit." "Have some rest." My mom: "How are you my son?" Here, no one can do that to you.

After relocating to the working-class inner suburbs, Omar routinizes his eating practices. He hawks at the nearby metro station: “There, I am quite serene. Serene. Watching the news on TV in the morning, having lunch at noon, selling the goods in the afternoon and in the evening, having dinner in the night... I live on the third floor, every morning I go to the café downstairs, the guy is nice, he is a Kabyle married to a Romanian.” From a time filler status, inserted between supplying and hawking sequences, eating shifts to a scheduled time status. Omar accommodates his preparation and consumption practices to his tastes. In his kitchen, he can “cook real Kabyle couscous, almost like my mommy.” The retail structure of his new working-class neighborhood remains consistent with his economic constraints: “For dinner, always, I make a salad at home. A tomato, a vinegar, a small onion, and a green salad. I find that at the market, here, that's cheap. Otherwise I go to the supermarket.” Omar rarely goes back to Goutte d’Or, except for “greeting the acquaintances” and the waiters of the Café Royal: “This is quite normal I will go to the Royal! These are guys who never forgot me, sirs who did something good to me, I don't forget them!”

Omar earns little and erratic money, sells illegal goods, does not have documents, and could hardly find a brick-and-mortar place after months sleeping rough. He has firmly rooted values, knowledge, and tastes (the natural, the fresh, the Kabyle), and contradictory tastes honed over a current living of poverty (the satiating, the rich, the easily shared). Omar works hard throughout the day to get tea, water, salad, olives, cheese, biscuits, Kabyle galettes, “mom-like” couscous – also coffee, soda, beer, hash, tobacco, meat, sandwiches, “machine-like” couscous, in Goutte d’Or (from local families, restaurants and cafés, Café Royal), in nearby working-class neighborhoods (a café, a park, a soup kitchen), and in the working-class inner suburbs where he eventually relocates (a café, a bakery, a street market, a supermarket).

THE WORKING CLASS: PARTITIONING FOODS AND PLACES

In Goutte d’Or, working-class people are immigrants having legal status and native-born French. Most live in public housing. Household types are, just as the poor, single, couples, and single- and two-parent families. Occupations are service-work jobs; incomes range from the minimum wage to the median wage.

I detail the case of the Touré family. Kouassi, a sixty-year-old man, and Blandine, a fifty-year-old woman, immigrated to Paris from Ivory Coast in the 1980s. Kouassi is retired; he was a construction worker and a security guard. Blandine is a janitor. The two elder children left the home; the youngest, Romain, is cohabiting. The Touré have legal status and have lived in social housing in Goutte d’Or since the 1990s. I conducted two in-depth interviews, followed by lunches, with Kouassi in the apartment's living room, and talked with him and Blandine at church.
Kouassi does most of errands, and Blandine most of house chores. Each evening, after work, Blandine cooks an “African” meal. This requires three hours, from 6 pm to 9 pm. The Touré do not quantify food according to unique, individual portions, but 24-hour, collective rations. At 9 pm, Kouassi, Blandine, and Romain have dinner together. They stock up the remainder for the next day. During the day, all have lunch on their own, depending on their schedules: “The meal is here, you come, you help yourself. If it's cold, you heat up, if it's not cold, you eat, and it's OK.”

The Touré split budget to fixed limits: “We set aside a share for food, a share for the rent, a share for electricity...” These budgetary items correspond to shopping places: “the Barbès market budget, the Château Rouge budget...” On the living room table, Kouassi amasses stacks of till receipts, each one corresponding to one shopping place. He allocates a fixed amount to each trip, to which he adds the outstanding amount of the last trip to the same place: “Before going to the market, I try to take stock of the money I'm bringing. For the market, I know that if I have a 20 euro bill in the pocket, I come back, I have spent 17 euros, I take stock of the remainder, and then I come back for the next market trip with 3 euros.”

Kouassi resorts to supermarkets and hypermarkets “for all industrial, processed products, all that is packed, pre-packed,” and to the closest bakery for bread. He selects supermarkets and hypermarkets according to promotions first, and second, to proximity. Where absence of promotions, he walks to the nearby supermarkets. Otherwise, “when there are promotions, we head to the hypermarkets. We find a quite considerable quantity. So we leave with 100 euros, we shop that way. Per week.” These hypermarkets are located in the inner suburbs. The trips demand time and energy, even more as the Touré do not have a car: “We take the metro, I don't have a car. And the errand, I load it up on my head, hehe. And this takes an hour. Just the fact of going around, even if we don't go there to hang about...”

