

INED Population Studies

Volume 8

Series Editors

Éric Brian

Département de sciences sociales

Ecole normale supérieure

Centre Maurice-Halbwachs (CNRS_ENS_EHESS), Paris, France

Jean-Marc Rohrbasser

Institut national d'études démographiques (INED), Paris, France

Editorial Advisory Board

Isabelle Attané (INED), Didier Breton (University of Strasbourg), Olivia Ekert-Jaffé (INED), Lionel Kesztenbaum (INED), Anne Lambert (INED), Cécile Lefèvre (University Paris-V), Godelieve Masuy-Stroobant (University of Louvain-la-Neuve), Nadine Ouellette (INED), Arnaud Régnier-Loilier (INED), Claudine Sauvain-Dugerdil (University of Geneva).

This book series is devoted to publications of international relevance in population studies and demography as promoted by the French Institute for Demographic Studies (INED, Paris). As one social science among many, demography is interlinked with related disciplines including sociology, anthropology, history and linguistics, and continuously explores its boundaries with neighbouring disciplines, ranging from epidemiology and biology to economics. The studies published in the series are based on solid empirical research and firm methodological foundations. Particular attention is paid to long-term and collaborative surveys. Guided by its distinguished Editorial Advisory Board, the INED series aims to provide international visibility to works of high academic standard recognized in the French-speaking scientific community. The series supports an internationally acknowledged style of demographic research, championed by INED for more than half a century and rekindled in such fields as the study of demographic situations around the world; the relationship between demographic conditions and development; international comparisons; migration, identities and territories; family studies; gender studies and sexuality; ageing, health and mortality; trajectories, mobility and social networks.

More information about this series at <http://www.springer.com/series/11579>

Cris Beauchemin • Christelle Hamel
Patrick Simon
Editors

Trajectories and Origins: Survey on the Diversity of the French Population

 Springer

Editors

Cris Beauchemin
Institut national d'études
démographiques (INED)
Paris, France

Christelle Hamel
Institut national d'études
démographiques (INED)
Paris, France

Patrick Simon
Institut national d'études
démographiques (INED)
Paris, France

ISSN 2214-2452

INED Population Studies

ISBN 978-3-319-76637-9

<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-76638-6>

ISSN 2214-2460 (electronic)

ISBN 978-3-319-76638-6 (eBook)

Library of Congress Control Number: 2018942529

© Springer International Publishing AG, part of Springer Nature 2018, corrected publication 2019

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

The publisher, the authors and the editors are safe to assume that the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication. Neither the publisher nor the authors or the editors give a warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein or for any errors or omissions that may have been made. The publisher remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

This Springer imprint is published by the registered company Springer International Publishing AG part of Springer Nature.

The registered company address is: Gewerbestrasse 11, 6330 Cham, Switzerland

The TeO survey was a major collective endeavour. We would like to thank all those who brought this venture to fruition, first and foremost François Héran, Director of INED when the survey was first conceived. He defended the project throughout the 4 years of survey preparation and implementation, offering scientific and political support at difficult times when the survey's legitimacy was brought into question. Chantal Cases, his successor, also provided her unstinting encouragement. She ensured optimal conditions for data analysis and followed the progress of our research with close attention.

A large-scale data collection operation of this kind would have been impossible without the close collaboration of our colleagues at INSEE, both for project governance and for survey design and implementation. Stéfan Lollivier, Head of Demographic and Social Statistics at the time, took the necessary steps to include the survey in the INSEE work programme. Guy Desplanques, Head of the Demography Department, followed by Pascale Breuil, Head of the Demographic and Social Studies unit, supervised its design and implementation. Our colleagues at the Statistics and Immigration Studies unit, Catherine Borrel, unit head, Elisabeth Algava, then Bertrand Lhommeau, and the survey leaders, Jacqueline Perrin-Hayes and Pascal Germé, played a central role in all the survey phases, from its initial design to the release of data just 1 year

after collection. Cécile Ménard, followed by Pascale Pietri-Bessy, coordinated the operations at INSEE and the data collection process. Data collection was organized by the INSEE teams, and we are very grateful to the regional managers and the interviewers who deployed the questionnaire in the field and who recorded the slices of life that respondents kindly made available to us.

