

**THE IMPACTS OF ARTICLE 55 OF THE LAW ON SOLI-  
DARITY AND URBAN RENEWAL IN FRANCE: A SYSTEM-  
ATIC LITERATURE REVIEW**

Verna Jakonen  
Master's thesis  
Social and public policy  
Department of Social Sci-  
ences and Philosophy  
University of Jyväskylä  
Spring 2023

## ABSTRACT

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Faculty<br>Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities   | Department<br>Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy |
| Author Verna Jakonen   |  |
| Name of the work<br><br>The impacts of article 55 of the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal in France: a systematic literature review   |  |
| Subject<br>Social and Public policy  | Type of work<br>Master's thesis                            |
| Time<br>Spring 2023  | Number of pages<br>42 + attachments                        |
| Instructors<br>Nathan Lillie and Quivine Ndomo   |  |
| Abstract<br><br><p>This master's thesis examines the impacts of article 55 of the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal in France. The law, which came into force in 2000, aims at decreasing segregation and requires municipalities to have at least 20 % social housing by 2020. With the methodology of mixed-methods systematic literature review, the thesis composes all available, peer-reviewed studies on the impacts of article 55 of the law. The results are synthesized with narrative synthesis.</p> <p>The analysis shows that regardless of the study's framework, academic studies bring up the same concern: many of the targeted municipalities have refused to build new social housing, and if new social housing is built, it is often allocated to the middle class or applicants who already live in the municipality. As the law has not been implemented as expected, it seems to have a disconcerting co-impact with the Borloo law. When the poorest are not excepted to the new social housing units and the old social housing neighbourhoods are renewed to contain less social housing, it appears that some of the most vulnerable must look for a new place to live, which is often more expensive.</p> |  |
| Index words Law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal, SRU Law, social mix, urban segregation, France  |  |
| Place of reservation University of Jyväskylä   |  |
| Other information  |  |

## TIIVISTELMÄ

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Tiedekunta<br>Humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellinen tiedekunta   | Laitos<br>Yhteiskuntatieteiden ja filosofian laitos |
| Tekijä Verna Jakonen  |   |
| Työn nimi<br><br>Urbaanin uudistamisen ja solidaarisuuden lain 55. artiklan vaikutukset Ranskassa: systemaattinen kirjallisuuskatsaus   |   |
| Oppiaine<br>Yhteiskuntapolitiikka   | Työn tyyppi<br>Pro Gradu                            |
| Aika<br>Kevät 2023  | Sivumäärä<br>42 + liitteet                          |
| Ohjaajat<br>Nathan Lillie ja Quivine Ndomo  |   |
| Tiivistelmä<br><br><p>Tämä maisterintutkielma käsittelee ranskalaisen urbaanin uudistamisen ja solidaarisuuden lain 55. artiklan vaikutuksia. Kyseinen laki, joka tuli voimaan vuonna 2000, pyrkii vähentämään segregatiota ja vaatii kuntia kasvattamaan sosiaalisen asuntokannan osuuden vähintään 20 prosenttiin vuoteen 2020 mennessä. Tutkielma koostaa kaikki saatavilla olevat vertaisarvioidut tutkimukset lain 55. artiklan vaikutuksista systemaattisen kirjallisuuskatsauksen keinoin.</p> <p>Analyysi osoittaa, että tutkimukset nostavat erilaisista viitekehyksistään huolimatta esiin saman huolenaiheen: monet lain piirissä olevista kunnista eivät ole kasvattaneet sosiaalista asuntokantaa, ja jos sitä on kasvatettu, uudet asunnot on usein jaettu keski-luokalle tai hakijoille, jotka asuvat jo kyseisessä kunnassa. Kun urbaanin uudistamisen ja solidaarisuuden lain 55. artiklaa ei ole sovellettu kunnissa lain tavoitteiden mukaisesti, sillä vaikuttaa olevan huolestuttava yhteisvaikutus Borloo-lain kanssa: samanaikaisesti kun köyhimpiä ei ole hyväksytty uusiin sosiaalisen asumisen kohteisiin, vanhat lähiöt on uudistettu niin, että sosiaalisia asuntoja on vähemmän. Sen vuoksi osa kaikista haavoittuvimmassa asemassa olevista joutuu etsimään uuden kodin, joka on usein aikaisempaa kalliimpi.</p> |   |
| Asiasanat Urbaanin uudistamisen ja solidaarisuuden laki, SRU-laki, sosiaalinen sekoittaminen, urbaani segregatio, Ranska  |   |
| Säilytyspaikka Jyväskylän yliopisto   |   |
| Muita tietoja   |   |

## **TABLES**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table 1. Research material                  | 48 |
| Table 2. Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool       | 52 |
| Table 3. Critical appraisal of the articles | 54 |

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | INTRODUCTION .....                                    | 1  |
| 2 | URBAN SEGREGATION .....                               | 5  |
|   | 2.1 The concept of urban segregation.....             | 5  |
|   | 2.2 Urban segregation in France.....                  | 8  |
| 3 | SOCIAL MIX POLICIES .....                             | 11 |
|   | 3.1 What are social mix policies? .....               | 11 |
|   | 3.2 Social mix policies in France.....                | 14 |
|   | 3.3 The law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal .....     | 15 |
| 4 | IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDY .....                     | 17 |
|   | 4.1 Methodology of systematic literature review ..... | 17 |
|   | 4.2 Research material .....                           | 21 |
|   | 4.3 Narrative synthesis .....                         | 25 |
|   | 4.4 Research ethics.....                              | 26 |
| 5 | SYNTHESIS .....                                       | 27 |
|   | 5.1 Impacts on the quantity of social housing.....    | 28 |
|   | 5.2 Impacts on social mix .....                       | 30 |
|   | 5.3 Cooperative impacts with the Borloo law .....     | 35 |
| 6 | CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION .....                       | 38 |
|   | LITERATURE .....                                      | 43 |
|   | APPENDIXES  |    |

# 1 INTRODUCTION

Social segregation in cities has lately become a concern in the European Commission. According to the latest statistics on European poverty (2021), 95,4 million people – 21,7 % of the population of the EU – were at risk of poverty or social exclusion. In the EU, the phenomena related to urban segregation are often connected to poverty and migration and the commission has also raised concerns on “invisible segregation”, by which they mean the segregation not visible in official statistics. This is often the case with those migrants and refugees, who stay informally or temporarily in the city. According to the European Commission, the position of migrants in general is worrying: the concentration to disadvantaged areas might be involuntary. Among European cities, the Western ones – including French cities – are considered the most unequal. (European commission 2019; Eurostat 2022.)

During past decades, restlessness of certain suburbs has raised concerns in the French society: the challenging conditions, malaise and misery of the youth have become visible through several series of riots in the French *banlieues* (suburbs). Perhaps the most recognized of these riots has been the one of autumn 2005, when the suburban youth burned almost 9000 cars and multiple day-care centres, schools, and police departments in various French cities: during the weeks of riots, over 2900 people were arrested. The French state responded to these riots with a national state of emergency. (Hess, Tammaru & van Ham 2018, 4; Lagrange 2008, 377; Le Monde 7.11.2005; Sahlin 2006; The Guardian 22.10.2015; The New York Times 3.11.2005.)

In the aftermath of the first terror attacks of France in 2015, the *banlieues* have been attached to radicalisation processes, because the attackers had connections to suburbs of Paris. Thereafter, there has appeared a discussion on whether the exclusion of these suburbs might advance radicalisation of the suffering youth. (Moran 2017, 315–317; The New Yorker 2015). As the stigma of the disadvantaged suburbs seems to have grown, the questions of recognizing and deconstructing the situation in these suburbs have become societally even more important. Researchers have compared the French phenomenon to that of the United States and wondered, whether the word *ghetto* would be suitable for the French case as well (Wacquant 2006; Lapeyronnie 2008; Rey 2017). This concern – although it is a subject of debate – gives clues of the seriousness of the phenomena in France.

The French riots of 2005 were not the first of their kind: the problems started to emerge in the beginning of the 1980s. During the 1990s, the disadvantaged neighbourhoods were made a target of development policies in the framework of *politique de la ville*, City Politics. These suburbs were originally built for working classes in the reconstruction projects after World War II. Located in the outskirts of larger cities, they consist of massive concrete apartment buildings, *grands ensembles*. During the deindustrialization, these areas suffered deterioration, as many of the inhabitants lost their jobs in manufacturing. The affordable apartments became a home of those non-European immigrants who have suffered from poverty, social problems, and stigmatization. (Hess, Tammaru & van Hamm 2018, 7; McAvay & Verdugo 2021, 330; Moran 2017, 321–322.)

But how is France solving its problems regarding urban segregation? French politics have tried to repair the situation by creating new laws targeted to these disadvantaged neighbourhoods – many of them aiming for *social mix*. The policies of social mixing have been used in the United States, Western Europe, and Australia: their shared aim is to mix social classes by creating housing policies that encourage citizens from different social classes to settle to same neighbourhoods (Arthurson 2012, 2).

In 2000, the objective of social mix was enshrined in the French law, when *Law n° 2000-1208 on Solidarity and Urban Renewal* (SRU Law) gained legal force. The purpose of the law was to decrease segregation and strengthen solidarity by rising the amount of social housing to 20 percent by 2020. The other part of social mix legislation appeared soon after in 2003, when “the Borloo law”, *Law n° 2003-710 on Town planning and urban renewal*, gained legal power. This second piece of legislation has led the urban renewal of the problematic banlieues.

The two laws, which form the legal frame of the French social mix policy, work in two ways. The SRU aims to provide new social housing units in the more affluent municipalities, and thus disperse the social housing stock. With this striven development, the residents of the disadvantaged neighbourhoods would have more opportunities regarding their place of residence. On the other hand, the Borloo Law seeks to renew the most disadvantaged neighbourhoods, and diversify the social composition of these disadvantaged areas by introducing middle classes to the renewed banlieues. On January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023, the French government made the 20% objective of social housing permanent and thus extended the use of social mix as a segregation reduction policy. The policy has now been practiced in France for over 20 years, and it is going to be used until the objective is fulfilled.

At the same time, the social problems and disadvantage have proven to be difficult to eradicate: during the 21<sup>st</sup> century, segregation, inequality and homelessness have increased in France (Insee 2015; Statista 2022; McAvay & Verdugo 2021). In addition, McAvay (2018) has found clues of intergenerational disadvantage in the banlieues. The difficulties of suburbs appear to have been persistent also in other countries of Europe, Australia, and the United States, and the effectiveness of social mix

policies has thus been questioned in recent studies. (Arthurson 2012; Kintrea 2013; Scanlon, Whitehead & Fernànded Arrigoitia 2014; Watt 2017.) Parallely, researchers have hoped for more comprehensive and consensual assessments of social mix policies in France and in general (Kintrea 2013; Levy-Vroélant, Schaefer and Tutin 2014).

Over the past decades, scientific world has experienced an information overload: the increased number of published studies available requires greater work from researchers, policymakers, and administration in scoping the information, getting a comprehensive understanding of the subjects, and choosing the most relevant studies to support decision-making. (Booth, Sutton & Papaioannou 2016, 13; Heyvaert, Hannes & Onghena 2017, 2; Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 7.) In this context, systematic literature review has gained foothold in social sciences: the methodology aims at producing transparent and reliable summaries of the studies made on a specific topic. In the field of social and public policy, the methodology is often used to support evidence-based practice in policy-making. (Sundberg 2017, 100-101.)

To my knowledge, there exists no systematic reviews of the social housing dispersion policy of France. As researchers have hoped for more comprehensive assessments on social mix policy, I decided to conduct a systematic literature review on the impacts of the SRU Law. The research material includes all peer-reviewed articles that concern the impacts of article 55 of the SRU Law and their findings are summarized with narrative synthesis. Critical appraisal is conducted with the latest Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool from year 2018.

The research questions of this thesis are:

1. What are the impacts of article 55 of the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal in France?
2. What could explain the impacts of article 55 of the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal?
3. Is there something that stays unexplored or needs further investigation?

Answering the first question summarizes the impacts found in research literature and the second question further deepens the understanding on the impacts. Lastly, the third question is supposed to provide reflection on whether the picture provided by the studied articles is comprehensive. With this approach, I summarize the workings of the SRU Law found in good-quality academic research.

This thesis is structured as follows. In the next chapters, I introduce the concept of urban segregation and social mix policies. These chapters handle the scientific approaches to these themes along with the context of the phenomena and policy in France. The SRU Law is defined more precisely under chapter 3. In the fourth chapter, I move to the implementation of this study: I introduce the methodology of systematic



literature review, data, narrative synthesis as an analytical method and lastly reflect on study's ethical questions. The fifth chapter, synthesis, summarizes the findings narratively. In the concluding chapter, I combine the findings and discuss them in a wider context.

## 2 URBAN SEGREGATION

Urban segregation is a key concept in the study of division in cities. In this chapter, I first introduce the development of the concept, review possible scientific approaches to it and the connection of the phenomenon on social problems. Then, I move on to the background and current context of urban segregation in France. The aim of this chapter is to give historical background to the phenomenon and introduce the possible conceptual and theoretical approaches to it.

### 2.1 The concept of urban segregation

The concept of urban segregation has been used for a long time in the field of urban studies: the outset for the developing urban studies was created during 1915-1935 in Chicago school of urban sociology and criminology. At the time, the scientific conception of segregation was built on biological models, which can also be seen in the name of their theoretical framework, *human ecology*. The original Chicago School of thought thus believed in an “organic segregation”, according to which segregation happens naturally in human population. In the analysis of these “natural” developments, called the *equilibrium approach*, researchers used the concepts of invasion, dominance, and succession. (Arbaci 2019, 21; Bailey 2020, 367-368; Musterd 2020, 412; Stébé & Marchal 2019, 71-77.)

With growing economy, industrialization, and capitalism during the following decades, the concept of urban segregation was filled with new meanings that derived from the North American economic schools. These perspectives have been seen to constitute North American school of thought, which, according to Arbaci (2019), has later been very influential. The researchers of this school formed their framework mostly based on the *choice and constraints perspective*, which relied on such normative values as individual responsibility. Regarding segregation, the school suggested that

the ethnic segregation of the United States was caused by unfulfilled individual's responsibilities and "culture of poverty". (Arbaci 2019, 23; Bailey 2020, 367; Lin & Mele 2013, 182; Musterd 2020, 3-4; Waquant & Wilson 2013, 184)

In the 1980's, the previously mentioned approaches got more progressive theoretical companion developed in William Julius Wilson's, Douglas Massey's, and Nancy Denton's works. Stemming from the legacy of critical social sciences, they started the studies on the connection of inequality and ethnic segregation. According to Wilson, segregated areas in urban space created social problems in 1980s U.S. (Kaufman 1998, 53-55; Lin & Mele 2013, 182-183; Musterd & Ostendorf 1998, 5.) Similarly, Massey and Denton saw that the structural changes in economy contributed to urban segregation, which, according to them, created underclasses. (Lin & Mele 2013, 192-193; Kaufman 1998, 55; Musterd & Ostendorf 1998, 1 ja 5.)