The Touré navigate various tastes and values. Two of them work as binary oppositions. First, the Touré oppose “natural” and “African” products, like “African eggplants, plantains,” available in Château Rouge, versus “chemical” and “European” products, such as “zucchinis, cucumbers, and the like,” sold at the Barbès market. As we tour the household's kitchen, Kouassi brandishes a banana: “This for example, this comes from Africa, this is natural, there is no fertilizer on it, nothing. It grows in the nature, you have to go to Château Rouge to find it, because in Château Rouge it is cheaper.” He rolls his eyes: “But there are storekeepers, they want to cheat us! They take stuff at the Barbès market, and they sell it in Château Rouge! So they sell it more expensive saying that they are African products!” Second, the Touré distinguish the “basic necessities” (fruit and vegetables, meat, and fish), and “the products one can do without for the proper functioning of the organism, for example wine, yogurt, and cheese” (hereinafter referred to as unessential products).

Besides, the Touré value “variety” (i.e., types of meat, fish species, variety of fruit and vegetables) and “freshness.” For example, out of the weekly 150 euros allocated to Château Rouge, Kouassi keeps 30 to 40 euros for fish. He favors semi-wholesale stores, which ensure better value for money than retail stores, and the least expensive species. Yet, “everything is calculated in such a way that... we don’t consume too much of the same thing.” He acquires in semi-wholesale stores one fish species, then goes to a retail store to top up with another type: “One 15-euro packet of tilapias, for instance. There are six, seven of them inside. So this is sufficient for a week... but we don’t eat tilapias
all the week long. If the mackerel, instead of 5 euros per kilo, it shifts to 4.99 euros, we take it that
day. If the Nile perch, the price is lower than the mackerel, then we rather take the Nile perch.”
Kouassi does not have a favorite fish shop: he tours Château Rouge and compares price and freshness.
“In Château Rouge, there are three fish shops, we go from one to another, according to the quality of
what we are going to buy. They sell the same things, but often this is not the same quality. A fish, for
example, we have to look at, not the fins... how do you call that... not the airways... you look at that.
When it's all red, it means that the fish is fresh. But when it's blue, it means that the fish is not fresh.
Stuff like that. In any case, the prices shown inform you a bit about the quality.”

Their tastes and values of variety and freshness on the one hand, and their limited food budget
on the other hand, exclude some foods and eating practices. The Touré do not find interest in organic
fruit and vegetables: “Organic fruits, it's in your head... This is the same tree that produces the various
fruits.” As Kouassi ponders as we share a kedjenou chicken, the Touré never dine out: “You need
money to dine out. And what we just ate, we would have paid that around thirty euros at a restaurant,
so...” Kouassi only grabs coffee across the street: “I grab a coffee at the café, every two days now. For
health reasons. When I come back from dialysis, I don’t feel good, so I grab a coffee, this is my new
drug.”

Income is regular; food budget is invariable. Nonetheless, Kouassi stocks up on supplies at the
beginning of the month, to convert in food reserves the household’s newly earned money before it
passes by vi: “If this is the beginning of the month in which I receive the pay, I prefer to invest,
anticipate, keep, stock up to keep, rather than wait... until at the end of the month, we would lack
money, lack food. That would be a problem.” Kouassi maximizes quantities for “non-perishable
foods” (such as rice, bought in 20-kilogram sacks), and unessential products (like herbs, plants, and
saucis, gathered in the freezer). He exempts from stocking the “basic necessities” – which also happen
to be “perishable.” “Perishable foodstuffs, every two days or one week. Meat, even if I have the
financial means, I can buy meat just one week. Then I buy one week again, then one week again.
Fruits, vegetables, I buy every two days. I cannot afford to buy meat to keep in the freezer during one
month, two months.” If at the end of the month, Kouassi has not exhausted one budgetary item, he
“improves the quality of what [he] buy[s]” – “quality” meaning variety and freshness: “Chicken, it's
always the same thing. Only beef meat is cut up, is sold at various prices. So rather than ribs, I will
buy... how do you say that... tender... tender-something that costs 32 euros.”