The survey design, notably the content of the questionnaire, owes much to a multidisciplinary team of colleagues. Most of them were also members of the broader data analysis group. We extend our thanks to Maryline Bèque, Yaël Brinbaum, Martin Clément, Stéphanie Condon, Hugues Lagrange, Maud Lesné, Dominique Meurs, Laure Moguerou, Muriel Moisy, Mahrez Okba, Ariane Pailhé, Jean-Louis Pan-Ké-Shon, Jean-Luc Primon, Corinne Régnard, Mirna Safi, Emmanuelle Santelli and Vincent Tiberj for their respective contributions to our collective endeavour. The survey coordinators at INED received fantastic assistance in their task from Karine Wigdorowicz, Stéphane Bernard and Amélie Charruault, who also helped to prepare the data files and their documentation.

This book is an abridged translation of the book *Trajectoires et origines: enquête sur la diversité des populations en France* published by Éditions de l'Ined in 2015 (Grandes Enquêtes book series). For the original publication, we wish to thank Jean-Marc Rohrbasser, head of the editorial committee, the various anonymous reviewers and the INED editorial team: Martine Rousso-Rossmann, Nicole Berthoux, Dominique Paris and Agnès Belbezet. The book was translated into English by Harriet Coleman, Paul Reeve and Brian Stacy. We wish to thank them for their hard work and for the excellent quality of their translations. Our thanks also to Catriona Dutreuilh who did an amazing job of coordinating the translation work and editing the final version.

A survey of this kind would not have been possible without the financial support of numerous institutions interested in questions of integration and discrimination. Alongside INSEE and INED, they include ACSÉ,

AFPA, ANPE, ANR, DARES, DREES, HALDE, IAURIF-ÎdF and ONZUS. Working together with scientific experts in the steering committee, the funding institutions were present throughout the project.

This book is above all a tribute to the respondents who kindly agreed to share their experiences and trajectories, thereby illustrating the diversity of contemporary French society.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
	Patrick Simon, Cris Beauchemin, and Christelle Hamel	
2	Migration Histories and Socioeconomic Profiles	11
	Cris Beauchemin, Bertrand Lhommeau, and Patrick Simon	
3	Educational Trajectories and Transition to Employment of the Second Generation	39
	Jean-Luc Primon, Yaël Brinbaum, and Laure Moguérou	
4	Employment and Wages of Immigrants and Descendants of Immigrants: Measures of Inequality and Perceived Discrimination	79
	Dominique Meurs	
5	Union Formation in a Multicultural Context	107
	Christelle Hamel, Bertrand Lhommeau, Ariane Pailhé, and Emmanuelle Santelli	
6	The Living Environment of Immigrants and Their Descendants: Perceived Discrimination and Segregation	143
	Jean-Louis Pan Ké Shon and Claire Scodellaro	
7	Migration and Living Conditions: Their Impact on Health	171
	Christelle Hamel and Muriel Moisy	
8	Discrimination in France: Between Perception and Experience	195
	Yaël Brinbaum, Mirna Safi, and Patrick Simon	
9	The Place of Racism in the Study of Discrimination	223
	Christelle Hamel, Maud Lesné, and Jean-Luc Primon	
10	Language Use and Family Transmission in Migration Context	249
	Stephanie Condon and Corinne Régnard	

11 Registers of Identity. The Relationships of Immigrants and their Descendants to French National Identity	277
Patrick Simon and Vincent Tiberj	
12 Secularization or a Return to Religion? The Religiosity of Immigrants and Their Descendants.....	307
Patrick Simon and Vincent Tiberj	
13 Transnational Links and Integration: Between Here and There	331
Cris Beauchemin, Hugues Lagrange, and Mirna Safi	
14 Conclusion: Diversity of Origins and the Emergence of Minorities	359
Cris Beauchemin, Christelle Hamel, and Patrick Simon	
Correction to: Employment and Wages of Immigrants and Descendants of Immigrants: Measures of Inequality and Perceived Discrimination	C1
Appendix: Trajectories and Origins: Survey Methodology	369
Elisabeth Algava, Bertrand Lhommeau, and Cris Beauchemin	