As a collective noteworthy finding, Wilson, Massey, and Denton noted urban policies as a new part of the multifaced phenomenon of ethnic discrimination in the United States. On a larger scale, their work has been connected to the post-Fordist *macro-development perspective*, which enabled the critical understanding on political and economic structures and their influence on cities, housing, and migration on a global scale. Along their studies, researchers developed *dual city theory*, *hyper ghetto theory*, *underclass theory* and *neighborhood effect thesis* based on findings from North American cities. (Arbaci 2019, 23; Préceteille & Cardoso 2020, 270.) From this theoretical trend, the neighbourhood effects thesis appears to be especially influential: it forms the basis for segregation reduction policy called social mix policy, used in many European countries. According to the thesis, the concentration of poor households in certain areas produces disadvantageous social effects. (Arthurson 2012, 52-54; Kintrea 2013, 134-139.)

Chicago was not of course the only city, nor North America the only continent, in which urban segregation was studied, but it appears historically influential in this field of study (Arbaci 2019, 6). The fact that American studies have become selected and are still selected as a major source on urban studies might have depended on the long and visible reality of dividedness and racism on the continent, and, elsewhere, on the varying nature of European states and city structures. As a whole, the studies regarding United States seems to have had some influence on all the formerly mentioned theoretical perspectives: the studies have concentrated especially on ethnic segregation.

Notwithstanding, after the 1990s, there has occurred a new line of European *contextual divergence perspectives* (Arbaci 2019, 24). These approaches have contributed to a recent theoretical trend line, in which the paradigm seen in the previous segregation studies has changed. Since the number of studies increased in Europe, there appeared an emerging amount of more diverse and critical research focusing on societal structures and *socioeconomic segregation* besides ethnic segregation: this has been seen to be

more suitable a measurement for some European contexts. (Arbaci 2019, 24.) According to Musterd (1998, 2), the perspective got its wind out of increasing socio-economic polarization, that has walked hand in hand with economic renewal processes, globalization, and digitalization.

Musterd (2020, xv) sees that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the amount of knowledge in urban segregation has risen in general and the perspectives gathered from around the globe have brought up new approaches, that focus on the connection of ethnic and socio-economic segregation. This perspective, which is currently under research, rises from the recently noted correlation between the two phenomena (Musterd 2020, xv). What is also defining for the 21<sup>st</sup> century European studies, is that the concept of urban segregation is often used as a synonym for spatial inequality (Maloutas 2020, 325). Stébé and Marchal (2019, 152-153) see in addition, that the concept has today a strong normative connection: one could choose to use the words division or separation, polarization, or fragmentation, but the concept seems to hold in the normative history of decreasing inequality.

On a practical level, the most studied perspective on the phenomenon is *residential segregation*. However, in the current century, the approaches on urban segregation have expanded also to *demographic, class, and vertical segregation* and to *segregation that occurs in public space, workplace, transport, and education*. (Bailey 2020, 367; Prêteceille & Cardoso 2020, 271.) In today's Europe, the problem of urban segregation found in the studies is that residential segregation correlates with the segregation of other domains: those who stay in the most segregated neighbourhoods live their lives within a very homogenous group, which is, in parallel, segregated demographically, class-wise, vertically and in public space, workplaces and education (Musterd 2020, 15).

Lately, researchers have opened a discussion on countries with liberal welfare regimes that have higher segregation numbers: these phenomena have been connected to neoliberal policies, which are more market-driven, enable bigger income gaps and, at the same time, pay less attention on economic inequalities (Arbaci 2019, 313; Kovács 2020, 130; Musterd 2020, 412; Prêteceille & Cardoso 2020, 270; Randolph 2020, 94; Van Rooyen & Lemanski 2020, 29-31). Some researchers also consider the urban renewal programs to contain a specific risk of working as an instrument of exclusion in cities. (Musterd & Ostendorf 1998, 1; Lin & Mele 2013, 391).

In its entirety, the challenging policy questions make urban segregation an interesting subject for social and public policy: the phenomena are closely tied with social equality, discrimination, cohesion and polarization, poverty, violence, migration, and public policies. In public policy, there is also a normative approach to these questions – the science is there to improve well-being and societal cohesion through critical studies that hope to engage in creating change in societies.

## 2.2 Urban segregation in France

In France, segregation studies have been especially interested in social housing estates, i.e. public housing in the outskirts of cities, that was built after World War II to offer affordable rental apartments for working class. In France, the social housing estates are often referred to as *grands ensembles*. These places of segregation were noticed already in the 1950s by Henry Chombart de Lauwe, who brought the Chicago school approach to France (Stébé & Marchal 2019, 93). Unfortunately, during the processes of deindustrialization in the second half of 20<sup>th</sup> century, these suburbs have turned into places of concentrated poverty and social problems. Nowadays, the suburbs are often homes of non-European immigrants, who suffer from poverty and exclusion. France is not alone with this trend: these kinds of problems of social housing estates are recognized in many countries in the European Union. (Hess, Tammaru & van Ham 2018, 3 and 7; Deboulet & Abram 2017, 143.)

Today's concerns regarding segregation in France focus on *city policy neighbourhoods*, former sensitive urban zones (*zones urbaines sensibles*) which are located in the post-war social housing estates (Bonneville 2005, 229-230; Carpenter 2018, 29; Escafré-Dublet & Lelévrier 2019, 286). These neighbourhoods have been visible in media due to their violence and riots, but they have often simultaneously been the poorest neighbourhoods in France (Hess, Tammaru & van Hamm 2018, 4; Insee 2015; Mathieu-Fritz 2007, 638 ja 642-643). The social worlds of these banlieues have been described to be isolated: researchers have used the metaphor of an invisible wall that comes across the residents in multiple domains of society - for example in labor market and education. (McAvay & Verdugo 2021, 330-332).

Mirna Safi's quantitative study on the segregation of migrants during the years 1968-1999 showed that immigrants have been concentrated to same areas of eight largest cities (except Lille) in France, and immigrant segregation has increased during 1968-1999. In her article, Safi wondered whether the urban segregation of immigrants was a consequence of discrimination on the French housing market. (Safi 2009, 546-547.) She also observed the fact that second and third generation immigrants are not represented in the French statistics, which hinders from studying their situation on the housing market. (Safi 2009, 547.)

Pan Ké Shon and Verdugo (2014) proceeded from Safi's research by sorting out different immigrant minorities and studying the segregation of these minorities between the years 1968-2007. In their study, Pan Ké Shon and Verdugo observed that there are differences between immigrants: the majority of immigrants has not lived in suburbs, but a minority of non-European immigrants has experienced intense segregation. The article suggests that the segregation seen in France could depend on the low socio-economic status of the non-European migrants, especially North African, Sub-Saharan African, and Turkish migrants. (Pan Ké Shon and Verdugo 2014, 246.)

In the 21<sup>st</sup> century France, immigrants are concentrated to Paris, Lyon, and Marseille. Non-European immigrants face the highest risk of living in the stigmatized social housing estates, which French natives instead appear to avoid. As schools are assigned by the place of residence, the children of non-European immigrants are often concentrated in the most disadvantaged schools. (McAvay 2018, 1511-1512.) McAvay (McAvay 2018, 1534) has also discovered that non-European second-generation immigrants tend to stay in their neighbourhoods and the neighbourhood environments are partially inherited.

In the metropolis of Paris, wealth has concentrated to the prosperous city centre: the residents of inner western Paris are among the wealthiest of the country. The most disadvantaged areas are instead in the outskirts of Paris metropolis: for example, in the suburbs of Seine-Saint-Denis and Val-De-Marne, that are the among the poorest neighbourhoods of France. (White 1998, 151, Préceteille 2006, 73.) The trend of Paris which is a home for 12 million inhabitants is that segregation has increased during the last three decades. (McAvay and Verdugo 2021, 342-343). In Paris, the upper classes and the blue-collar class are the most segregated: the difference between the segregated classes is their possibility to widen their life circles (Atkinson & Kei Ho 2020, 302; Le Roux, Vallée & Commenges 2016, 140-141; Marques & Franca 2020, 51; Préceteille & Cardoso 2020, 283).

The most recent analysis of the French National Institute of Statistics and Economic Studies on socioeconomic segregation focuses on the year 2019. The analysis uses Theil index to measure the socioeconomical inequalities in space: it measures the distance from a situation in which everyone would have the same income - the more the number is close to 1, the higher the income segregation. The analysis shows that from the biggest French cities, segregation was highest in Lille (0,129-0,142), Marseille (0,129-0,142), Paris (0,118-0,129), Lyon (0,118-0,129), Bordeaux (0,118-0,129) and Toulouse (0,118-0,129) (Gerardin & Pramil 2023, 1.) For comparison, the corresponding number for the United States in the same year was 0,404 (Semega, Kollar, Shrider & Creamer 2020). Location-wise, Gerarding and Pramil (2023, 3) observed that segregation remained highest in suburbs, especially in Paris.

In 2021, there were 7 million immigrants in France, which represents 10,3 % of population. From the 7 million immigrants 47,5 % were born in Africa, most often in Algeria and Morocco: former colonies of France. (Insee 2022.) Thus, the number of non-European immigrants who face a higher risk of unequal segregation is relatively high. Notwithstanding, ethnic segregation could not be measured, because France still forbids the gathering of any data on ethnicity.

As the whole, it appears that in France, some non-European immigrants are the ones to suffer from urban segregation. The disadvantaged position seems to be tied to specific districts of post-war social housing estates, which hold in isolated suburban worlds within the French society. During the 30-year attempt to decrease segregation, segregation has intensified at least in Paris and the number of homeless people in

France has grown from 93 000 to 300 000 (Insee 2015, Statista 2022). This development has led to a point in which the banlieues are described as a symbol of migration policy failure in France (McAvay & Verdugo 2021, 329; Moran 2017, 317).

To summarize these chapters, urban segregation is a key concept when studying the division of cities. Nowadays, as in this thesis as well, urban segregation is associated specifically to the unequal aspects of division: situations where the social disadvantage is concentrated to specific areas, where the residents have to live involuntarily. In the past decades, the concerns of segregation studies have often been the concentration of non-European migrants to large social housing estates, which is also the situation of France. With a relatively high number of non-European migrants and visible malaise seen in the suburban riots, the situation of France appears concerning – especially from the perspective of the suffering and exclusion experienced in these suburbs.

It is from this perspective, that I hope to be able to summarize the workings of one French anti-segregation policy, social housing dispersion required in article 55 of law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal. As hoped in recent literature on urban segregation, the phenomenon is studied here from a mixed-methods perspective. As a study of social and public policy and urban segregation, the thesis has also a normative connection to the purpose of decreasing inequality through policy evaluation.

### **3 SOCIAL MIX POLICIES**

Social mix policies are city policies often offered as an answer to the problems of urban segregation. In this chapter, I first introduce the definition and history of social mix policies. Chapter 3.2 covers the policy of social mixing in the context of France. Lastly, I describe the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal, which is a French social mix policy and the objective of this thesis. The purpose of this chapter is to provide an understanding of the policy that is under research in this thesis.

#### **3.1 What are social mix policies?**

Social mix policies are a city policy category which is built on the idea that socioeconomically mixed neighbourhoods decrease segregation. The intention of social mix policies has been to create more inclusive neighbourhoods, from which the disadvantaged parts of population would benefit. These benefits are claimed to be increased social interaction between different social groups, wider networks in terms of employment, new neighbours that work as role models and create social control, decrease of the stigmatization, and a caring community that encourages in positive change (Kintrea 2013, 137). In an ideal social mix, the social housing renters, homeowners, private renters, middle-income and low-income residents would be in balance in the housing market. (Arthurson 2012, 2.)

Currently, the questions of social mix have been widely attached to the neighbourhoods of social housing estates, to which social problems seem to have located in many of the Western societies and Australia (Arthurson 2012, 11-12; Kintrea 2013, 141-142). In the 21<sup>st</sup> century, there has been an overrepresentation of migrants in these housing estates - which, according to Scanlon, Whitehead and Fernáded Arrigoitia (2014, 16), depends on migrant's low socioeconomic position. This general trend has raised concerns in France as well, as described in the previous chapter.



Kathy Arthurson has discussed social mix policies extensively in her book *Social Mix and the City* (2012). According to her the interest in social mix has an extensive history, and the concept of social mix is thus multi-layered (Arthurson 2012, 11). She suggests that the utopia of social mix was alive already in mid 19<sup>th</sup> century United Kingdom: back then, the aim was to bring the social classes, which were separated by industrial capitalism, together. The second remarkable wave of social mixing took place instead in the repercussions of World War II – this time along the hope of increasing equality and social justice. (Arthurson 2012, 11.) The most current change happened in the beginning of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, when social mix gained popularity as a segregation reduction policy (Kintrea 2013, 39).

Modern social mix policies often lean on the *neighbourhood effect thesis*, that was introduced in Chapter 2.1. According to this theoretical approach created in the 1990s Chicago, the concentration of disadvantaged households to certain areas produces social problems and might start a negative cycle of neighbourhood. By this, the researchers meant the social isolation and the accumulation of social problems and disadvantage, such as poverty, health issues, unemployment, addictions, violence, and the effects of these social challenges on children. Neighbourhood effect thesis became widely utilized in European research concerning social housing estates, since they worked as a common divider of poverty, exclusion and crime in Europe and United States. This theoretical approach has, however, been questioned and criticized: many see, that the existence of neighbourhood effects has not been proven strongly enough. Despite of this critique, social mix has been and still is a widely used policy. (Arthurson 2012, 52–54, Kintrea 2013, 134–139; Watt 2017, 3–4.)

The objective of social mix has often been implemented by creating social housing estates. This form of housing was built especially in Northern Europe, United States and Australia after the second World War, and it was connected to post-war utopias and optimism: in Sweden, as well as in the United Kingdom, social housing was promoted as an example of working welfare capitalism (Hess, Tammaru & van Ham 2018, 7; Watt 2017, 2 and 12). According to Watt (2017, 1–2), the social housing estates were, at the time of their building, renewal projects, that were often meant to decrease the number of slums with modernist housing blocks. He mentions Netherlands, Austria, Denmark, France, United Kingdom, and West Germany as the “heartlands” of social housing due to their extensive industrial sectors and large number of industrial workers who needed affordable homes. (Watt 2017, 1–2.)

The above-mentioned European countries varied on the locations of social housing: whereas in London and Amsterdam the estates were built to inner city, in Glasgow, Edinburgh, Paris, Copenhagen, Cologne and Dusseldorf social housing was built on the suburban periphery of the cities. Nevertheless, what connected these countries, was that the social housing was meant for the working class as well as the most vulnerable. The European type of social housing has later been called the mass

form of social housing and these countries' social housing estates are often monotenure: state-owned or held up by voluntary sector associations. (Watt 2017, 1-2.)

Many academics, as well as media and politicians, saw the estates as problematic already in the early stages of social housing estate projects. The criticism focused often on the concrete tower and slab -model of estates: the areas soon became places of concentrated " - - poverty, misery and lawlessness", in both Europe and United States. In London and Paris, the problems have become visible through series of riots. (Watt 2017, 3-4).

The United States, Canada and Australia trusted, on the other hand, in a residual form of social housing: the housing estates were meant explicitly to the vulnerable parts of the population, and the amount of the estates was much lower. Regardless, research literature shows, that the residual model, paradoxically, led to stronger polarization in cities and the estates became even faster stigmatized with large numbers of poverty and crime. What was again defining for the problems of the United States was the inequality between ethnic groups: the lack of equality became visible also in the social housing estates, which were homes for the most vulnerable. Watt (2017, 3) sees that in the context of the United States, the social housing estates paradoxically created a second ghetto to Chicago. (Watt 2017, 2-3.)