The Touré shop for foods in Goutte d’Or (Barbès street market, bakery, supermarkets, Château Rouge
fish shops, meat shops and wholesalers), as well as in the working-class inner suburbs (hypermarkets).
This controlled partitioning is the most effort- and time-saving adjustment between their eating
practices (day-long, family “African” meals) and their knowledge, values, and tastes (natural and
African vs. chemical and European, basic necessities vs. unessential products, variety, freshness) on
the one hand, and their limited, fixed food budget on the other hand.

THE MIDDLE CLASS: ANCHORING FOODS AND PLACES
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In Goutte d’Or, middle-class people are native-born French, and second- and third-generation immigrants. Most are homeowners or tenants in private housing. Main household types are singles, couples, and two-parent families. Occupations include professionals in the public, scientific, media, and artistic fields, as well as students. Incomes are higher than the average wage.

I detail the case of the Guéguen family. Laure and Pierre Guéguen are thirty-year-old engineers. They were born and raised in the outer suburbs of Paris and became proprietors in Goutte d’Or almost a decade ago. They have two middle-aged children. I conducted one in-depth interview with Laure that ended in teatime, and had conversations in the park while the children were playing.

Laure works from home; she does the groceries almost every weekday morning: “I often go shopping, because as we are in Paris, we don’t have a way of stocking up. We don’t have a big kitchen, we have a big living room, but we have a very small kitchen, and we don’t have a balcony. So we cannot stock up in any way, so I buy the equivalent of a cart. I don't know the cash equivalent... Each time it costs me about 50 euros. It depends on the products, obviously if I buy three bottles of champagne, it will cost me 100 euros, haha! But overall, when I shop, it costs me... See, it's a good exercise, because actually I don’t have any idea about it.”

Laure has a taste for organic and vegetable products, barely shared by Pierre: “Pierre goes exclusively to the nearby supermarket. He buys organic products because I favor organic products, but otherwise he's not too fond of that... Well, he likes that... As soon as he needs to go shopping on weekends, I never go shopping on week-ends, this is annoying. But these will be just refills and he goes straight to the supermarket, he doesn’t bother to go far away.” On weekdays, the Guéguen dine “in general only vegetables, otherwise many... how do you call that... pulses, starches... all that is rice, pasta, lentils, quinoa, semolina.” They eat meat and fish on week-ends.

Laure buys fruit and vegetables, and “all that is for breakfast,” at an organic shop located about one mile apart, which is “far away.” In the neighborhood, she goes to supermarkets for “branded products” (“fruit juices, yogurts, sandwich bread, cream, canned food, coffee, desserts, sparkling water,”), and to a food co-op for pulses. The fish shops of Château Rouge cause discomfort: “The stalls are not beautiful, it's like, big crates, fish you don't know where it comes from.” As for the meat shops, this is utter disgust: “It's a matter of habit, of taste. You know, it's deeply rooted... because the butchers, I just can’t enter. I can’t! I don't know, it's silly, because those who eat that, they are in good shape, hehe, so there is no reason... But that's impossible for me, it makes me feel sick, it's awful, these sheep heads... So this is about education, I think, I don't know... And they may say the same, I suppose... seeing pork, it may disgust them as it disgusts me.” Laure then walks to a more affluent neighborhood, where she finds “French” meat and fish shops, as well as a cheese shop: “that, too, we don’t have in the neighborhood.” Laure laments the travel time: “Each time, I must count 20 minutes. So in the end it's like one hour to make the round trip.”

Laure and Pierre use Goutte d’Or to satisfy a taste for culinary exoticism. Laure buys baguettes at “an awesome bakery held by a Maghrebian, the guy is Tunisian.” She depicts the profusion of worldwide bakery and pastry products: “The bread is good. Everything is in there, French baguettes, Italian baguettes, flat breads, pains au chocolat and the like, oriental products, desserts, those small oriental cookies, sandwiches...” “At the Maghrebian stores” and “at the genuinely African
small groceries,” Laure buys spices, pistachios, olives, tahini, and mint: “stuff that cost a fortune in the supermarkets, and there it costs nothing.” With these products, she sometimes cooks “African dishes,” “simple stuff, like maafe, colombos.” Laure and Pierre hang out with friends at the “Indian and African” restaurants of Goutte d’Or. Yet, when it comes to bars, they shun the neighborhood: “We like to hang out in bars, but never in Goutte d’Or. That’s silly by the way, a beer is a beer, there’s no reason... but we don't think about it... I'm not sure how to put it, it's a bit weird.”