Preface

Science by Exception, or How the TeO Survey Fulfilled Its Mission

Anyone in France who follows the news on political and social life with a minimum of attention will have heard of the Trajectories and Origins survey, subtitled “Survey on population diversity in France”. Carried out jointly by INED and INSEE in 2008 and 2009, the survey caused something of a stir on its launch (I will return to this below). Since then many articles, working papers, and dissertations have contributed to sustaining public interest in the survey and popularizing its acronym, TeO. But until 2015, no reference document had been published to bring together these publications, expand upon them and systematize their content. You are holding just such a document in your hands (or viewing it on your screen), thanks to the extensive team of collaborators led by Cris Beauchemin, Christelle Hamel, and Patrick Simon. Beyond INED and INSEE, the project leaders agreed from an early stage to provide open access to the survey datasets. They were thus able to include contributions from universities and research institutions, for whose participation I would like to express particular thanks.

It must be emphasized from the outset that the TeO survey is a lone star in the universe of research and public statistics in France. How many surveys have explored in depth the lives and experiences of immigrants and their descendants in France, their integration in French society, and the successes and obstacles that have marked their trajectory over two generations, including experience of discrimination? The only comparable precedent is the geographical mobility and social integration survey (*Mobilité géographique et insertion sociale*, MGIS) carried out by Michèle Tribalat, an INED researcher, in 1992. This pioneering survey, performed in collaboration with INSEE, focused on a set of seven migration streams dating back to different periods of recent French history. It resulted in a set of important publications, and remains a reference today for anyone seeking to understand the process of migrant integration in France in the second half of the twentieth century. Its questionnaire not only retraced migrants’ personal trajectories, it also looked

back at the previous generation. This was the very first time in France that the relevant supervisory bodies, the CNIS and the CNIL,¹ gave authorization to collect information on the countries of birth of individuals and their parents, paving the way for the comparative study of what are now known as the “first generation” (migrants who came from elsewhere to reside in France) and the “second generation” (their children born or raised in France). As the MGIS survey covered several decades retrospectively, regular updating was not necessary. The addition of a few further years of observations would have made little difference to the overall pattern of results. But this argument does not justify the fact that 16 years were allowed to pass between MGIS and TeO. Why such a long delay?

The first reason, and not the least among them, is the cost of such surveys, notably the cost of collecting data by means of a long and complex questionnaire. The objective was to record the trajectories of migrants and their descendants in their various dimensions: geographical, residential, familial, educational, occupational, religious, civic, not forgetting their social networks, cultural activities, and their own perceptions of their personal trajectory. Hence the need to ask hundreds of questions, through interpreters when needed, in face-to-face interviews that took over an hour to complete on average. The next factor was the cost of reaching the relevant minority populations. In France there is no population register providing a sampling frame that can be used to reach all descendants of migrants. The census includes questions on origins, including those of migrants who are naturalized French citizens, but they are limited to the respondents’ own generation, and do not cover their parents. To prepare for the TeO survey, the INSEE team thus had no choice but to trawl by hand through many thousands of birth certificates held by French municipalities, with authorization from judges, in order to identify the children of immigrants who might be eligible to enter the sample.

It was no easy matter to obtain funding for the TeO survey. In the lively debate that surrounded its launch, one commentator – not particularly well-informed on the funding of public surveys, but convinced that self-interest runs the world – became convinced that the primary motivation of the project’s leaders was to grab all the available grant money, supposedly showered so generously upon studies of “diversity” in France. But nothing could be further from the truth. Neither INSEE nor INED had the means to cover the full costs of data collection. Heaven and earth had to be moved before adequate funds could be obtained from various ministries, supplemented by the decisive contributions of a number of agencies and authorities – to whom we are most grateful.² Unable to supervise the content of the questionnaire, the Direction des populations et des migrations (Department for populations and

¹Respectively, the Conseil national de l’information statistique and the Commission nationale de l’informatique et des libertés (national bodies charged with personal data protection in France).