As soon as the problems of the social housing estates were noticed, there started a wave of demolition of social housing estates in the United States, Australia, and Western Europe. The phenomena have been called "*the new urban renewal*", and again, the renewal includes the same social mix objective to prevent such concentration. After the demolition, the areas are often re-built to include mixed-tenure housing for different socioeconomic groups. (Watt 2017, 6.)

However, Watt raises questions on whether this new urban renewal actually decreases the concentration of inequality, promotes social mix and spatial justice, since the previous renewal that was made in the name of social mix led to more intense segregation. These matters are, according to Watt (2017, 7-8) intensely debated in current scientific and political discussions: others believe in urban renewal and social mix policies, while others - critical urbanists - see it as a neoliberal city policy, which leads to the displacement and exclusion of the poorest. According to Watt (2017, 9), there is skepticism especially within the academic circles towards the impacts of social housing renewal and social mixing.

The impacts of social mix policies have been researched through certain study designs, which have often aimed to inform policy makers. The research questions frequently ask, whether social mix improves the resident's social wellbeing, education, employment, or health - in other words, the social problems, that segregation brings together. In the United States, the impacts have been measured with random controlled trials: the studies have discussed the experiences of two experimental groups of African American and Hispanic people, others living in more mixed neighbour-

hoods and others living in disadvantaged neighbourhoods that often are those of public housing. (Arthurson 2012, 13-15.) Another common way of studying the impacts of social mix is studying secondary data quantitatively. For example, Massey and Kanaiaupuni found out in 1993, that the social mix policy increased the concentration of poverty. Evaluations of the policy from the U.S. and Netherlands have observed that the policy of social mixing has not led to the expected benefits for the poor. However, there appears to be rather little amount of long-term policy evaluation research on this matter. (Kintrea 2013, 149)

Arthurson (2012, 14) criticizes the previous research: according to her, these studies do not consider “- - political, social, historical and personal issues attached to the experiences of racial segregation and lack of social mix and how these situations arise.” However, more recent studies seem to have focused more on the fieldwork, which has increased the number of case studies, qualitative studies and comparing studies that give more multifaced information. Yet, the need for more diverse studies on different contexts has been highlighted. (Arthurson 2012, 13-14.)

Lastly, Arthurson underlines, that the history of social mix policy research is frequently neglected, and the policy is often framed as a new way of solving the difficulties of segregation. According to several literature reviews, social mix does not lead to the anticipated social outcomes and there is no evidence, that social mix would impact the employment of the disadvantaged. (Arthurson 2012, 61-62.) The policy category has also been criticized to bypass the underlying social problems of poverty and inequality (Arthurson 2012, 75; Watt 2017, 9).

### 3.2 Social mix policies in France

As described in the previous chapter, current European concerns on segregation are related to the concentration of non-European migrants to post-war social housing estates. In Europe, the segregation of these housing estates is found to be highest in large cities, such as Munich, London and Paris. When it comes to the anti-segregation policies, the United Kingdom, Netherlands and France have trusted in the neighbourhood effect thesis as a premise for their housing policy, which aims for social mix. (Watt 2017, 6).

Social mix has been France’s policy response to segregation since the 1980s and, as in general, the French social mix policy is tied to social housing. Therefore, the form of housing navigates the location of social classes in French cities. The French public housing is called HML (*Habitation à loyer modéré*) and approximately 70 % of the population are entitled to it. It has been connected to *ghettoization* that was discussed in Wacquant’s (2006) Lapeyronnie’s (2008) and Rey’s (2017) works. (Lévy-Vroelant, Schaefer and Tutin 2014, 123.)

The French government has created a few laws to strengthen social mix in the frame of City Politics (*Politique de la Ville*) (Deboulet & Abram 2017, 146). The first of them was the *Loi n° 90-449 à la mise en œuvre du droit au logement* (1990), which required the departments to make a plan for the housing of the disadvantaged. It was followed by *Loi n° 91-662 d'Orientation pour la Ville* (1991) that guided the municipalities to build more social housing. However, by the time, there were no sanctions if the 20 % quota was not achieved. In 1998, *Loi n° 98-657 relative à la Lutte contre les Exclusions* aimed to decrease exclusion and give access to fundamental rights. (CNLE 2008; Vie publique 1991.)

A major step was taken in 2000, when the *loi n° 2000-1208 relative à la Solidarité et renouvellement urbain*, the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal (SRU Law) came into force under the leftist government of Lionel Jospin. This law made it mandatory for the municipalities to increase their amount of social housing to 20 % or 25 %, with a threat of penalties (Ministère de la Transition écologique et de la Cohésion des territoires 2021). The law was followed by *Loi n° 2003-710 d'Orientation et de Programmation pour la Ville et la Renovation Urbaine* (Borloo law, 2003), that created a National Urban Renewal Programme (PNRU), which focused on the renewal of the ZUS-areas (*zones urbaines sensibles*). The latter was legislated by right-wing government of Jean-Pierre Raffarin.

These two laws, SRU Law and Borloo Law, form the legal frame of French social mix policy, which works in two ways. Firstly, the SRU Law aims at dispersion of the vulnerable from post-war social housing estates to wealthier municipalities: this should be guaranteed by the new social housing units required by the law. Secondly, Borloo Law urges at the renewal of old, post-war social housing estates: the renewing and rebuilding of disadvantaged neighbourhoods are favoured with the intention of increasing social mix by introducing middle classes to these neighbourhoods.

### **3.3 The law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal**

As described above, social mixing has been taken to the policy agenda already in the 1980s, and the French governments have tried to find a working model of social mix legislation in the framework of *politique de la ville*. In 1999, under the government of Lionel Jospin, the legal response to these questions was realized, as the government prepared *law n° 2000-1208 on Solidarity and Urban Renewal* (2000, SRU Law). The article 55 that reforms social mixing in France appears to have gained a lot of attention and become an objective of debates and critique in the French society.

Law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal is a law that promotes social mix housing policy with concrete demands for municipalities. As in social mix housing policies in general, the intention of the SRU Law is also to decrease segregation by mixing social

classes in French cities. The social mix component of the law is written in the article 55, which specifies that every municipality that has over 1500 residents in the Paris metropolitan area of Île-de-France must increase the amount of public housing to 20 % until 2022. Outside Île-de-France, the 20 % goal is the same, but the number of residents in the municipality is 3500. The set quota of social housing is mandatory, but the implementation and locations of social housing are in the hands of municipalities. (Lévy-Vroelant, Schaefer & Tutin 2014, 126-127; Ministère de la Transition écologique et de la Cohésion des territoires 2021.)

In 2014, *Loi n° 2014-366 pour l'accès au logement et un urbanisme rénové* (ALUR Law) strengthened the objective of SRU to require 25 % of social housing by 2025 and enabled bigger sanctions. Again, on January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2023, a new Law called 3D (*Loi n° 2022-217 relative à la différenciation, la décentralization, la déconcentration et portant diverses mesures de simplification de l'action public locale*) made the Objective of SRU Law permanent: the law will be legally valid until the targeted municipalities have fulfilled the goal of 20% social housing. (Deffontaines 2022.)

To summarize this chapter, social mix policies are a widely used city policy aimed at decreasing urban segregation. The measures of the policy are often tied to social housing estates and urban renewal, and the policy is often represented as a new solution to segregation related problems. However, social mix policies have a rather extensive history, and researchers have questioned their effectivity based on the results of former policies. The French state-led social mix policy works through social housing dispersion and urban renewal of old social housing estates. The article 55 of the SRU Law covers the dispersion policy, and thus targets the wealthier municipalities.

After 22 years of influencing France, the objective of the SRU law was made permanent. Hence, I consider the evaluation of this policy topical. With the systematic approach of this thesis, I aspire to respond to researchers' hopes of more comprehensive long-term policy evaluation of social mix policies. The next chapter introduces the methodology and material through which the impacts of SRU law are studied in this thesis.

## **4 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STUDY**

In this chapter, I describe the methodology, research material and analysis of this thesis. The methodology of systematic literature review is introduced firstly. After a general description of the method, I describe how I have gathered the research material, define what kind of studies form it and how the critical appraisal is conducted. Then I define the approach of this thesis, a mixed-methods systematic review with narrative synthesis. Lastly, I reflect on the ethical questions related to this thesis. I have chosen this structure, because the systematic collection of data is easier to follow after a general description of the methodology. Moreover, the description of the analysis requires understanding of the research material.

### **4.1 Methodology of systematic literature review**

Systematic literature review is a methodology that aims to summon and appraise all relevant academic studies made on a specific topic (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 9). The method has history in the field of health sciences, where the research material has often consisted of quantitative studies, the approach has been realist, and the studies have been categorized using a model called hierarchy of evidence. In this context, the reviews have been called one-method reviews, and they have focused on comparing randomized controlled trials (Heyvaert, Hannes & Onghena 2017, 3). However, as the information overload has reached the field of social sciences in the preceding decades, the use of systematic reviews has increased on the field of social sciences as well. Along the shift to social sciences reviews, approaches have also moved towards more multidimensional study designs, mixed-methods, and qualitative synthesis. In social and public policy, the method has today a leading role in policy evaluation research. (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 7, 57-58; Sundberg 2017, 100-101.)

Regardless of the field of study, systematic reviews' most important aims are to summarize and systematize science and bring up possible challenges, incoherencies, research gaps and strengths in the studies that are under research. Systematic review has also been seen as an explicit, transparent, standardized, renewable and objective method. According to Booth, Sutton & Papaioannou (2016, 20) and Fink (2020, 6) these factors separate systematic review from other systematic approaches in literature reviews.

Systematic review differs concretely from other forms of literature reviews firstly in the selection of research material. The objectivity and transparency at this phase are built upon a carefully described and conducted searches in all relevant databases. The aim is that the review would cover all relevant studies that answer the research questions, and thus give a comprehensive understanding of the research made. (Booth, Sutton & Papaioannou 2016, 120; Fink 2020, 28-29.) This character could be compared to survey research, in which the researcher tries to avoid research errors with a specific method of data collection. (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 10). Handbooks recommend cooperation with information specialist when defining the search terms: finding correct terms, confirming that one uses the right Boolean operators (AND, OR, NOT) and selects relevant databases is an important factor for the scope of the study, which should be as comprehensive as possible (Booth, Sutton & Papaioannou 2016, 116-123; Fink 2020, 6-7; Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 81-85). For transparency and renewability of the study, the process of collecting research material should be described carefully.

After the search terms have been chosen, there are other restrictions to be made: it is important to define what kind of studies are included and excluded (Booth, Sutton & Papaioannou 2016, 119; Fink 2020, 50). These choices depend on the research questions, field of study and on the type of systematic review. Some researchers for example limit their material to "best evidence" of impact assessment and thus include only randomized controlled trials whereas others focus on differently studied topics and use a wider methodological scope.

The third feature regarding the research material is the critical appraisal. After the searches are made and studies have been chosen according to inclusion and exclusion criteria, the research material must be critically appraised (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 125). Critical appraisal is often made using field-specific checklist or scale, that are applied to each study (Fink 2020, 166; Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 128). This phase is supposed to help both the researcher and the reader to recognize the quality of studies made and enable the comparison of the studies. Thus, the critical appraisal should carefully described: as the reader can verify what checklist is used and how the author has answered the questions, it is easier to get an understanding of the quality of the research material as well as notice possible mistakes that the author might have done.

The function on critical appraisal in a mixed methods systematic review is to find out, whether there is a bias that could be large enough to affect the reliability of the findings (Petticrew & Roberts 128; Sundberg 2017, 116). Petticrew and Roberts (2006,

128-129) note that in the field of social sciences, it is not purposeful to use too clinical checklists, for example from health sciences clinical interventions – with this kind of criteria, the criticism might be inappropriate regarding the field of study. Thus, they recommend using appraisal tools that help in evaluating whether the study is fit for its purpose (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 131).

What is also defining for systematic review, is the synthesis. The types of synthesis variate depending firstly on the methodologies of research material and secondly on researcher's preference and resources. A *meta-analysis* is possible when working with quantitative material: this approach holds in a statistical summary of the findings and offers new, summarized statistical information of the studied topic. On the contrary, with an all-qualitative research material, the approach chosen is often a *meta-synthesis*. However, if the material contains both quantitative and qualitative studies, the researcher has the possibility to conduct a *narrative synthesis*, or both narrative synthesis and meta-analysis. (Fink 2020, 205-212; Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 164; Sundberg 2017 111).

In social sciences, systematic review is often categorized to be a mixed-methods approach, because the method enables studying a variety of qualitative and quantitative studies. (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 58, 71). Compared to the widely used model of health sciences systematic review, the social sciences approach seems more permissive: it highlights the importance of both qualitative and quantitative research and is more interested in the adequacy of research material's methods in relation to research question. Paradigm wise this approach seems a little more critical – especially when it comes to ontology.

In social and public policy, systematic reviews have also been seen as an answer to the trend of evidence-based practice: the reviews can work as a summary for both researchers and policymakers and address policy impacts that might have been ignored in the administration. Reviews are seen to produce reliable summaries, because they synthesize all the high-quality studies on the topic, appraise their study quality transparently and would thus have a lower risk of bias in the findings (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 11; Sundberg 2017, 102).

The development of the methodology as a tool of policy evaluation appears to have happened fast. In 2006, Petticrew and Roberts (2006, xiii) wrote that social scientists were particularly interested in the possibilities of policy impact evaluation offered by systematic reviews. Ten years later in 2016, Booth, Sutton and Papaioannou saw, that systematic reviews already had a strong foothold on the evaluation of policies, and in 2017 Sundberg described it as the main method of policy evaluation. (Booth, Sutton & Papaioannou 2016, 11-12; Heyvaert, Hannes & Onghena 2017, 2; Sundberg 2017, 100.)

Heyvaert, Hannes ja Onghena (2017, 3) see, that this recent, mixed methods approach of systematic reviews enables answering more multidimensional research



questions: alongside the quantitative impacts of a policy, the review can cover the impacts on multiple levels of society. Petticrew and Roberts (2006, 2) and Sundberg (2017, 105) see as well, that a cross-disciplinary systematic review can be very useful, when there is only a little amount of research on the topic.

However, there is critique and concerns towards the method as well. Firstly, the limitation of studies based on hierarchy of evidence has been seen as problematic model when transferred to policy evaluation (Sundberg 2017, 102). The hierarchy of evidence is a model, that has been used in the field of health sciences to evaluate the quality of research. It represents systematic meta-analysis and randomized controlled trials as the highest quality research due to their internal validity and has often led to the exclusion of other methodologies in systematic reviews (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 58; Sundberg 2017, 103).

This has to do with the nature of health sciences: the studied phenomena have been different, and it has been possible to evaluate the quality of quantitative studies for example in studies where a medicine is tested within randomized groups. However, researchers have brought out concerns regarding the use of this model in social sciences research: the phenomena of social world are more complex, and the exclusion of certain methodologies does not guarantee the quality, but rather limits the possible approaches and findings on the matter. In social policy decision making, the use of hierarchy of evidence could, at worst, lead to a narrow view that does not consider most of the good-quality research of social sciences. (Sundberg 2017, 103)

Secondly, the requirement of replicability posed to systematic reviews has received critique. Some see that the transparent description of the research process does not diminish the possible misinterpretation by the researcher (Sundberg 2017, 102). This is an important note for the readers of systematic reviews: although the steps are clearly described, the author is still a human. Thus, the risk of human errors such as confirmation bias is always possible.