For Laure, stores should be part of a close-knit neighborhood sociability, for the enjoyment of “the executives,” but also “the Africans” and “the Maghrebians.” Laure does not want to get rid of the immigrant stores: “Chucking out all the African butchers? No, everybody should be satisfied.” But: “Yes, developing this diversity, there should be a diversity of retail stores, it would attract many people, for sure.” She supports the only wine merchant in the neighborhood: “I was very happy to find out a wine merchant. We like wine, it is so important... But the business is not going well, the guy tells me it's a bit rough. But he must not shut down, at all.” Being committed to the neighborhood, while neglecting it for food shopping, annoys her: “There absolutely should be a development of organic stores, plenty of us are demanding that. Plus, I think, it would attract people, executives... We live there, we love Goutte d’Or, we participate in civic life, and my kids go to a public school in the neighborhood, which means a lot... We do quite a number of things in the neighborhood. But we don’t shop there. I leave the neighborhood. Clearly.”

The Guéguen value local anchorage when it comes to moving, and the organic and the vegetable when it comes to eating. They believe shopping in Goutte d’Or make them belong here. Yet, local fish and meat shops trigger nausea. To solve this emotional discomfort, the Guéguen remain in Goutte d’Or for either organic and vegetable products, or selected locally-anchored “exotic” products. Otherwise, they walk to the closest middle-class neighborhood, where they find organic, fish, meat, and cheese shops that are better suited to their tastes and practices.

EATING, MOVING, AND THE STRUCTURE OF URBAN DAILY LIVING

In Goutte d’Or, the poor multiplies foods and places. They acquire food in many places in Goutte d’Or, in nearby working-class neighborhoods, and in the working-class inner suburbs. Their everyday lives are rife with tremendous constraints. What they eat, and where, result from strategic, resourceful, and sometimes gut-wrenching makeups between their knowledge, their values, their tastes, and what they can attain on budget, on time, and on spot.

The working class partitions foods and places. They do the groceries in Goutte d’Or, as well as in working-class Paris and inner suburbs. As everyone else, working-class people care about their knowledge, values, tastes, and practices when it comes to food and eating. Yet, money is short. Therefore, they put significant time and effort to move wherever they can pick the choicest, cheapest foods.
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The middle class anchors foods and places. They value the local – local foods, local places. They believe they should do their groceries in Goutte d’Or. Yet, local stores can be a source of disgust. They turn to these local stores whenever these can cater to their tastes and practices, failing which they reluctantly head to the closest middle-class neighborhoods.

Generalizability is a complex, delicate problem. Especially in ethnography, even more in urban research, super even more in international scholarship. Here, what is generalizable is the framework for studying urban daily living. That is, investigating its constituent elements (be they knowledge, emotions, beliefs, values, attitudes, and behaviors), the elements of social structure that shape it (pertaining to urban and national contexts), and its social differentiation (considering urban and national stratification systems). What is context-bound is how this framework takes form within Goutte d’Or, Paris, and France’s singularities, resulting in poor people multiplying, working-class people partitioning, and middle-class people anchoring. Let us ask ourselves about other contexts. What is going on in stratification systems in which race is salient, and in urban structures with higher segregation levels and lower coverage in public transports, like in the United States? With evidence of food deserts, like in the United Kingdom and the United States? We would replicate our neighborhood-based ethnographic fieldwork on eating and moving. We would thus have a more thorough grasp of the structure of daily living in Western urban societies.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

I conclude by discussing these findings in light of a number of scholarly fields for which they offer insights: values on space and place in Western urban societies; empirical evidence about daily living in the Paris metropolis; the sociology of stratification, social class, and immigration; research designs on social structure and urban everyday life; and quantitative research linking neighborhoods of residence to health outcomes. I also consider policy and normative implications.

A number of studies on mobility report that the disadvantaged are stuck in place and value local attachment (Orfeuil and Ripoll, 2015). In Goutte d’Or, I find quite the reverse: remaining in place and objecting to moving rather distinguishes the advantaged. The poor and the working class travel more than the middle class, especially in terms of spatial extent; the middle class values local anchoring, while the poor and the working class do neither value nor devalue traveling. These findings then complicate our understanding of class-based values related to space and place. That said, they are consistent with recent empirical evidence on the European urban upper-middle class: albeit portrayed as the vanguard of global de-territorialized hyper-mobility, this category combines a taste for modern global life with a keen attachment to place (Andreotti et al., 2015).