²Direction de l’animation de la recherche, des études et des statistiques (DARES), Direction de la recherche, des études, de l’évaluation et des statistiques (DREES), l’Agence nationale pour la cohésion sociale et l’égalité des chances (ACSÉ), Association pour la formation professionnelle des adultes (AFPA) la Haute Autorité de lutte contre les discriminations et pour l’égalité (HALDE), Agence nationale de la recherche (ANR), l’Institut d’aménagement et d’urbanisme (IAU-ÎdF), Observatoire national des zones urbaines sensibles (ONZUS).

migrations) which at the time was being absorbed by the Ministry of Immigration, abstained from contributing to survey funding, leaving this to the DREES, the shared research and statistics unit of the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Social Affairs. The hunt for the funds needed for the TeO survey involved exhausting efforts on the part of the project leaders, illustrating the chronic deficit of large-scale infrastructure that afflicts social science research in France. I would like to pay particular tribute to these young researchers, who spared no effort in initiating this venture against all odds, despite the risk that their publications would be delayed by several years.

This brings us to one further factor behind the difficulty in launching a new survey on the integration of immigrants and their descendants. Fifteen years after the MGIS survey, a new generation of researchers was needed at INED, along with a new generation of statisticians at INSEE. And yet the initial number of personnel fell far short of what was required. As the director of INED since the late 1990s, I had the backing of the board of administration and the scientific council on this point. In 2002 they supported the creation of a research unit on international migration and minorities, and agreed to staff it through recruitment at the highest level, while in parallel INSEE increased the staff resources devoted to the question of migration. These renewed and rejuvenated teams valiantly led the TeO survey project. But the emergence of a new generation of researchers was evidently a lengthy process.

Finally, the concern, and even hostility, aroused by the very idea of the TeO survey must also be mentioned. Its designers had constructed a questionnaire that explored migrants' integration over time in the various facets of social life, but they also wanted to obtain as much detailed information as possible on experience of discrimination. How can different forms of discrimination be studied without taking into account the categories used by its perpetrators? Given the impossibility of questioning those perpetrators, the survey had to rely on the victims' capacity to perceive discrimination and describe the experience. In France, it was out of the question for the TeO survey to apply the kind of "ethno-racial" framework used in censuses in the United States or the United Kingdom – a list of "races", potentially subdivided into cultural affinities, with the respondent invited to tick one or more boxes.

A first solution consisted in posing questions on various experiences of discrimination or unfair treatment, followed by a long list of possible grounds, including country of origin, surname, neighbourhood of residence, skin colour, accent, etc. These were maintained in the final version of the questionnaire, and detailed studies based on these data can be found in this volume. It is thus possible, based on the TeO survey data, to determine what proportion of persons who experienced discrimination attributed it to one or other factor, including physical appearance and skin colour. The reverse, however, is not possible. What is the probability that individuals will experience discrimination if they are unlucky enough to be perceived as black, Asian, North African, but also white, etc.? The data do not say. This is comparable to a scenario where the proportion of tourists among visitors to the Louvre is known (it is very high), without knowing the probability for a randomly selected

tourist of visiting the Louvre (which is much lower), nor indeed even having an approximation of the number of tourists in a year.

Louis Schweitzer, who at the time was the head of the national authority in charge of combating discrimination (Haute autorité de lutte contre les discriminations et pour l'égalité, Halde), took a lively interest in the TeO survey, to the point of co-financing it. He spoke out in favour of a second solution, so-called hetero-perception. This begins with a question such as "Do you feel that you are perceived as black?", followed by a second question such as "If yes, have you been discriminated against for this reason?" This general question would doubtless then have to be broken down by context: family, work, public space, dealings with the administration, etc. Several options of this kind were studied, but they met resolute opposition from the association SOS-Racisme: they saw the "Schweitzer solution", as it came to be known, as nothing other than a "racial census". In their view, under the cover of studying racial discrimination, the TeO researchers were in fact planning to practise discrimination themselves.