Social sciences systematic review handbooks propose more divergent approaches regarding research material (Petticrew & Roberts 2006; Sundberg 2017). Simultaneously, researchers have asked for more multidimensional studies on segregation (Arbaci 2019) and more comprehensive studies of social mix policy evaluation (Arthurson 2012; Kintrea 2013). From its small part, this thesis tries to answer these hopes with a mixed-methods systematic review that covers all the peer-reviewed studies that handle the impacts of article 55 of the SRU Law.

The approach of this thesis is paradigm-mixing: I see that there is some kind of truth that can be achieved with the systematic review, but as I work critically with social phenomena, qualitative approaches and operationalizations, the constructionist paradigm affects my thinking as well. I consider this a suitable combination for mixed-methods social policy approach, in which one must evaluate both quantitative and qualitative studies, but simultaneously produce a summary on the workings of the policy.

Lastly, the most important factor in a reliable systematic review of social sciences seems to be the reflection on one's own objectivity and transparency in the choices and interpretations: there are various places in systematic review, where the researcher might mistake to lead the work towards his own premises (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 5). As the social world is full of meanings that affect those who produce research and those who interpret it, the risk of confirmation bias is always possible. Notwithstanding, I would not consider the systematic reviews of social sciences unreliable: there is rather a greater need for self-reflection, precision with interpretations and openness due to the nature of social sciences research. Thus, I have tried to clarify my approach as precisely as I can, describe the analytic process and choices carefully and reflect transparently on the limitations of this approach.

## 4.2 Research material

In this chapter, I first describe how the research material was gathered and introduce its composition. Then I present the Mixed Methods appraisal tool (2018), that is later used for critical appraisal of the material. The research material of this study was gathered following the general rules of systematic review: search terms have been developed based on the research questions and an information specialist from University of Jyväskylä was consulted. The searches have then been carried out in the following databases: JYKDOK, ProQuest Applied Social Sciences Index & Abstracts, ProQuest Sociological Abstracts, JSTOR, Sciences Po Library and Cairn Library. The findings were then sorted to possible and excluded articles, from which the possibly suitable were read carefully with the inclusion criteria in mind. Finally, 13 articles matched the requirements and were critically appraised using the latest Mixed method appraisal tool (2018).

The process of this thesis started in Spring 2022, when I made a protocol for this thesis. At the same time, I started to formulate the search terms for databases based on my research questions. With the intention to find articles that would handle the impacts of law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal, first defined the search terms as follows:

French: "*Loi solidarité et renouvellement urbain*" OR "*Loi SRU*" AND "*évaluation*" OR "*impact\**" OR "*effet\**".

English: "*Solidarity and Urban Renewal Act*" OR "*SRU Law*" AND "*evaluation*" OR "*impact\**" OR "*effect\**".

With this search conducted in the databases of JYKDOK, ProQuest, JSTOR, Sciences Po Library and Cairn Library, I found 20 preliminary potential articles, that I would read more carefully to determine, whether they are suitable. After these preliminary searches, I met with the information specialist of social sciences and philosophy to make sure that I am using relevant search terms before starting the official searches. During the meeting I found out that all the articles were also discovered with the name of the law and the search phrases would not have to be so complicated. Thus, the final search terms are the name of the law and the abbreviation of the law in French and in English:

*“Solidarité et renouvellement urbain”*

*“Loi SRU”*

*“Solidarity and Urban Renewal”*

*“SRU Law”*

When these search terms were chosen, I defined the requirements for the studies. I was interested in the overall picture that the studies concerning the impacts of article 55 of SRU Law propose. Thus, I decided to include methodology-wise multifaceted group of studies, with the intention to get wider view on the impacts and to see whether the methodologies might affect the results of the studies.

Thus, the material is not limited purely to studies that would fulfil the criteria of best impact assessment studies, but more broadly on peer-reviewed studies that aim at increasing understanding on the consequences of the law. This limitation is linked to the quantity of the studies available on this topic and the nature of this policy: it would be very difficult to conduct a randomized controlled trial on the impacts of the SRU Law, and the studies that get closest to explaining causality on this matter are quasi-experimental studies. Moreover, I found the number of studies to be relatively small, and the studies are heterogenous regarding methodologies. In addition, the features regarding quality, suitable time limitation, and availability were important. For each study chosen I used the same criteria, that is as follows:

- the article must examine the impacts of article 55 of the SRU law in France
- the article must have been published after the year 1999
- the article must be peer-reviewed
- the article must be an original study
- the article must be available in English or in French
- the article must be available for free in the used databases

The final searches for this thesis were made in February 2023 to assure that the articles from year 2022 are included. The possibilities to limit the features of the articles depended on the database: the limitation to academic articles and scholarly journals from years 2000-2023 in French or in English was possible in JYKDOK, ProQuest, JSTOR and Sciences Po Library. The peer-reviewed articles could be sorted out in JYKDOK and ProQuest. None of these limitations was, however, possible in Cairn, and there was thus a lot more work going through the results of Cairn library.

In this final search, I found 158 articles from JYKDOK, 2 articles from ProQuest Applied Social Sciences Index & Abstracts, 17 articles from ProQuest Sociological Abstracts, 130 articles from JSTOR, 57 articles from Sciences Po Library and 786 articles in Cairn Library. There were a lot of duplicands within the databases and same articles in different databases. In Cairn Library, there was also a large number of publications that were not available for free and that were not scientific articles. Many of the found articles concerned other parts of the SRU Law that covers policies on transports and ecological transition.

Finally, after going through the databases, I found 20 articles that seemed suitable and which I read more carefully. Five of these handled the workings of Borloo Law, and I thus left them out. Two potential articles did not instead include original data, and they were thus outlined. The final research material consists of the remaining 13 articles that fulfil the inclusion criteria. With this search I hope to have succeeded in finding all available, peer reviewed articles on the impacts of the law from years 2000-2023.

Consequently, the research material might appear as narrow, but it could not be easily modified in this kind of study design. In addition, in Aveyard's handbook of systematic reviews for students the recommended minimum number of articles to include for a master's thesis is 10-20 (Aveyard 2019, 88). Previous master's thesis using similar methodology (Hautala 2019; Jaatinen 2014; Leinonen 2014; Männistö 2017) have a sample size within this range. Thus, I consider the 13 articles form an adequate research material. I view the number of found articles also as one of the findings of this thesis: it seems, that there is not a lot of peer reviewed research on the impacts of the SRU Law.

At first, I pondered whether I could have included the articles that deal with the impacts of the Borloo law as well, since it would have given an overall picture of social mix policy in France; however, as I checked the number of articles made on the impacts of the Borloo law, I quickly noticed that the material would have been too wide for the resources of this thesis. The situation was same regarding reports and articles that were not peer-reviewed. Therefore, I stayed on the planned research material.

The authors, publishing years, names, publication journals, study missions, data, methodologies, and conclusions of the research material are gathered in table 1, which is found in the appendixes. All these studies discuss the impacts of SRU law in a way

or another; however, inside this thematic, there are various approaches. These features are briefly described in the following paragraphs.

Three of the studies (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay, Vermeersch 2011; Desage 2016; Rousseau 2017) are qualitative case studies that are based on interviews with local officials and residents, policy documents, newspaper articles and statistics. These studies approach the impacts of SRU law from the perspective of social effects and actors through the meanings of the policy and its implementation. The fourth qualitative article (Blanc 2010) is an anthropological analysis, which also studies the impacts through meanings and observations on the speeches of politicians, statistical information, and newspapers.

Nine studies use quantitative methods. Three articles study the impacts of the SRU Law descriptively. Two descriptive studies (Doutreligne 2009; Levasseur 2016) focus on the quantity of built units as well as the features of the municipalities that do not follow the law. In addition, Desponds (2010) focused on the valuation and features of the SRU municipalities. One of these descriptive studies includes two small case studies that handle four municipalities targeted by SRU law (Levasseur 2016).

Of the quantitative studies, two (Górczynska 2017; Najib 2020) use multivariate analyses: cluster analysis and multivariate factorial analysis. These studies focus on the relationship of social mix and tenure mix and the development of socio-spatial inequalities in French cities. Korsu (2016) uses a quantitative methodology designed specifically for his article: it contains a parametric hypothesis test, dissimilarity and exposure indexes, micro-impacts evaluation, and reference to a potential comparison. Three of the studies (Beaubrun-Diant & Maury 2022; Gobillon & Vignolles 2016; Maaoui 2021) use quasi-experimental differences-in-differences design, through which they study the causal impacts of the SRU Law on social housing quota, housing tenure, real estate prices and income segregation.

Four of the articles are published in *Housing studies*, one in *International journal of urban and regional research*, one in *Demography*, one in *Économie publique*, one in *Gouvernement & action publique*, one in *Espaces et sociétés*, one in *Après-demain*, one in *Revue économique*, one in *Revue française des affaires sociales*, one in *Population, space and place* and one in *Sociétés contemporaines*.

The critical appraisal of the research material is conducted using a rather new Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (2018) developed by Hong, Pluye, Fàbregues, Bartlett, Boardman, Cargo, Dagenais, Gagnon, Griffiths, Nicolau, O’Cathain, Rousseau and Vedel. The tool is made for mixed-methods systematic reviews, and it covers a set of appraisal questions for qualitative, quantitative randomized controlled trials, quantitative non-randomized, quantitative descriptive and mixed methods studies. For each group, there are five questions that are developed precisely for the methodological category. This checklist and the critical appraisal of research material are found in the tables 2 and 3.

### 4.3 Narrative synthesis

Narrative synthesis is a type of synthesis used in mixed-methods systematic literature reviews when meta-analysis is not possible. It differs from meta-analysis through its narrative structure: the synthesis consists of textual description of the articles, whereas a quantitative meta-analysis would statistically summarize the findings. The idea of the narrative synthesis process is to systematically go through all the research material, quantify the parts that answer the questions, and form a compact, contextualized narrative text on the findings (Petticrew & Roberts 178). The approach I seen to be suitable especially in situations where there is little research available, and the available material is heterogenous. In this chapter, I describe the elements of narrative synthesis, the critiques towards it and the approach of this thesis.

According to Petticrew and Roberts (2006, 170), the process of conducting narrative synthesis consists of three phases: the organization of research material on logical categories, analysing articles withing these categories and synthesizing findings across studies. Popay, Roberts, Sowden, Petticrew, Arai, Rodgers, Britten, Roen & Duffy (2005, 16–19) and Sundberg (2017, 112) propose that the analysis can be done either thematic analysis or content analysis. In this thesis, I have chosen to use the thematic analysis, because it appears to be a widely used and clearly guided method to the analysis (Silvasti 2014, 44–45). The findings are represented narratively according to the found themes.

I started the narrative synthesis by organizing the research material. I made a table, which is, according to Petticrew and Roberts (2006, 165) among the most important tasks of narrative synthesis: it listed the authors, publishing years, names, publication journals, study missions, data, methodologies, and conclusions to table (see table 1.). These features construct a comprehensive description of the research material, as required (Petticrew & Roberts 2006, 165). I have also represented the critical appraisal in the form of table as proposed in Petticrew's and Roberts' work (2006, 165). During the first readings and tabulation, I noticed that some of the conclusions were recurrent, and started to take notes on these preliminary codes, that concerned the different dimensions of impacts. After tabulation and critical appraisal, I started a careful re-reading process with the goal of identifying recurrenting codes on the impacts of the SRU law. During this process, I got a preliminary understanding of the possible themes, and it thus started the second phase, the so-called within-study thematic analysis.

However, the process of within-study thematic analysis was not linear: I noticed some codes and themes already before I made it intentionally and revisited the articles multiple times while constructing the themes. In autumn 2022 I also made a preliminary analysis of three articles that I later found unsuitable for the purposes of this study. During the research project, I also learned more about the French legislation,

and the analysis was therefore shaped to a more accurate form along the development of my understanding. As the theming process is of qualitative nature, I was most worried of confirmation bias, that should be outweighed in a systematic review. I therefore re-read the articles multiple times and challenged my presumptions continuously to ensure that the themes would be accurate, and the understandings correct. However, it must be noted that the analysis is a human-made qualitative analysis, and there is thus always a risk of confirmation bias.

In the final analysis, that was conducted after the final searches in winter 2023, I found three themes: 1. *Impacts on the quantity of social housing*, 2. *Impacts of social mix and* 3. *Cooperative impacts with Borloo law*. The first theme, impacts on social housing quota, is built on the codes of *social housing, implementation of the law, affluent municipalities, and fee*. The second theme “impacts on social mix” consists instead of the codes *social mix, allocation of the units, perceiving social balance and similar composition of population*. Lastly, the third theme, cooperative impacts with Borloo law, was formed based on the codes of *renewal, paradox, and exclusion*.

The first theme appeared in seven articles, and it describes the concrete impacts of the law: it summarizes findings on the production of social housing. This is an important basis, because the SRU law required 20 % of social housing and this theme shows, how much new social housing is built. It also described the features of those municipalities, that have not fulfilled the legal requirements. The second theme that was found in ten articles, summarizes the impacts regarding the objective of article 55, social mixing. It sheds light on the connection of the law on social mixing and on the reasons behind the findings. The third theme discusses the co-impacts of article 55 of SRU law with Borloo law, and it was found in seven articles. These themes form the cross-study synthesis, and they are represented narratively in chapter 5.

#### **4.4 Research ethics**

My French and English language skills are strong, but I am not a native speaker of these languages. To avoid any confusion, I aim to make my thesis as transparent as possible, using sources precisely and correctly so that the reader could easily check the decisions I have made and the sources I have used.

## 5 SYNTHESIS

In this chapter, my aim is to provide a structured presentation on the themes that were found in the thematic within-study analysis. The synthesis consists of three themes: *1. impacts on the quantity of social housing; 2. impacts on social mix; and 3. cooperative impacts with the Borloo law.* The first theme, *impacts on the quantity of social housing*, appeared in six articles and it handles the concrete impacts of the policy on the amount of social housing. Due to its nature, the first theme is quite compact: it offers numerical information about the concrete social housing developments and features.

The second theme, *impacts on social mix*, is instead based on ten articles and it covers the impacts of the law regarding its objective of social mix. This chapter opens the impacts more thoroughly: it was handled extensively from multiple perspectives. The third and last theme, *cooperative impacts with the Borloo law*, appeared in six articles, and it summarizes concern on the co-impacts of French social mix policies. This theme is again quite compact because it was addressed more narrowly in the material.

This synthesis is based on the 13 peer-reviewed studies that concern the impacts of SRU Law. Further information regarding the articles and the critical appraisal are found in tables 1, 2 and 3. The studied articles, regardless of their frameworks, gave evidence that the article 55 of law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal has not led to the expected changes: many of the concerned municipalities have refused to build social housing and if new social housing has been built, it has often been allocated to people already living in the area. As the article 55 has not worked as aspired, the overall impacts of French social mix policies seem paradoxical: the policy does not benefit the poorest, who would have the greatest need for support.



## 5.1 Impacts on the quantity of social housing

The first theme is built on the codes of *implementation of the law, municipalities, social housing, and fee*. This chapter combines shared views of very modest outcomes of the law on social housing stock, which depend on the implementation of the law in the studied municipalities. This theme was handled in six articles: Blanc's (2010), Desage's (2010), Doutreligne's (2008), Gobillon's and Vignolles' (2016), Levasseur's (2016) and Maaoui's (2021).