These findings about eating and moving are intriguing when lined up with empirical evidence, in Paris and the inner suburbs, on another ADL: education and learning. Through in-depth interviews and quantitative data on residential and school segregation, urban sociologist Marco Oberti demonstrates that the upper class and the middle class not only live in neighborhoods with better schools, but also elaborate large-scale mobility strategies (Oberti, 2007). For food and eating, quite the reverse occurs.
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The working class not only lives in neighborhoods well equipped with stores, but also elaborates large-scale mobility strategies. We could then integrate mobility and moving, food and eating, and education and learning, with other ADL: health and caring, culture and cultivating, and sport and exercising. To find out relevant elements of social structure, we could begin by considering the quantitative evidence about the distribution of amenities. The working-class inner suburbs are less equipped with cultural establishments than the city of Paris (Préteceille, 2000), and significantly less with health facilities (Vigneron, 2011), yet more with sports venues (Préteceille, 1998). We would thus draw a bigger picture of ADL in the Paris metropolis.

In Goutte d’Or, eating and moving are differentiated along lines of social class rather than immigrant status; yet, the working-class includes immigrants. This finding speaks to important issues in social stratification in France and Western democratic polities. In line with nation-state ideals of egalitarianism and social integration, studies in France single out how immigration status shapes outcomes for which state regulation is key, such as jobs, housing, and education (Rea and Tripier, 2008). Research on issues for which public authorities play a less significant role, including food, are rarer (Tichit, 2012). The sociology of the working class is increasingly interested in immigrants, noting that most belong to the working class while retaining significant cultural specifics (Siblot et al., 2015). Yet, empirical works exploring such intersections are still lacking. Generally, in today’s Western world, issues of class and status tend to be neglected – historically in the United States (Fiske and Markus, 2012), and increasingly in France (Pierru and Spire, 2008). But we saw a dramatic turn lastly. Brexit, the election of Donald Trump in the United States, and the rise of the extreme right in Europe are triggering a welcome, yet misleading attention to the fate of the working class. Progressive activists have pointed out the tendency to think about immigrants as folks with no class interests but “culture,” while the working class, economically and materially downtrodden, is invariably native-born. I hope this paper contributes to challenging this misrepresentation with much-needed empirical evidence: indeed, the immigrant working-class does exist.

On top of it, qualitative researchers have pointed out the tendency of the sociology of stratification to put a lot of effort into uncovering macro-structures, but to shun the investigation of how they affect people’s everyday lives (Back, 2015). In line with current calls to create “a space for place” (Gieryn, 2000) in sociology, these findings highlight the relevance of studying social structure and stratification on the ground, in context, wherein their concrete effects on people are being felt.

Cultural sociologists discuss how particularly delicate it is to investigate agency among the disadvantaged. Consider canonical Distinction (2010 [1979]), in which sociologist Pierre Bourdieu shows that while the dominant class distinguishes itself by a taste of luxury, the working class is fated to taste of necessity and amor fati. In short, working-class people relish the fat, the heavy, because they are unable to hope for more. Yet, because Distinction reduces working-class lifestyles to a one-sided story of privation and domination, it fails to recognize these lifestyles’ specific features (Grignon and Passeron, 1989). The origin of Distinction’s miserabilist fallacy lies in its research design. It does not empirically demonstrate that dispositions to legitimate lifestyles distinguish the dominant class over the working class. Rather, through statistical methods, it demonstrates that the dominant class articulates legitimate lifestyles, and deduces thereupon that dispositions to legitimate lifestyles distinguish the dominant class over the working class (Lahire, 2008; Lizardo and Skiles, 2012). In this
paper, I design a field methodology that allows for an encompassing, contextual grasp of people’s life principles and lifestyles; I can thus empirically demonstrate that the disadvantaged do have complex cultural lives and do create strategies, while facing significant structural constraints.

On this front, ethnographies in marginalized neighborhoods can end up either fetishizing or blaming the poor whenever they fail to pay attention to social structure (Wacquant, 2002). Most ethnographies of gentrifying neighborhoods focus on middle-class newcomers (oftentimes from a critical perspective); few investigate the experiences of working-class locals (Paton, 2014). By studying aspects of daily life and living conditions of people across the social spectrum in Goutte d’Or, I hope to have provided a nuanced, balanced account about social life in a gentrifying neighborhood. In particular, at odds with the commonsensical image of the revanchist middle-class gentrifier, I find that in Goutte d’Or, middle-class newcomers believe that their ADL are a means to show their attachment to the neighborhood as is, to the point that shopping outside the neighborhood becomes a heartbreaking decision. In stark contrast, poor and working-class people do not believe that shopping in the neighborhood is a marker of local rooting.