The first chapter of the present volume recounts the special treatment to which the TeO survey was subjected in its preparatory phase of examination by the competent authorities: a double examination by the control bodies of the CNIS; an unauthorized leak of the questionnaire to the general public; an online petition launched by SOS-Racisme; and scathing opinion pieces in several daily newspapers either defending or condemning the famous "ethnic statistics" that TeO had come to symbolize. Some were even signed by INED researchers from outside the research unit on migrations. Not to mention the considerable reluctance of the Haut conseil à l'intégration, a body that has since ceased to exist, whose erstwhile president affirmed in an official letter that the TeO project was decidedly too focused on studying discrimination and not enough on integration. No previous INED or INSEE survey had ever kindled such fierce debate.

A coincidence of timing fanned the flames. After the questionnaire had been approved by the CNIS and was about to enter its final test phase, an initiative taken in 2007 by parliamentarians who were also members of the CNIL began to make headlines. It consisted in introducing an amendment to article 63 of a proposed immigration law (known as the "loi Hortefeux", after the Minister of Immigration at the time) aiming to facilitate CNIL scrutiny of "operations needed to conduct studies that measure the diversity of the origins, discrimination, and integration", and specifying that such operations were to remain strictly anonymous and be subjected to a full examination procedure. This amendment was immediately interpreted by the media as a green light for "ethnic statistics", of which the TeO survey was taken as the illustration *par excellence*. On the legal level, the amendment took the form of an exception that was to be added to the ten exceptions already set out in article 8 of the Data Protection Act (*loi Informatique et libertés*) of 6 January 1978, modified in August 2004.

This point merits further explanation. Article 8 of the Data Protection Act, which sets out a general principle inspired by Article 1 of the French Constitution, is of key importance for statisticians and social science and health researchers: "The collection and processing of personal data that reveals, directly or indirectly, the racial and

ethnic origins, the political, philosophical, religious opinions or trade union affiliation of persons, or which concern their health or sexual life, is prohibited.” Such data are labelled as “sensitive” by law (note in passing that income and assets are not included in this list...). This list is a singular one for those interested in research. Are there not countless surveys that draw on individual data in these areas? Does the press not regularly report on opinion polls and surveys that measure political, trade union, and religious affiliations? And what of surveys on health, disabilities, and sexual behaviour? If the 1978 law applies in the same way to private polling institutes and public institutions (INSEE, INED, INSERM, etc.), what, then, is the legal basis for the studies that regularly appear under the “Science” and “Society” headings of print and audiovisual media?

The answer can be given in a single word: exceptions (*dérogations* in French legal language). The same article of law that forbids the collection and use of sensitive personal data then immediately lists no less than ten exceptions, themselves subject to variable conditions. The collection and use of such data is authorized if the protection of persons is guaranteed (written consent is obtained, data are anonymized, statistics compiled by INSEE under the control of the CNIS), if it serves certain ends (favouring the assertion of rights or progress in health research, an association studying its own members...), if it is authorized by a decree from the Conseil d’État, or if it is judged to be in the “public interest”. But the CNIL must always examine which of these exceptions applies, if any, on a case-by-case basis. Anonymity at source, for example, eliminates personally identifiable information from data and takes them out of the scope of the Data Protection Act, but it is again up to the CNIL to determine the technical conditions under which the data collected can be “depersonalized” (as for example in the case of INSERM and INED telephone surveys on sexual behaviours). The law thus responds in the affirmative to the crucial question of whether collecting and using “sensitive data” is permitted. But instead of saying: “It is allowed, as long as...”, it states that “It is prohibited, unless...” The general principle of prohibition remains, although it is made more flexible through a range of duly controlled exceptions.