Two of the articles, those of Doutreligne's and Levasseur's, focused on describing these statistics and the characteristics of the municipalities that had not reached the required quota of social housing, especially those in carence. Doutreligne notes that in 2008, 736 municipalities were under the effect of SRU Law, because they had less than 20% or 25 % social housing, depending on their size. Levasseur, on the other hand, sheds light on these measures between years 2011–2013, when the number of targeted municipalities had risen to 1022. The increase in the number of concerned municipalities might be due to the rise of the objective from 20 to 25% caused by the ALUR Law or restricted policy on the exemptions given to certain concerned municipalities.

Researchers describe that in 2006, 39,6 % of the municipalities had reached their objective and in 2013 the corresponding percentage was 36 %. In other words, in 2006 60,4 % of the municipalities did not respect the objective of the law, and in 2013 the percentage had risen to 64%. (Doutreligne 2008, 14; Levasseur 2016, 125–127.) Both researchers were interested in finding out, what kind of municipalities did not fulfil the objective of the law.

In their statistical assessments, Doutreligne and Levasseur observed that the concerned municipalities were often wealthier than average and located especially in Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur (PACA) and Île-de-France. Levasseur gives statistics on the distribution of these municipalities: in 2013, 40 % were in PACA and 18 % in Île-de-France. She also noted Languedoc-Roussillon, in which 14 % of these municipalities were located in 2013. The municipalities were rather small, approximately of 9000 residents. When it comes to social housing, the tenants living in these municipalities were wealthier than usual. (Doutreligne 2008, 14–15; Levasseur 2016, 127.)

Regarding the wealth of the targeted municipalities, Levasseur (2016) and Desage (2016) notify also to amount of fees ordered to municipalities: the fee corresponds about 150 euros for lacking unit, and it appears to be quite small for these wealthier municipalities. Desage for example brings up that for in Val-des-Champs, the 70 000-euro fine per year represents only 1 % of the commune's budget. Levasseur, on the other hand, observed that in 2014 the residents of affluent Carry-le-Rouet paid 61 euros per capita to avoid the construction of new social housing. (Desage 2016, 90–91; Levasseur 2016, 144.)

In 2016, Gobillon and Vignolles investigated the impacts of the SRU Law with a quasi-experimental study combining differences-in-differences analysis and regression discontinuity design. They examined how the SRU Law has impacted to the construction of social housing units, home tenure segregation and average prices of estates. Comparing municipalities concerned by SRU and municipalities whose population size is close to the limit of the law they found out that the SRU Law has had small but positive impact on the construction of social housing, particularly in the municipalities with less than 5 % of social housing (Gobillon & Vignolles 2016, 629). According to their study, home tenure segregation had decreased, and building social housing did not have a significant effect on the loss of attractiveness (Gobillon & Vignolles 2016, 631–632).

Maaoui (2021) conducted also a differences-in-differences analysis, which compared the social housing stock of municipalities concerned by SRU Law from the perspective of article 55 fee: treatment group consists of those to whom the fee was designated and the control group of those exempt from the fee (Maaoui 2021, 11). The findings tell that the fee has not had a positive impact on the quantity of social housing: the municipalities who were assigned to pay the fee chose to build less social housing than the control group without fee (Maaoui 2021, 18). Based on her theoretical framework that defines French urban policy making as a product of structural logics of domination mechanisms, Maaoui discusses the possibility of housing ideologies, that might affect behind the explored housing trends. (Maaoui 2021, 18.)

This was discussed also in Blanc's (2010) article, which shed light on the early stages of the law: SRU was adopted in the government of Jospin, who represented socialist party. At the time, opposition had considered the objective of SRU as an "intolerable obstacle to housing market fluidity", and the political unwillingness of the right-wing parties to meet the 20% objective of SRU Law was thus outspoken already in the very early stages of the legislation. (Blanc 2010, 266.) Blanc brings up that during the 2000's some majors of the concerned municipalities have stated that they would rather pay fines than build social housing to their municipality (Blanc 2010, 259). These observations of the French political field – values and emotions regarding the new law – show the strong attitudes towards it and contribute to the understanding of the overall willingness to implement the article 55.

To summarize, the concrete impacts of the law on social housing quota seem to rely profoundly on the implementation of the law in the targeted municipalities. The municipalities who refused to build the required amount of social housing have often been in the regions of Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur, Île-de-France, and Languedoc-Roussillon. The residents of these municipalities are approximately wealthier than usual, including those living in social housing.

## 5.2 Impacts on social mix

The second theme concerns the impacts of the law on social mix. The theme is built on the codes of *social mix*, *allocation of (social housing) units*, *perceiving social balance* and *similar composition of population*. It was dealt with in ten articles: Blanc's (2010), Levasseur's (2016), Bacqué's, Fijalkow's, Launay's and Vermeersch's (2011), Desage's (2016), Rousseau's (2017) Despond's (2010), Górczynska (2017), Korsu's (2016), Najib's (2020) and Beaubrun-Diant's and Maury's (2022). This chapter summarizes these articles' findings of social housing required by SRU Law on social mix. The findings shed light to concrete impacts on city structures, but also on the reasons of the low rate of social mix observed in the municipalities that have constructed social housing.

The findings summarized in the previous chapter showed that many of the municipalities have not met the requirements of SRU Law regarding social housing stock. However, researchers have asked as well, what the consequences of the law might be in those municipalities that have built social housing. Blanc (2010), for example, reflects in his anthropological analysis, that the private sector residents, in general, might have prejudices towards the tenants of social housing, and the new social housing units might thus be targeted to middle class. He interprets that the new social housing projects, which often aim in constructing smaller social housing units and are more expensive, are built with the aim of alluring the middle classes. Blanc observes that the new tenants of these buildings are often chosen in the name of "*social balance*". (Blanc 2010, 267-269.)

Levasseur (2016) pays attention to the affluency of targeted municipalities and interprets that the abnormal wealth might depend on favouring certain types of social housing or allocating the units to wealthier residents. (Levasseur 2016, 125-127.) Furthermore, she mentions that there are a few possible strategies of avoiding the objectives of the SRU Law: in addition to paying the fees, the municipalities can for example change their land use plans in a way that hinders from building more social housing and consciously delay urban planning projects (Levasseur 2016, 137). Blanc's and Levasseur's interpretations seem to be very poignant: many researchers have noted these trends on national level and in different parts of France. These findings will be introduced next, starting from case studies from Paris, Lille and Lyon, followed by quantitative analyses from Île-de-France, Lyon, Marseille, Mulhouse, Besancon and Strasbourg and one quasi-experimental study regarding France as whole.

In 2011, Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay and Vermeersch (2011) carried out the first case study on the impacts of the law. They analysed the social effects of the social mix policy implemented in Paris – to be more precise, the creation of new social housing units to the 9<sup>th</sup>, 15<sup>th</sup>, and 16<sup>th</sup> arrondissements of Paris due to the obligations of SRU Law (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 263). By the time of their study, city of Paris had made social mix the central theme of urban development, and the

“sociological rebalancing” of the city leaned on social housing. After the passage of SRU Law, 13,4 % of the city’s housing stock was classified as social housing. With the purpose to achieve the 25 % target by 2020, City Council decided to construct 4000 housing units a year. In the prosperous areas of Paris, the City Council actualized the plans of creating social housing through buying existing buildings and transforming them into social housing. City of Paris decided the locations and allocated the units to working and middle classes: middle classes were seen to work as a balancing element in the neighbourhoods. (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 259–260.)

Researchers discovered that after the buildings had been bought to the city, the upper classes expressed their attitude towards social housing in different ways. In the 15<sup>th</sup> arrondissement building, attitudes were expressed by moving out of the building. In contrast, in the two buildings of the 16<sup>th</sup> arrondissement, the population remained more similar: the new residents of these social housing units lived already in the 16<sup>th</sup> arrondissement. What connected these social housing buildings was the allocation of the units as a significant factor to the composition of the new population. In the buildings of the 16<sup>th</sup> arrondissement, researchers observed that the applicants were chosen from the same district to perceive “harmony”. In the 9<sup>th</sup> arrondissement the allocation was, on the other hand, based on occupations: the apartments were given to applicants who would not cause problems due to their working status. (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 265.)

Based on the interviews with the old and new residents of Paris social housing, Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch (2011) found polarized attitudes and prejudice toward the social housing residents that were new to the formerly affluent building. The fact that City of Paris bought the buildings was seen as “irredeemable loss of symbolic value”. The questions were strongly attached to the ethnicity of the new residents, who had roots in sub-Saharan and North African countries. Researchers interpreted that this racial dimension was “in the heart of representation on social mix” in Paris. African households did not express similar attitudes towards the former residents but struggled to find suitable shops in the 16<sup>th</sup> arrondissement. Consequently, some of the African households moved away. (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 266–269.)

Aspiring to know more about the means and motives for social housing allocation policy in municipalities that had built new social housing, Desage (2016) conducted a case study concerning the distribution of social housing units in the wealthy municipality of Val-des-Champs. He had noticed that in this municipality the officials who had formerly opposed the objective of SRU Law changed their attitudes during 2007-2008. After this decisive moment, the municipality became a “model student” of the SRU Law – at least on paper. (Desage 2016, 87). Desage’s research material consists of a survey, 35 interviews, a few informal interviews and administrative and expert literature. As aspired, the study sheds light of the reasons behind this change (Desage 2016, 86–87).

The interviews that Desage (2016) made with local officials and representatives of social landlords, reveal that during 2008, the officials made an agreement to build social housing with one condition: the policy would not change the population of the municipality. In Val-des-Champs, the allocation of the new social housing units was made in the name of “social balance”. This resembles the objective of preserving harmony in the 16<sup>th</sup> arrondissement buildings of Paris. In the case on Val-des-Champs, the biggest factor that impacts the allocation is income, similarly with the 9<sup>th</sup> arrondissement building in Paris. Notwithstanding, immigrant families were assumed to have difficulties in adapting to the municipality, and they were not found in the population of social housing (Desage 2016, 106). As a consequence of this allocation policy, the composition of Val-des-Champs population has changed very little, and the objective of social mix has not been realized although new social housing units have been built. (Desage 2016, 104–109).

In 2017, Rousseau continued the series of case studies by exploring the affluent western suburbs and working-class eastern suburbs of Lyon metropolitan area through an analysis of semi-directive interviews with officials and local press. Congruent to the two previous case studies, Rousseau’s work discovers that affluent municipalities have been against the objective of social mixing, and they have found ways of preserving the composition of their population while building more social housing. Rousseau (2017, 39) observed that in the case of Lyon metropolis, the majors had power in the allocation of units: in the affluent west, the new, smaller social housing units were allocated to students already living in the municipality.

Interviews with local officials gave insights to the preconceptions towards post-war social housing estates: the large apartment buildings were seen as “aggressive” and as a home of “dangerous classes”. The residents of the municipality seem to have had strong opinions on the matter: many had told that they would vote for those who oppose new social housing (Rousseau 2017, 34–35). As a whole, Rousseau (2017, 47–48) observed a continuity of historical segregation being upheld and even reinforced in the strict control of housing allocation in the social housing units required by the law.

The features of social housing allocation seem rather similar in the cases of Paris, Val-des-Champs, and Lyon: the municipalities and, in the case of Paris, neighborhoods, are quite prosperous and the allocation seems to be made consciously to preserve similar population. The unwillingness to participate in social mixing seems to depend on the prejudices of the residents: all the cases brought up the stigmatization of social housing and its residents. Based on the studies concerning Paris and Val-des-Champs, the prejudices were often associated with the non-European immigrant background of the social housing tenants and applicants. These findings raise questions on the prevalence of this social housing allocation: one is left wondering, how often is the allocation used to pursue similar population, which is against the original objective of SRU Law. The following quantitative analyses give answers to this subject.

Desponds (2010) and Górczynska (2017) focused on Île-de-France using descriptive and multivariate quantitative study designs. Desponds' article described an indirect analysis of the impacts of the law: he compared the real estate valuation and buyer profile evaluation on both SRU and Borloo municipalities in Île-de-France from 2001 to 2005. Regarding the SRU Law, Desponds (2010, 55) concluded, that the SRU municipalities seemed to have kept their structure identical and the appreciation of these communes seemed to have decreased. The study could not confirm causality, but it nonetheless carefully describes the situation.

Górczynska (2017) used instead cluster analysis and entropy indices to study the impacts of social housing on social mix. In her analysis, she observed that after the implementation of SRU Law, the social composition of Île-de-France had not diversified: tenure mix had not led to social mix. Górczynska observed that the municipalities that did not meet the expectations of SRU on social housing quota were more homogeneous in 2010 than in 1990 (Górczynska 2017, 401). At the same time period, Górczynska (2017, 401) discovered a trend of social upgrading in social housing: in 2010, the proportion of professionals and executives in social housing had risen to 19 %, and the proportion of intermediate categories was 22%. Górczynska (2017, 402, 404) interpreted that the social mix observed by the entropy indices might in fact be a temporary phase, which has later led to social upgrading and homogenization: processes of gentrification and elitization.

In the same vein, Korsu (2016) explored the impact of social housing on social mix in the metropolitan areas of Île-de-France, Lyon, and Marseille. The study concerned 48 000 social housing units in Paris, 6900 in Lyon and 4000 in Marseille and covered the years 1999-2008. Korsu (2016, 610) concluded that the impact of social housing on social mix is very modest: at maximum, 1,5 %. Korsu writes that there are several factors, that seem to hinder the pro-mix effects of social housing, the major reason being allocations policy. Korsu discovered that if the lower social groups were to be located on wealthier areas, the impact of social housing on social mix would have been significantly greater (Korsu 2016, 611).

Korsu reflects that allocating a large share of new social housing to middle class hinders the social mix with lower classes: for example, in Paris, 5000 of the new social housing units were allocated to middle managers and 2000 to senior managers and superior intellectual professions (Korsu 2016, 619-620). Korsu (2016, 618-619) concludes that it would be unrealistic to count on this kind of social housing policy in decreasing segregation in these metropolises.

Moreover, Najib (2020) focused on the segregation of Besançon, Mulhouse, and Strasbourg with the means of multivariate factorial analysis: he explored the development of socio-spatial inequalities of these cities before and after the passage of SRU Law. In his analysis, Najib discovered that the wealthy districts have not become more mixed: on the opposite, he finds a trend of higher concentration on rich and poor enclaves. Najib concludes that the inequalities of the studied cities seem persistent and

have intensified regardless of the SRU Law. He rises critique on the article 55 of SRU Law for its inaccuracy in the locations of the social housing: this ambiguity makes it possible to build new social housing to the poorest areas of the municipality. In addition, he discusses the reasons behind the segregative developments: Najib (2020, 10-11) sees that the observed division depends on the self-segregation of the wealthiest.

Lastly, but closest to proving causality, Beaubrun-Diant and Maury (2022) conducted a study on the impacts of the SRU Law on income segregation. The study design was formulated based on the aim of the law, which was to decrease segregation and enhance the position of the poorest. The study comprehended all the municipalities that were concerned by the SRU Law. With a differences-in-differences analysis and regression discontinuity design, the researchers found out that the SRU Law have not had descendent impact on the income segregation. (Beaubrun-Diant & Maury 2022, 697.) On the contrary, income segregation had risen slightly as home tenure segregation decreased significantly. (Beaubrun-Diant & Maury 2022, 685).