Urban ethnography meets social epidemiology. By stressing the interconnectedness between eating and moving, I provide neighborhood-based field insights to quantitative research about neighborhood effects on health outcomes. Herein, most studies operationalize neighborhoods as respondents’ census tracts or postcode areas, hence assuming that people’s ADL narrow around their residential locations. Recent epidemiological studies address such “local trap,” (Cummins, 2007) “residential trap,” (Chaix et al., 2009) through sophisticated measurement tools including GPS tracking (Chaix et al., 2013). My findings endorse the relevance of these current endeavors.

On the policy front, these findings speak to current efforts to improve Paris’s hub-and-spoke transit network by building more cross-suburban connections. While current projects focus on connecting employment and business hubs (for instance, from La Défense business district, located west of the city limits of Paris, to Charles de Gaulle Airport, in the northeastern inner suburb), my findings suggest a people-, everyday life-centered approach which would connect working-class living places across Paris and the inner suburbs.

Lastly, I hope to complicate normative discussions on mobility in current Western societies, wherein spatial and social mobility is judged good and desirable (Swift, 2004). Because their mobility practices are deemed less valuable and legitimate than those of the upper classes (Damon, 2004), the lower classes are portrayed as unable to take up the norm of mobility. Yet, in the case of eating and moving in Goutte d’Or, the mobile are the lower classes and the immobile are the upper classes. But is that a good thing that a working-class household can spend hours and miles in public transportation so as to do the groceries, while a middle-class household walks to the street corner store? Are the disadvantaged being resourceful and gritty, as a rational choice view would argue? Or, under a structuralist perspective, are the disadvantaged facing social inequality down to the most ordinary aspects of their lives? These questions are important; yet, they fall beyond the scope of sociological scholarship. From what you have read in this paper, I let you, reader, make up your mind. At least, I hope to have convinced you that seemingly mundane ADL do have social relevance.
THE STRUCTURE OF URBAN DAILY LIVING

REFERENCES


THE STRUCTURE OF URBAN DAILY LIVING


THE STRUCTURE OF URBAN DAILY LIVING


Poulain, Jean-Pierre (2010), Sociologies de l'alimentation: les mangeurs et l'espace social alimentaire, Paris: PUF.


Rea, Andrea and Maryse Tripier (2008), Sociologie de l'immigration, Paris: La Découverte.

Régnier, Faustine, Séverine Gojard and Anne Lhuissier (2006), Sociologie de l'alimentation, Paris: La Découverte.


Siblot, Yasmine, Marie Cartier, Isabelle Coutant, Olivier Masclet and Nicolas Renahy (2015), Sociologie des classes populaires contemporaines, Paris: Armand Colin.


THE STRUCTURE OF URBAN DAILY LIVING

Ⅰ Cf. the Association for Humanist Sociology.
Ⅱ Cf. the Society for Humanistic Anthropology.
Ⅲ Cf. the Association for Humanistic Psychology.
Ⅳ An example of this are the interdisciplinary journals focusing on food (e.g., Appetite; Food, Culture & Society; Food and Foodways; Gastronomica: The Journal of Critical Food Studies).
Ⅴ As per French retail trade entry regulations, groceries (épiceries) have floor areas lower than 120 m², mini-markets (supérettes) of between 120 m² to 400 m², supermarkets (supermarchés) of between 400 to 1,000 m², and hypermarkets (hypermarchés) greater than 1,000 m².
Ⅵ Ethnographic studies conducted in working-class French neighborhoods report similar strategies of “solidifying” money (Perrin-Heredia, 2010: 440-441; Laé et Murard, 1985: 83).
Neighbourhood, immediate geographical area surrounding a family’s place of residence, bounded by physical features of the environment such as streets, rivers, train tracks, and political divisions. Neighbourhoods also typically involve a strong social component, characterized by social interaction between neighbours, a sense of shared identity, and similar demographic characteristics such as life stage and socioeconomic status. What is it about a neighbourhood that makes a difference in the lives of youth? One answer is the neighbours. Nearly all neighbourhood studies find that the demographic or socioeconomic characteristics of neighbours are associated with the outcomes of interest.