The CNIL amendment to article 63 of the Hortefeux immigration law thus proposed an additional exception in favour of studies on the diversity of origins and the extent of discrimination. But the Conseil constitutionnel, in a decision issued on 15 November 2007, declared the amendment unconstitutional, on the grounds that it was a “legislative rider” that was out of place in a law on immigration controls. Would it have been found acceptable in another, more relevant law? Looking back in hindsight some years later (and this type of analysis cannot be rushed), I strongly doubt it. The amendment’s sin was not the desire to introduce an eleventh exception to the general prohibition, but the fact that this exception was a thematic one: it was supposed to cover all studies on the diversity of origins, instead of being restricted to an exception of a technical or procedural nature (bearing on privacy protection guarantees). It is in this respect that, rider or not, the amendment proved to be contrary to Article 1 of the Constitution, as the Conseil constitutionnel mentioned in a commentary on the same decision (*obiter dictum*, in legal terms). An exception cannot suspend a general principle; it must remain an exception. The amendment

sought by the CNIL gave the impression that any and all surveys on “the diversity of origins” could thus automatically be classified as in the public interest, whereas the spirit of the law implied that the fulfilment of this condition should be examined on a case-by-case basis. Needless to say, neither INED nor INSEE had called for such an exception, nor had the designers of the TeO survey. The application of the standard procedures of the CNIL was largely sufficient.

Here I must draw the reader’s attention to a fundamental point that, to my knowledge, has never before been raised. Most of our socio-demographic knowledge on changes in French society and questions of public health has been obtained by way of derogation. This is true of studies on the evolution of social mores and family structures, and it is equally true of studies on migrants’ origins and the impact of these origins on their interactions with the host society. As INED researchers gain knowledge of social mores, in the old sense of “moral and political sciences”, they refine their questions, explore individual biographies in greater detail, and trace back histories over several generations. In doing so they are constantly navigating the boundaries between the public, the private, and the intimate.³ The list of sensitive – sometimes extremely sensitive – topics that INED has explored in its surveys over the last 15 years is long: non-marital cohabitation, children born outside marriage, medically assisted procreation, abortion, sexual behaviour, genital mutilation, sexual dysfunction, family violence, disability, adoption, homelessness, end-of-life medical decisions, etc. How have such surveys been possible? Only by exception. In this respect, there is nothing unusual about the study of immigrant populations.

Of course, the sensitive or intrusive character of an issue can change over time. Questions on non-marital cohabitation were still sensitive in 1980, but became commonplace over the following years. In the first years of the PACS civil partnership, compiling statistics on the sex of the partners in civil unions was prohibited by law, until homosexual organizations themselves requested that this secrecy be lifted. I could give many more examples. In the eyes of young researchers today, the questionnaires of the 1980s seem timid, as those of the 1950s were for my generation. Will the same not be true a decade from now, in 2025, to those rereading the passionate debates of the late 2000s on the TeO survey? Will the suspicion that certain questions on origins and appearances seek to “undermine the foundations of the Republic” still be understood, when their modest aim was to better capture the mechanisms underlying the various forms of discrimination that undermine the principle of equality?

More than a decade has passed since the polemics stirred by the TeO survey, and already the lava has cooled on at least one theme: questions about religion. Who remembers the fiery accusations spurred by these questions, on the same grounds as (and perhaps to an even greater extent than) ethnic origins and physical appearance? In an official letter to the CNIS on the TeO survey, SOS-Racisme issued this absolute accusation: “Apparently, INED and INSEE wish once again to verify that

³This line of thought was already broached in the preface to the INED volume on the Family history survey associated with the 1999 census (*Histoires de familles, histoires familiales. Les résultats de l'enquête Famille de 1999*, Paris, Éditions de l'Ined, coll. « Les Cahiers », 156).

anti-Semitic adage, ‘Jews are rich.’” And further down, this definitive statement: “Presuming to understand the contribution of religious influence to the behaviour of individuals is totally unacceptable.” This casts opprobrium on the very principle of a sociology of religion, already present in 1897 in Émile Durkheim’s universal classic *Suicide*, and practised in countless research centres around the world. Who can deny the influence of the religious factor on behaviours as varied as non-marital cohabitation, fertility, abortion, divorce, and end-of-life care? There is no major stage in the life cycle that is not deeply affected by individuals’ relationship to religion. What demographer or sociologist would dare to forbid research of this type, risking exclusion from the entire scientific community? Before the data had been examined, how could anyone dictate that religion has no effect on the integration of migrants and their descendants in different spheres of social life in France?