Researchers interpreted, that the observed lack of impact of SRU Law on income segregation might be due to the *allocation processes* of the concerned municipalities. (Beaubrun-Diant & Maury 2022, 697.) Using decomposition and simulation techniques, they found evidence for this kind of “sorting effect” in the allocation of social housing. Beaubrun-Diant and Maury concluded that wealthier municipalities allocate their new social housing units to tenants that are wealthier than usual. The segregation of low-income households has, on the other hand, increased. The new locations of social housing do not thus reject the concentration of the poorest on certain enclaves. (Beaubrun-Diant & Maury 2022, 685-688.)

The last question that remains, is whether social mix would increase interaction and cohesion between the new neighbours, if the tenure mix was achieved. Korsu discusses the important question on the measurement of social mix: spatial proximity and tenure mix do not yet prove the social mix in social terms. Interaction, trust, tolerance, and social cohesion are, however, hard to measure, and quantitative studies thus often use the spatial proximity to measure social mix. (Korsu 2016, 605.)

In this group of studies, social dynamic was observed only in the case study of Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch (2011). They discovered, that in the studied buildings of Paris, the old and new tenants most often ignored each other. In some cases of the 9<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> arrondissement buildings, the cultural capital of working class was appreciated by middle classes, and they showed social goodwill towards each other. Notwithstanding, the impacts of the SRU Law on positive social interaction were minor and happened between working and middle classes. The upper classes moved away or distanced themselves socially, and the most vulnerable were not included in the population of the buildings due to the allocation policies. (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 268 & 271.) Based on these observations, the outcome of achieved social mix does not seem to create the intended social atmosphere. However, these findings describe only the studied buildings of Paris.

On the whole, the implementation of the law in the studied municipalities seems to have led to unexpected consequences of the SRU Law: when new social housing has been built, the new units have often been smaller and more expensive – and most importantly, meant for middle class or the residents of the municipality. This explains in part the descriptive findings of Doutreligne (2008) and Levasseur (2016): social housing tenants of SRU municipalities are wealthier, because the units are allocated to these groups.

However, one question remains: what are the overall impacts of French social mix policy if the first half, SRU Law, hasn't been implemented as supposed? Blanc discusses this interesting yet alarming question: when compared to the original objective of the law, one is left wondering what happens to the most vulnerable who were supposed to get residential opportunities, that would lead to greater equity and solidarity. When the municipalities choose to build the new social housing units for middle class, the most vulnerable don't have good chances of getting an affordable home from the new social housing units. (Blanc 2010, 267–269.) The next theme gives insights to this discussion.

### 5.3 Cooperative impacts with the Borloo law

The third and last theme consists of the codes of *renewal*, *paradox* and *exclusion* found in six articles: Despond's (2010), Korsu's (2016), Blanc's (2010), Bacqué's, Fijalkow's, Launay's & Vermeersch's (2011), Górczynska's (2017) and Rousseau's (2017). It summarizes concerns on paradoxical cooperative impacts with the Borloo law. The Borloo law, which legislates the second half of French social mix policy, created a National Program of Urban Renewal (PNRU). This program leads the renewal projects of the disadvantaged and stigmatized banlieues often through the demolition and rebuilding of these suburbs. The aim is to increase social mix, due to which the demolished suburbs are built to attract middle classes to the area. However, as the municipalities haven't implemented the SRU Law as hoped, the researchers have expressed concerns of the paradoxical co-impacts of the policies.

Desponds (2010) shed light on this question from an original point of view: his data analysis on the real estate valuation and buyer profile evaluation in Île-de-France municipalities Seine-Saint-Denis, Yvelines and Val-d'Oise brought together interesting describing data of the differences of communes implementing SRU Law and on the other hand, the Borloo law. In the comparison of these municipalities, Desponds (2010, 51) showed that the valuation of the latter increased along with the renewal programs, whereas SRU municipalities, on the other hand, have seen a loss of valuation during the process of building more social housing. Simultaneously, blue-collar workers have contributed significantly less on the acquisitions, as the number of



wealthy buyers has increased (Desponds 2010, 51). The study stays on a descriptive level, but Desponds raises a relevant question on the position of the most vulnerable who were supposed to benefit from social mix policies: if the differences between the studied communities are decreasing, what can the most vulnerable do – and could this be an act of relegating them to the peripheries of Paris? (Desponds 2010, 55.)

Korsu (2016) attended to the same discussion in his article that handled the new social housing of Paris, Lyon, and Marseille. He had discovered that new social housing had a very small impact on social mix, but at the same time he observed that office workers had located to the low-income areas. Korsu (2016, 620) reflected on the position of the low-income households: where do they find affordable housing, when their area is inhabited by new socio-professional groups? Korsu notes, that during the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the situation on private housing market has been even harder since the rents have risen significantly. (Korsu 2016, 620.)

Blanc had also risen concerns over this matter in 2010. Since the middle classes appear to have been the class accepted to the new social housing estates of wealthier SRU municipalities and old social housing estates are rebuilt to contain a tenure mix, some of the previous tenants of these old social housing estates are left without home. This group has contained some of the most socio-economically vulnerable people, who have not been accepted to wealthier municipalities and do not get affordable apartment from their former, rebuilt neighbourhood. (Blanc 2010, 259.) Blanc used the concept of underclass to describe the new position of the poorest: he assessed that this development might create multi-ethnic ghettos. (Blanc 2010, 269).

Exploring the effected neighbourhoods of City of Paris social mix policy, Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch (2011, 265–267) discussed the allocation policy: since nearly all of the residents who were chosen to these buildings worked, what was the position of the most vulnerable who are unemployed for a reason or another? (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 265.) In comparison with the affluent neighbourhoods affected by SRU Law, Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch (2011) studied one working-class neighbourhood of Goutte d'Or. Researchers observed that in Goutte d'Or, only 43 – 62 % of demolished housing units, which were often homes of the most vulnerable, were replaced (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 265). Researchers noticed that these policies do not seem to have benefited the poorest but led to the reposition of poverty in Paris (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011, 268). Gorczynska (2017, 404) concludes that the exclusion of poorer and gentrification and elitization of wealthier in Paris are trends, that should be better responded by policies.

Rousseau (2017) found a similar trend exploring the social housing of affluent and working-class neighbourhoods in Lyon conurbation. He discovered that as the new social housing units of affluent municipalities are allocated to the students of these municipalities, working-class neighbourhoods are simultaneously aiming for economic development. Thus, in both kinds of suburbs, the most vulnerable in need

of social housing seemed undesired. This was connected to the fear of creating new social housing estates equal to the old, stigmatized post-war estates and probably to the social problems attached to them. (Rousseau 2017, 48.)

To summarize the third theme, it appears that as the SRU Law has not been implemented as planned, the situation contributes to disconcerting impacts with the Borloo law. As the poorest are not excepted to the new social housing of more affluent municipalities and the old banlieues have been renewed, the poorest inhabitants might have to move out to cheaper areas. Hence, the most vulnerable appear to be in a difficult situation, especially as private housing rents have risen.

## 6 CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

This systematic literature review has summarized the peer-reviewed studies that deal with the impacts of article 55 of the French law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal. The mixed-methods approach with a narrative synthesis has enabled summarizing methodologically different kinds of research: quasi-experimental, multivariate quantitative, descriptive quantitative, mixed-methods and qualitative studies. As a whole, the 13 articles form a multidimensional material, which is also quite coherent in findings.

The synthesis consists of three themes, which all cover different impacts of the SRU Law: 1. *Impacts on the quantity of social housing*; 2. *Impacts on social mix*; and 3. *Co-operative impacts with the Borloo law*. These themes answered to research questions 1 and 2:

1. What are the impacts of article 55 of the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal in France?
2. What could explain the impacts of article 55 of the law on Solidarity and Urban Renewal?

The first theme *impacts on the quantity of social housing* summarized the findings on modest impacts of the law on the amount of social housing. It appears that majority of the targeted municipalities were unwilling to build social housing regardless of the fees sanctioned by the central government. These rather small and affluent municipalities were mostly located in southeast France and the metropolitan area of Paris: Provence-Alpes-Cote d'Azur, Languedoc-Roussillon and Île-de-France. (Blanc 2010; Desage 2010; Doutreligne 2008; Gobillon & Vignolles 2016; Levasseur 2016; Maaoui 2021.)

The second theme *impacts on social mix* summarized the ambiguous results of the law in the municipalities that had built new social housing. Researchers observed, that although some social housing was built, the social composition of the municipalities had not changed as expected. With further inspection, research discovered that there

exists a sorting mechanism, which discriminates in the allocation of new social housing units. These processes seem to depend on the residents' prejudices towards social housing, conscious decisions of municipal officials and the small size of sanction fee in relation to the wealth of the municipality. (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011; Beaubrun-Diant & Maury 2022; Blanc 2010; Desage 2016; Desponds 2010; Górczynska 2017; Korsu 2016; Levasseur 2017; Najib 2020; Rousseau 2017.)

The outcome of these sorting mechanisms has led to a point, in which the new social housing units obligated by article 55 of the SRU Law are often smaller and more expensive and they are allocated to people who are already living in the area and are wealthier than social housing tenants in general. Researchers see, that on the contrary to increasing social mix, this has enhanced the self-segregation of the wealthiest and gentrification of the concerned neighbourhoods. (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011; Blanc 2010; Desage 2016; Desponds 2010; Górczynska 2017; Levasseur 2017; Najib 2020; Rousseau 2017.)

The third theme, *cooperative impacts with the Borloo law*, shed light on the co-impacts of the French social mix policies. The two laws, which form the backbone of the French social mix city policy, seem to cause disconcerting phenomena. As the most vulnerable often do not have access to new, affluent social housing neighbourhoods due to the implementation of SRU law, and the amount of social housing units decreases in their neighbourhoods due to Borloo law, they must look for a new place to live. (Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch 2011; Blanc 2010; Desponds 2010; Górczynska 2017; Korsu 2016; Rousseau 2017.) Regarding the objectives of article 55 of the SRU Law – decreasing urban segregation and increasing solidarity – the policy does not seem to have worked as intended. Quite on the contrary, it appears that the position of the most vulnerable has become harder, whereas middle classes have benefited from the affordable housing.

The third research question was:

### 3. Is there something that stays unexplored or needs further investigation?

First, researchers noted that ethnic discrimination and segregation cannot be measured due to the ban of gathering data on ethnicity (Blanc 2010; Maaoui 2021; Najib 2020). This French model, which is referred to as color-blindness, is often seen to have good purposes, but it simultaneously makes discrimination invisible. Thus, the studies concerning the impacts of the SRU law do not cover ethnic segregation or discrimination.

In the case of article 55 of the SRU Law, there is also a general need for more research on the subject. There are various methodologies and approaches that could bring relevant information about the impacts, but I would see that some are especially important. To begin with, the studies on the impacts of the SRU Law dealt very little with the voice of the most vulnerable residents of the banlieues. As they are most

heavily influenced by urban segregation, it would be crucial to hear their opinions and experiences of the policy, its implementation, and objectives. This matter could be studied with qualitative frameworks as well as a more comprehensive survey in the disadvantaged neighborhoods. The residents might want to be heard in this matter and might answer well-conducted surveys.

Secondly, the voice of the residents of affluent municipalities could, as well, be studied with larger data. If the attitudes towards the social housing and its poorer residents are indeed as prejudicial and discriminative as suggested in the case studies of Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch (2011), Desage (2016) and Rousseau (2017), a more comprehensive analysis could give important information regarding the policy implementation and social polarization on this spatial sector of the French society. Nevertheless, as highlighted, there are various designs and approaches that would add up to the current understanding.

In the findings concerning France, there are some similarities to the formerly introduced international findings on social mix policies. The biggest overall similarity is that the French social mix policy has not led to the expected changes, a result in line with international research (Arthurson 2012). The case study of Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch (2011) was the only to examine whether this social mix policy led to interaction between social groups: coherently with quantitative studies from the U.S. and Netherlands, researchers observed that social mix policy didn't lead to the expected changes in interaction. This is unfortunate as at the core of these policies is the supposedly increased interaction between new neighbours (Arthurson 2012; Kintrea 2013). However, as Bacqué, Fijalkow, Launay & Vermeersch (2011) note themselves, their study is limited to the four buildings in which the study took place. Thus, further studies on the social impacts of social housing dispersion would be needed to compare the French policy to other countries.

When it comes to the cooperative impacts with the Borloo law, there exists a more extensive background in the international literature. The French urban renewal program appears similar to the wave of "new urban renewal" seen in the United States, Western Europe, and Australia (Watt 2017). However, this thesis summarizes only the impacts of article 55 of the SRU law and can thus give only clues of the impacts of the National Program of Urban Renewal. If somebody was to summarize the impacts of this other half of French social mix policy, it would, in my understanding, be highly possible, that the results would be coherent with the international findings on urban renewal policies.

Since the effectiveness of a policy depends first and foremost on its implementation, it is crucial to understand enabling and hindering factors in the implementation process. In this regard, the mixed-methods narrative synthesis brought interesting information due to the multimethodology that has been avoided in more clinical systematic reviews. The approach seems to be a relevant for social sciences, which views social reality as always difficult to reach completely in research. Many methodological

approaches, when they are well-executed, provide relevant information, complement each other, and participate in a wider process of developing social sciences research and understanding.

It is important to note that this systematic review has also its limitations. Firstly, the research material is quite compact due to the rather small number of peer reviewed studies on the topic and the resources of a master's thesis. With larger resources, one could have completed the research material with peer-reviewed studies on the Borloo law, grey literature, reports or non-peer-reviewed articles. After scoping these possibilities, I found these materials too extensive for the resources of this review, but in principle, these additional materials could have brought more comprehensive information on the impacts of the policy. Secondly, this kind of narrative synthesis, which includes a qualitative thematic analysis and is made by one person, has always the risk of including human errors. I have tried to avoid them with careful description of methodology and choices, constant self-reflection, and conscious challenging of my own understandings. However, the risk of human errors cannot be eliminated in this kind of systematic review.

As the whole, this thesis has, from its small part, contributed to the recent trends of more multidimensional segregation research, more comprehensive and long-term social mix policy evaluation, mixed-methods systematic review approach in policy evaluation and using an appraisal tool that does not give certain methodologies bigger value than others. Systematic literature review appeared to be a rather time-consuming methodology, as noted in methodological handbooks of Fink (2020), Petticrew & Roberts (2006) and Booth, Sutton & Papaioannou (2016). The processes of gathering data and critical appraisal required time, preciseness, and constant self-reflection, especially with the two foreign languages and methodology-wise multidimensional material.

Nevertheless, when conducted with real resources – a group of researchers and enough time and expertise – I would see this methodology as a very good way of summarizing policy evaluation research for decision makers. The systematic inclusion of all relevant studies lowers the risk of using few, possibly biased or incomprehensive studies as the justification of a policy. The cooperative work of researchers with enough expertise on the topic and on the used methodologies would probably lead to the most reliable summaries of evidence that can be achieved.

Lastly, some non-European immigrants have been among the most vulnerable in France for decades, and they seem to suffer from segregation in multiple sectors of society (McAvay 2018). This is congruent with the larger European trend of multilevel segregation (Musterd 2020). In France, non-European immigrants who suffer from segregation often have origins in France's former colonies (Insee 2022) which, in my understanding, reflects and upholds unequal power relations from the country's colonial history. Moreover, it seems that the current French city policy does not take this structure into account, thus enabling the continuity of historical inequalities.