While Article 1 of the constitution may sweepingly condemn legal distinctions by “origin, race, or religion”, not a single supervisory body, be it the CNIS, the CNIL, or even the Conseil constitutionnel in its decision of November 2007, casts doubt on the legitimacy of questions about religion in public statistical surveys. It is abundantly clear that scientific analysis of the religious factor in an anonymous survey cannot be construed as a form of unequal treatment granting rights to certain individuals or withdrawing them from others on the basis of their religion; and neither can it be seen as an attempt to label individuals on the basis of their religious affiliation. The antiracist group’s demand that questions on religion in the TeO survey be prohibited found no support. The present volume thus presents invaluable in-depth analyses of discrimination by religion, changes in religious references from one generation to the next, and levels of religious endogamy among practitioners of different religions, be they Catholic, Protestant, Jewish, Buddhist, or Muslim.

The classical argument holding that the relationship to religion is a shifting reality that resists all measurement also does not hold water: all the realities of this earthly existence are shifting ones, beginning with social realities. The response to this ancient problem does not consist in prohibiting statistics, but in diversifying them to better capture behaviours in all their complexity. This is why the TeO survey distinguishes between questions that reflect a simple sense of affiliation, those that speak of levels of practice, and those that establish a strong attachment to religion. It bears repeating, although it contradicts a widespread belief: public statistics and public research have the right to include direct questions on the religion of respondents, their spouses, and their parents, on the condition that the scientific purpose of the survey justifies this inclusion and is formally recognized. From 1980 to 2008, INSEE and INED had to content themselves with a question on respondents’ religious affiliation that did not specify the religion in question (the distinction drawn was simply: “neither sense of affiliation nor practice”, “sense of affiliation only”, “both”, “do not know or prefer not to respond”). Since then, at least three public statistical surveys have included direct questions on the religion of respondents and their families. Besides the TeO survey, there have also been the successive waves of the ERFI survey (the French version of the International Generations and Gender Survey, carried out in 2005, 2008, and 2011 in 15 European countries), as well as the MFV survey (Migration, families

and ageing in the overseas *départements*, 2009–2010). These surveys were all carried out jointly by INSEE and INED, with the approval of supervisory bodies. They gave rise to publications that are accessible online. None of them has ever led to the slightest stigmatization of populations who believe in or practise the religions concerned.

As the years go by and the dust begins to settle, there is no doubt that the TeO project stands out for its novelty and for its exceptional results. To critiques of principle, it responded with a demonstration in practice. Its leaders decided to show that the proof of the pudding was in the eating. It is now clearly established that social science research can expand our knowledge of discrimination and its mechanisms without the slightest threat to individual freedoms, and without any damage to minorities. More precisely, TeO demonstrates – if a demonstration were needed – that the technique of “proxies” or substitutes, whereby a problem is approached by talking about something else, has severe limitations. Country of origin cannot be equated with religion, any more than religion with physical appearance, or language with country of origin. These factors can act cumulatively or interact, but they only partly overlap. To take just one example, religious discrimination does indeed exist, but quite separately from discrimination by origin.

It has now been demonstrated, through the systematic use of logistic regression as a tool for modelling and differentiation, that for a given duration of residence, generation, age and level of education, migrants and their descendants still encounter difficulties of highly unequal scale in their integration into French society, depending on their origin and on the relationship of the native-born population to that origin group. Taking the redundancy of these different variables as axiomatic and excluding one or another of them *ex-ante* is not a scientific approach. In good science, the only valid criterion for introducing a variable into a model, or excluding it, is its added explanatory value, empirically attested. Opponents of a model are free to refute it, but it is up to them to demonstrate that the observed differences can be better explained with other variables.