The research on the urban field of France takes part in multiple debates: polarized discussions on immigration, societal economy, centralized form of governance, distribution of wealth and feelings of exclusion and belonging. It appears that the voices of preserving concentrated wealth and avoiding the interaction with the most vulnerable are rather strong, and the trend is visible in urban space as well. Thus, the difficult part in legislating better segregation reduction policies appears to be the lack of shared values in the French political field. One is left wondering, whether France has the tools to decrease segregation, which seems to depend on poverty and discrimination. Solutions would be needed very soon, as again a new generation suffers from exclusion in the French suburbs.

## LITERATURE

- Arbaci, S. (2019). *Paradoxes of Segregation: Housing Systems, Welfare Regimes and Ethnic Residential Change in Southern European Cities*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Arthurson, K. (2012). *Social Mix and the City: Challenging the Mixed Communities Consensus in Housing and Urban Planning Policies*. CSIRO Publishing.
- Atkinson, R., & Kei Ho, H. (2020). *Segregation and the urban rich: enclaves, networks and mobilities in* Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Aveyard, H. (2019). *Doing a literature review in health and social care: A practical guide* (Fourth edition.). Open University Press, McGraw-Hill Education.
- Bailey, N. (2020). *Understanding the processes of changing segregation in* Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Bonneville, M. (2005). The ambiguity of urban renewal in France: Between continuity and rupture. *Journal of housing and the built environment*. 20 (3), 229–242.
- Booth, A., Sutton, A. & Papaioannou, D. (2016). *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review*. Sage.
- Carpenter, J. (2018). 'Social Mix' as 'Sustainability Fix'? Exploring Social Sustainability in the French Suburbs. *Urban planning*, 3 (4), 29–37.
- CNLE (2008). Loi n° 90-449 du mai 31 1990 visant à la mise en œuvre du droit au logement. Conseil national des politiques de lutte contre pauvreté et l'exclusion sociale webpages 13.6.2008. Cited 16.2.2023. URL: <https://www.cnle.gouv.fr/loi-no-90-449-du-31-mai-1990.html>
- CNLE (2008). Loi d'orientation du 29 juillet 1998 relative à la lutte contre les exclusions. Conseil national des politiques de lutte contre pauvreté et l'exclusion sociale webpages 13.6.2008. Cited 16.2.2023. URL: <https://www.cnle.gouv.fr/loi-d-orientation-du-29-juillet.html>
- Deboulet, A., & Abram, S. (2017). Are Social Mix and Participation Compatible? Conflicts and Claims in Urban Renewal in France and England. in Watt, P., & Smets, P. (2017). *Social Housing and Urban Renewal: A Cross-National Perspective*. United Kingdom, Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Deffontaines, L. (2022). La loi 3DS change la donne pour les communes SRU. Editions législatives 24.2.2022. URL: <https://www.editions-legislatives.fr/actualite/la-loi-3ds%20change-la-donne-pour-les-communes-sru/>
- Escafré-Dublet, A., & Lelévrier, C. (2019). Governing diversity without naming it: An analysis of neighbourhood policies in Paris. *European urban and regional studies*, 26(3), 283–296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0969776417750439>
- European Commission (2019). Social segregation. European commission webpages, 2019. Cited 1.11.2022. URL: <https://urban.jrc.ec.europa.eu/thefutureofcities/social-segregation#the-chapter>
- Eurostat (2022). Over 1 in 5 at risk of poverty or social exclusion. Cited 23.2.2023. URL: <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/products-eurostat-news/-/ddn-20220915-1>



- Fink, A. (2020). *Conducting research literature reviews*. Sage.
- Gerardin, M. & Pramil, J. (2023). En 15 ans, les disparités entre quartiers, mesurées selon le revenu, se sont accentuées dans la plupart des grandes villes. *Insee analyses* n° 79. Cited 23.2.2023. URL: <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/6680439>
- Hautala, T. (2019). Pro Gradu. Systemaattinen kirjallisuuskatsaus oppimispelien vaikutuksista alakouluikäisten matematiikan osaamiseen ja opettajan rooliin oppimispelien integroinnissa. University of Lapland. Cited 23.2.2023 <https://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe2019111738428>
- Hess, D., Tammaru, T. & van Hamm, M. (2018). *Housing Estates in Europe: Poverty, Ethnic Segregation and Policy Challenges*. Springer international publishing.
- Heyvaert, M., Hannes, K. & Onghena, P. (2017). *Using mixed methods research synthesis for literature reviews*. Sage.
- Hong, G.N., Pluye, P., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M-P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O’Cathain, A., Rousseau, M-C., Vedel, I. (2018). *Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT)*, version 2018. Registration copyright (#1148552), Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Industry Canada.
- Insee (2015). The homeless in France. Institut national d’études démographiques webpages. Cited 15.9.2022. URL: [https://www.ined.fr/en/everything\\_about\\_population/demographic-facts-sheets/focus-on/the-homeless-in-france/](https://www.ined.fr/en/everything_about_population/demographic-facts-sheets/focus-on/the-homeless-in-france/)
- Insee (2022). L’essentiel sur... les immigrés et les étrangers. Institut national d’études démographiques webpages. Cited 16.2.2023. URL: <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/3633212>
- Jaatinen, S. (2014). Pro Gradu. Systemaattinen kirjallisuuskatsaus nuorten kokemuksista ja osallisuudesta lastensuojelussa. University of Jyväskylä. Cited 23.2.2023 <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ju-201501211154>
- Kaufman, J. (1998). *Chicago: Segregation and the New Urban Poverty* teoksessa Musterd, S. & Ostendorf, W. (1998). *Urban segregation and the Welfare State: Inequality and exclusion in western cities*. Routledge.
- Kintrea, K. (2013). *Social mix: International policy approaches* in Manley, D. t., van Ham, M. t., Bailey, N. t., Simpson, L. t., & Maclennan, D. t. (2013). *Neighbourhood Effects or Neighbourhood Based Problems?: A Policy Context*. Springer Netherlands. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-6695-2>
- Kovács, Z. (2020). Do market forces reduce segregation? The controversies of post-socialist urban regions of Central and Eastern Europe in Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Lapeyronnie, D. (2008). *Ghetto urbain. Ségrégation, violence, pauvreté en France aujourd’hui*. Robert Laffont, Paris.
- Lagrange, H. (2008). Riots, Urban Segregation and Political Alienation in France. *Revue française de science politique*, 58(3), 377–401.
- Leinonen, E. (2014). Pro Gradu. Henkilökohtainen budjetti : systemaattinen kirjallisuuskatsaus kansainvälisestä tutkimuksesta. University of Jyväskylä. Cited 23.2.2023 <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ju-201406122009>
- Le Monde (7.11.2005). 1408 véhicules incités et 395 interpellations dans la nuit de dimanche à lundi.

- Lévy-Vroelant, C., Schaefer, J.-P. & Tutin, C. (2014). Social housing in France in Scanlon, K., Whitehead, C., Arrigoitia, M. F., & Fernández Arrigoitia, M. (2014). *Social Housing in Europe*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Lin, J. & Mele, C. (2013). *The Urban Sociology Reader*. Routledge.
- Maloutas, T. (2020). Vertical social differentiation as segregation in spatial proximity in Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Marques, E. & Franca, D. (2020) Segregation by class and race in Sao Paulo in Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Mathieu-Fritz, A. (2007). Quand les banlieues brûlent... Retour sur les émeutes de novembre 2005 Quand la ville se défait. Quelle politique face à la crise des banlieues? *Revue française de sociologie*, 48(3), 638.
- McAvay, H. (2018). How Durable Are Ethnoracial Segregation and Spatial Disadvantage? Intergenerational Contextual Mobility in France. *Demography*, 55(4), 1507-1545. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-018-0689-0>
- McAvay, H. & Verdugo, G. (2021). Income Inequality and Segregation in the Paris Metro Area (1990-2015) in van Ham, M., Tammaru, T., Ubareviciene, R. & Janssen, H. (2021). *Urban Socio-Economic Segregation and Income Inequality: A Global Perspective*. Springer.
- Ministère de la Transition écologique et de la Cohésion des territoires (2021). L'article 55 de la loi solidarité et renouvellement urbain (SRU), mode d'emploi. Ministère de la Transition écologique et de la Cohésion des territoires webpages 23.8.2021. Cited 16.2.2023. URL: <https://www.ecologie.gouv.fr/larticle-55-loi-solidarite-et-renouvellement-urbain-sru-mode-demploi>
- Moran, M. (2017). Terrorism and the banlieues: The Charlie Hebdo attacks in context. *Modern & contemporary France*, 25(3), 315-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09639489.2017.1323199>
- Musterd, S. & Ostendorf, W. (1998). *Urban segregation and the Welfare State: Inequality and exclusion in western cities*. Routledge.
- Musterd, S. (2020). Urban segregation: contexts, domains, dimensions and approaches in Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Männistö, I. (2017). Pro Gradu. Sijoitettujen lasten ja nuorten kouluosuorittumisen ja kouluhyvinvoinnin tukemiseksi toteutetut interventiot : systemaattinen kirjallisuuskatsaus. University of Jyväskylä. Cited 23.2.2023 <http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi:ju-201706062708>
- Pan Ke Shon, J. & Verdugo, G. (2014). Forty years of immigrant segregation in France, 1968-2007. How different is the new immigration? (5), 823-840.
- Petticrew, M. & Roberts, H. (2006). *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: A Practical Guide*. Blackwell publishing.
- Popay, J., Roberts, H., Sowden, A., Petticrew, M., Britten, N., Arai, L., Roen, K., & Rodgers, M. (2005). Developing guidance on the conduct of narrative synthesis in systematic reviews. *J Epidemiol Community Health*, 59(Suppl 1):, A7. [http://jech.bmj.com/content/vol59/suppl\\_1/](http://jech.bmj.com/content/vol59/suppl_1/)

- Préteceille, E. (2009). La ségrégation ethno-raciale a-t-elle augmenté dans la métropole parisienne?: Espace et ségrégations. *Revue française de sociologie*, 50(3), 489–519.
- Préteceille, E. & Cardoso, A. (2020). Socioeconomic segregation and the middle classes in Paris, Rio de Janeiro and Sao Paulo: a comparative perspective in Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Randolph, B. (2020). Dimensions of urban segregation at the end of the Australian dream in Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Rey, H. (2017). Ghettos, banlieues – is the difference disappearing? *International social science journal*, 67(223-224), 55–61. <https://doi.org/10.1111/issj.12148>
- Safi, M. (2009). La dimension spatiale de l'intégration: évolution de la ségrégation des populations immigrées en France entre 1968 et 1999. *Revue française de sociologie*, 50(3), 521–552. <https://doi.org/10.3917/rfs.503.0521>
- Sahlins, P. (2006). Riots in France: Bringing the perspectives and knowledge of social scientists to bear on the social unrest that broke out in the suburbs of Paris in late 2005. *Insights from the social sciences* 24.10.2006. Cited 14.2.2023. URL: <https://items.ssrc.org/category/riots-in-france/>
- Scanlon, K., Whitehead, C., Arrigoitia, M. F., & Fernández Arrigoitia, M. (2014). *Social Housing in Europe*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Semega, J., Kollar, M., Shrider, E. A. & Creamer, J. (2020). Income and Poverty in the United States: 2019-Current Population Reports. United States Census Bureau, Report n° P60-270. Cited 23.2.2023. URL: <https://www.census.gov/library/visualizations/2020/demo/p60-270.html>
- Silvasti, T. (2014). Sisällönanalyysi. In Massa, I. (ed.) *Polkuja yhteiskuntatieteelliseen ympäristötutkimukseen*. Helsinki, Gaudeamus. 33–48.
- Statista research department (2022). Number of people without a home in France from 2017 to 2021. Statista webpages 10.1.2022. Cited 15.9.2022. URL: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1085952/number-homeless-france/>
- Stébé, J. & Marchal, H. (2019). Introduction à la sociologie urbaine. Armand Colin.
- Sundberg, T. (2017). Systematic reviews in social policy evaluation in Greve, B. (2017). *Handbook of social policy evaluation*. Edward Elgar Pub.
- The Guardian (22.10.2015). 'Nothing's changed': 10 years after French riots, banlieues remain in crisis.
- The New Yorker (24.8.2015). The Other France: Are the suburbs of Paris incubators of terrorism?
- The New York Times (3.11.2005). Riots in Paris.
- Van Rooyen, J. & Lemanski, C. (2020). Urban segregation in South Africa: the evolution of exclusion in Cape Town in Musterd, S. (2020). *Handbook of Urban Segregation*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Vie Publique (1991). Conseil des ministres du 24 Avril 1991 Loi d'orientation pour la ville. Vie publique webpages 2023. Cited 16.2.2023. URL: <https://www.vie-publique.fr/discours/155758-conseil-des-ministres-24041991-loi-d-orientation-pour-la-ville>
- Wacquant, L. & Wilson, W. (1989) *The Cost of Racial and Class Exclusion in the Inner City* in Lin, J. & Mele, C. (2013). *The Urban Sociology Reader*. Routledge.
- Wacquant, L. (2006). *Parias Urbains. Ghetto, Banlieues, État*. Paris, La Découverte.