In the same line, the designers of the TeO survey understood the importance of creating control samples for purposes of comparison, i.e. French citizens born in France to parents also born in France, but also persons born French in the overseas *départements*, or born in metropolitan France to parents born overseas. Complementary questions were used to carefully distinguish between repatriates and migrants (as well as their respective descendants). Here again, these methodological distinctions, far from dismembering our one and indivisible Republic, have treated it with total respect, working to measure the gap that separates the reality from the ideal. TeO is the first survey to compare the experiences of discrimination faced by members of different populations who, in the eyes of those practising discrimination, share a common visible trait: the colour of their skin; some because they descend from African populations reduced to slavery in the Antilles and long since legally included in the French nation, others because they came to France from sub-Saharan Africa. The results confirm that while a family and community history of several generations of French citizenship may guarantee access to jobs in the civil service, it does not protect individuals from racial discrimination.

The authors do not evade any of the difficulties that the second generation faces on the labour market, which are often greater than those of their parents when they arrived in France in a different economic context. Reinforcing the findings of Sciences Po's 2005 CEVIPOF survey by Sylvain Brouard and Vincent Tiberj, they confirm that the children of immigrants from the Maghreb and Turkey have tended to turn to Islam, and that this religious revival is not unrelated to frustrations arising from experience of discrimination. On a question as crucial as the unequal school outcomes of girls and boys, as measured notably by the probability of leaving school with no qualifications, they reveal that even after controlling for a series of socio-economic and sociolinguistic factors, large differences by country of origin remain. All other things being equal, school failure is less common among girls from families with origins in the Maghreb or sub-Saharan Africa than among boys from these families, whereas the opposite is the case among families of Turkish origin, who sometimes appear to deliberately curtail girls' education. Here again, these differences highlight a need for further research, both qualitative and quantitative. Many more examples could be given.

Generally speaking, the TeO survey reminds us that discrimination is not merely a postulate – it can be empirically demonstrated. Its mechanisms need not merely be guessed at – they can be measured. Nor can it be reduced to vague representations. Much to the contrary, it is crucial to study the relationships between subjectively perceived discrimination and the objective experience reflected in life trajectories, with their histories of success and failure, progress and marginalization. The TeO survey makes this possible. No doubt the first results presented here point to the need for further, more detailed studies, but we have already learnt a major lesson: the subjective and objective dimensions of discrimination are closely linked.

At this stage, one last clarification is needed. Indeed, perhaps I should have begun here. In collecting sensitive data on origins, four levels of knowledge and practice can be distinguished. In the nominative databases of administrations and businesses, recording data on origins and religion is prohibited: no exception is possible under current jurisprudence. The second level is currently that of the population census, which since the nineteenth century has included a question on respondents' country of birth and previous nationality, even if they have since acquired French citizenship. The third level goes back one generation, asking about country of birth and the previous nationality of the respondent's parents. This is the case, for example, of the family history survey (EHF), associated to the 1999 census and, since the years 2003–2004, of INSEE's major surveys (labour force, family and housing, living conditions, etc.). At last we are able to measure access to employment, housing, and social and career mobility among the descendants of immigrants.

The fourth and final level is reserved for specialized research surveys on sensitive topics. This includes the study of discrimination by origin, which calls for the description of characteristics linked to discrimination, including physical appearance, provided that strict technical and legal guarantees are set in place. Surveys in this category, which includes TeO, are extremely rare, but in my view they should be carried out every decade, or even every 5 years. Such surveys must address a

strong social demand: in the case of TeO, the need for international knowledge and comparisons on the dynamics of integration and the scale of discrimination. I do not consider, however, that it should fall upon the researchers themselves – be it with the best possible intentions – to demonstrate that their work will necessarily have a “positive impact” on the fight against discrimination or, for example, on the success of integration programmes. No one expects a survey on incomes to demonstrate that it will improve their distribution. Conversely, it is impossible to prevent statistical studies from being occasionally misused by the ignorant or the ill-intentioned. The work of refutation in these cases must take place in the public arena. The researcher’s role is not to reform society but to methodically inform social actors through new knowledge, as objectively as possible. The designers of the TeO survey and the researchers who have explored the resulting data have fulfilled this mission perfectly. Now is the time for other social actors to take hold of the results, for competing researchers to do better, and for the responsible authorities to ensure that the means are made available for future surveys on the same topic.

Institut national d’études démographiques (INED)
Paris, France

François Héran