- Watt, P. & Smets, P. (2017). *Social Housing and Urban Renewal*. Emerald Publishing Limited.
- White, P. (1998). *Ideologies, Social Exclusion and Spatial Segregation in Paris* in Musterd, S. & Ostendorf, W. (1998). *Urban segregation and the welfare state: Inequality and exclusion in western cities*. Routledge

## APPENDIXES

Table 1. Research material

| Article   | Study mission   | Data   | Method   | Conclusion   |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Bacqué, M., Fijalkow, Y., Launay, L., & Vermeersch, S. (2011). Social Mix Policies in Paris: Discourses, Policies and Social Effects. <i>International journal of urban and regional research</i> , 35(2), 256-273. | Finding out, what are the social effects of social mix policies in Paris  | 50 interviews from old and new tenants of four new social housing buildings located in the 9th, 15th and 16th arrondissement of Paris + questionnaires from three quarters of 9th and 15th arrondissement, statistical data from landlords | Case study: qualitative analysis on interviews & quantitative analysis on survey and data  | Social interaction hasn't increased in the new social housing units: tenure mix haven't led to social mix. In the 16th arrondissement, the units are allocated to those already living in the neighborhood: social composition hasn't changed. There are prejudices towards social housing and it's tenants. |
| Beaubrun-Diant, K., & Maury, T. (2022). On the Impact of Public Housing on Income Segregation in France. <i>Demography</i> , 59(2), 685-706.  | Finding out, what are the impacts of SRU Law on income segregation  | FILOCOM data on individual households' characteristics, odd years between 1999-2015. Municipal sample in 2 071 municipalities, from which 588 were targeted by the SRU Law.  | Descriptive quantitative analysis and quasi-experimental differences-in-differences analysis with regression discontinuity design, decomposition & simulation techniques | The SRU Law had no impact on income segregation: this is related to public housing residualization and allocation of public housing units.   |
| Blanc, M. (2010). The Impact of Social Mix Policies in France. <i>Housing studies</i> , 25(2), 257-272.   | Explaining why policymakers believe in tenure mix and assessing discrepancies between rhetorical policy aims and pragmatic policy outputs | INSEE statistics, speeches of politicians, interviews with inhabitants and activists, own observations in the areas  | Anthropological analysis   | Paradoxical impacts of social mix policy: strengthens ghettos and hinders the right to decent housing of the poorest   |
| Desage, F. (2016). "Unpeuplement de qualité". <i>Mise en oeuvre de la loi SRU dans le</i>   | Exploring the possibility to exercise communal preference in the allocation of new housing units  | 30 interviews with the housing policy actors, officials and trustees of Val-des-   | Case study: qualitative analysis, method not   | There are invisible forms of discrimination in the processes of social housing required  |

|   |  |  |  |   |
|---|--|--|--|---|
| périurbain résidentiel aisé et discrimination discrète. <i>Gouvernement &amp; action publique</i> , 5(3), 83–112.   |  | Champs, administrative and expert reports and evaluations and reports of DREAL and four improvised interviews in the new social housing units  | mentioned, appears to be content analysis  | by SRU Law: allocation of new social housing units according to “communal preference” has accentuated residential segregation   |
| Desponds, D. (2010). Effets paradoxaux de la loi Solidarité et renouvellement urbains (sru) et profil des acquéreurs de biens immobiliers en Île-de-France. <i>Espaces et sociétés</i> , 140–141(1), 37–58. | Evaluating the impact of the SRU Law on the valuation of municipalities        | BIEN data on the appreciation of estates and evolution of the profile of buyer households in Île-de-France, particularly Seine-Saint-Denis, Yvelines and Dal-d’Oise, years 2001–2005 | Descriptive quantitative analysis  | The valuation of the targeted communes seems to have decreased when new social housing is built. It appears that the population of the communes targeted by SRU Law stayed rather similar, and the policy benefits well-off categories. |
| Doutreligne, P. (2009). Loi SRU pour le logement social une belle loi... en mal d application. <i>Après-demain</i> , N 11, NF (3), 14–15.   | Describing the impacts of the SRU Law on the quantity of social housing        | Ministry of ecology transition and territorial cohesion data on the financing of social housing, covers 720 communes   | Descriptive quantitative analysis  | Many of the targeted municipalities refuse to build social housing  |
| Gobillon, L. & Vignolles, B. (2016). Évaluation de l’effet d’une politique spatialisée d’accès au logement. <i>Revue économique</i> , 67(3), 615–637.   | Evaluating the effects of the SRU Law on social housing and real estate prices | FILOCOM data on housing and social housing, 2000–2004 and 2000–2008  | Quasi-experimental differences in differences analysis and regression discontinuity design | SRU had modest positive impact on the quantity of social housing; 0,35% a year. Tenure mix has increased.   |
| Górczyńska, M. (2017). Social and housing tenure mix in Paris intra-muros, 1990–2010. <i>Housing</i>  | Exploring the relationship of social mix and tenure mix in Paris               | INSEE data on professional occupations of heads of households and occupational dwellings (1990, 1999 and 2010), Social   | Cluster analysis and entropy index   | Larger number of social housing units and increasing tenure mix doesn’t seem to have created greater social mix.  |

|   |   |  |  |   |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <i>studies</i> , 32(4), 385–410.  |   | housing stock directory data on social housing landlords and City of Paris data on social housing  |  |   |
| Korsu, E. (2016). Building social mix by building social housing? An evaluation in the Paris, Lyon and Marseille Metropolitan Areas. <i>Housing studies</i> , 31(5), 598–623. | Exploring the impacts of social housing on social mix in Paris, Lyon and Marseille                            | INSEE data on housing units and completion dates of these buildings, 1999-2008   | Quantitative methodology designed for the research: parametric hypothesis test, dissimilarity index and exposure index, micro-impacts evaluation and reference to a potential comparison | The impact of social housing on social mix in Paris, Lyon, and Marseille from years 1999–2008 is modest but positive: at maximum, 1,5 %. Social housing units of wealthy areas seems to be allocated to middle class. |
| Levasseur, S. (2016). La loi SRU et les quotas de logements sociaux: Bilan et perspectives. <i>Revue française des affaires sociales</i> , 3, 113–149.                        | Describing the impacts of SRU Law on the quantity of social housing   | Data of Ministère du Logement et de l’Habitat durable on social housing, INSEE data on social housing, population, employment, tax revenues and communal facilities, years 2011–2013   | Descriptive quantitative analysis and two descriptive case studies   | Many of the targeted municipalities refuse to build social housing.   |
| Maaoui, M. (2021) The SRU Law, twenty years later: Evaluating the legacy of France's most important social housing program. <i>Housing studies</i> , 1-23.                    | Evaluating the impact of SRU Law fee on rebalancing of the quantity of social housing in targeted communities | EPLS data on social housing, FiLoSoFi data on income, INSEE data on population change and unemployment, Government local electoral results data on right/left alignment and EPTB/SoeS, Sit@del and DGFIP data on taxes and number of fiscal households. Treatment group 269 municipalities and control | Difference-in-difference analysis  | Municipalities that were subject to the fee of SRU Law have built less social housing than municipalities exempt.   |

|  |   |   |  |   |
|--|---|---|--|---|
|  |   | group 274 municipalities, years 1996–2017.  |  |   |
| Najib, K. (2020). Socio-spatial inequalities and dynamics of rich and poor enclaves in three French cities: A policy of social mixing under test. <i>Population space and place</i> , 26(1). | Exploring the development of socio-spatial inequalities before and after the implementation of social mix policies in Besançon, Mulhouse and Strasbourg | Socio-demographic data from INSEE (17 indicators) from years 1990, 1999 and 2006                                    | Multidate factorial analysis   | After the SRU law gained legal force, segregation has intensified in the studied cities   |
| Rousseau, M. (2017). La densité fait-elle la mixité? <i>Sociétés contemporaines</i> , 107(3), 23–50.   | Analyzing the policies of urban compactness and social change in Lyon   | 21 semi-directive interviews with elected officials and administrative officials of Lyon urban area and local press | Case study: qualitative analysis on interviews and local press, method not mentioned, appears to be content analysis | The policies do not change historical segregation but strengthen residential specification of west and east. In west, the new social housing units are allocated to students and population hasn't changed. |



Table 2. Mixed Methods appraisal tool (2018) checklist

Screening questions for all studies:

|     |  |
|-----|--|
| S1. | Are there clear research questions?                            |
| S2. | Do the collected data allow to address the research questions? |

Questions for qualitative studies:

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 1.1. | Is the qualitative approach appropriate to answer the research questions?                     |
| 1.2. | Are the qualitative data collection methods adequate to address the research question?        |
| 1.3. | Are the findings adequately derived from the data?  |
| 1.4. | Is the interpretation of the results sufficiently substantiated by data?                      |
| 1.5. | Is there coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation? |

Questions for quantitative randomized controlled trials:

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 2.1. | Is randomization appropriately performed?                   |
| 2.2. | Are the groups comparable at baseline?                      |
| 2.3. | Are there complete outcome data?                            |
| 2.4. | Are outcome assessors blinded to the intervention provided? |
| 2.5. | Did the participants adhere to the assigned intervention?   |

Questions for quantitative non-randomized studies:

|      |   |
|------|---|
| 3.1. | Are the participants representative of the target population?                                 |
| 3.2. | Are measurements appropriate regarding both outcome and intervention (or exposure)?           |
| 3.3. | Are there complete outcome data?  |
| 3.4. | Are the confounders accounted for in the design and analysis?                                 |
| 3.5. | During the study period, is the intervention administered (or exposure occurred) as intended? |

Questions for quantitative descriptive studies:

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 4.1. | Is the sampling strategy relevant to address the research question?      |
| 4.2. | Is the sample representative of the target population?                   |
| 4.3. | Are the measurements appropriate?  |
| 4.4. | Is the risk of nonresponse bias low?                                     |
| 4.5. | Is the statistical analysis appropriate to answer the research question? |

Questions for mixed methods studies:

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 5.1. | Is there an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design to address the research question?      |
| 5.2. | Are the different components of the study effectively integrated to answer the research question?      |
| 5.3. | Are the outputs of the integration of qualitative and quantitative components adequately interpreted?  |
| 5.4. | Are divergences and inconsistencies between quantitative and qualitative results adequately addressed? |

|      |  |
|------|--|
| 5.5. | Do the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of each tradition of the methods involved? |
|------|--|

Answer options:

| Yes | No | Can't tell | Comments |
|-----|----|------------|----------|
|-----|----|------------|----------|

This Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool was developed by Hong, G.N., Pluye, P., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M-P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O’Cathain, A., Rousseau, M-C., Vedel, I. (2018). Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT), version 2018. Registration copyright (#1148552), Canadian Intellectual Property Office, Industry Canada.

Table 3. Critical appraisal of the research material

| Article   | Answers to screening questions  | Answers to methodology-specific questions  |
|---|---|--|
| Bacqué, M., Fijalkow, Y., Launay, L., & Vermeersch, S. (2011). Social Mix Policies in Paris: Discourses, Policies and Social Effects. <i>International journal of urban and regional research</i> , 35(2), 256–273. | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>5.1 Yes: there is an adequate rationale for using a mixed methods design</p> <p>5.2 Yes: the different components are effectively integrated to answer the research question.</p> <p>5.3 Yes: the outputs of both qualitative and quantitative components are adequately addressed.</p> <p>5.4 Yes: the divergences between and inconsistencies between qualitative and quantitative results are adequately addressed.</p> <p>5.5 Yes: the different components of the study adhere to the quality criteria of the methods involved</p>                 |
| Beaubrun-Diant, K., & Maury, T. (2022). On the Impact of Public Housing on Income Segregation in France. <i>Demography</i> , 59(2), 685–706.  | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>3.1 Yes: the sample is representative.</p> <p>3.2 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.</p> <p>3.3 Yes: there is complete outcome data.</p> <p>3.4 Yes: the confounders are accounted for in the design and analysis.</p> <p>3.5 Yes: during the study period, the exposure occurred as intended.</p>  |
| Blanc, M. (2010). The Impact of Social Mix Policies in France. <i>Housing studies</i> , 25(2), 257–272.   | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>1.1 Yes: the qualitative approach is appropriate to answer the research questions.</p> <p>1.2 Yes: the qualitative data collection methods are adequate to address the research questions.</p> <p>1.3 Yes: the findings are adequately derived from data.</p> <p>1.4 Yes: the interpretation of results is sufficiently substantiated by data.</p> <p>1.5 Yes: There is coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation.</p> <p>Comments: complementary information was received through email from the author.</p> |
| Desage, F. (2016). "Un peuplement de qualité". Mise en oeuvre de la loi SRU dans le périurbain résidentiel aisé et discrimination discrète. <i>Gouvernement &amp; action publique</i> , 5(3), 83–112.               | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>1.1 Yes: the qualitative approach is appropriate to answer the research questions.</p> <p>1.2 Yes: the qualitative data collection methods are adequate to address the research questions.</p> <p>1.3 Yes: the findings are adequately derived from data.</p> <p>1.4 Yes: the interpretation of results is sufficiently substantiated by data.</p> <p>1.5 Yes: there is coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis, and interpretation.</p>   |
| Desponds, D. (2010). Effets paradoxaux de la loi Sol-   | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p>   | <p>4.1 Yes: the sampling strategy is relevant to address the research question.</p> <p>4.2 Yes: the sample is representative.</p> <p>4.3 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.</p>  |

|   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>idarité et renouvellement urbains (sru) et profil des acquéreurs de biens immobiliers en Île-de-France. <i>Espaces et sociétés</i>, 140-141(1), 37-58.</p>   | <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p>   | <p>4.4 Yes: the risk of nonresponse bias is low.<br/>4.5 The statistical analysis is appropriate to answer the research question.</p>   |
| <p>Doutreligne, P. (2009). Loi SRU pour le logement social une belle loi... en mal d application. <i>Après-demain</i>, N 11, NF (3), 14-15.</p>                 | <p>S1. Can't tell: the research question is not expressed explicitly, but it can be interpreted.<br/><br/>S2. Can't tell: the data seems to allow the answering, but the research question is not explicitly expressed.</p> | <p>4.1 Can't tell: the sample is described well, but the research question is not expressed explicitly.<br/>4.2 Yes: the sample is representative.<br/>4.3 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.<br/>4.4 Yes, the risk of nonresponse bias is low.<br/>4.5 Can't tell: it seems that the statistical analysis is appropriate, but the research questions are not expressed explicitly.</p> |
| <p>Gobillon, L. &amp; Vignolles, B. (2016). Évaluation de l'effet d'une politique spatialisée d'accès au logement. <i>Revue économique</i>, 67(3), 615-637.</p> | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.<br/><br/>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p>   | <p>3.1 Yes: the sample is representative.<br/>3.2 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.<br/>3.3 Yes: there is complete outcome data.<br/>3.4 Yes: the confounders are accounted for in the design and analysis.<br/>3.5 Yes: the exposure has occurred as intended during the study period.</p>  |
| <p>Górczyńska, M. (2017). Social and housing tenure mix in Paris intra-muros, 1990-2010. <i>Housing studies</i>, 32(4), 385-410.</p>                            | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.<br/><br/>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p>   | <p>3.1 Yes: the sample is representative.<br/>3.2 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.<br/>3.3 Yes, there is complete outcome data.<br/>3.4 Yes: the confounders are accounted for in the design and analysis.<br/>3.5 Yes: the exposure has occurred as intended during the study period.</p>  |

|  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Korsu, E. (2016). Building social mix by building social housing? An evaluation in the Paris, Lyon and Marseille Metropolitan Areas. <i>Housing studies</i>, 31(5), 598–623.</p>                | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>3.1 Yes: the sample is representative.<br/> 3.2 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.<br/> 3.3 Yes: there is complete outcome data.<br/> 3.4 Yes: the confounders are accounted for in the design and analysis.<br/> 3.5 Yes: the exposure has occurred as intended during the study period.<br/> Comment: it appears that the study is very well conducted, but as it uses methodology designed for the study and I am not an expert, I could not reassure this. More information was asked via email, but I did not receive an answer.</p> |
| <p>Levasseur, S. (2016). La loi SRU et les quotas de logements sociaux: Bilan et perspectives. <i>Revue française des affaires sociales</i>, 3, 113–149.</p>                                       | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>4.1 Yes: the sampling strategy is relevant to address the research questions.<br/> 4.2 Yes: the sample is representative.<br/> 4.3 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.<br/> 4.4 Yes: the risk of nonresponse bias is low.<br/> 4.5 Yes: the statistical analysis is appropriate to answer the research questions.</p>  |
| <p>Maaoui, M. (2021). The SRU Law, twenty years later: Evaluating the legacy of France's most important social housing program. <i>Housing studies</i>, 1-23.</p>                                  | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>3.1 Yes, the sample is representative.<br/> 3.2 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.<br/> 3.3 Yes: there is complete outcome data.<br/> 3.4 Yes: the confounders are accounted for in the design and analysis.<br/> 3.5 Yes: during the study period, the exposure occurred as intended.</p>  |
| <p>Najib, K. (2020). Socio-spatial inequalities and dynamics of rich and poor enclaves in three French cities: A policy of social mixing under test. <i>Population space and place</i>, 26(1).</p> | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>3.1 Yes: the sample is representative.<br/> 3.2 Yes: the measurements are appropriate.<br/> 3.3 Yes: there is complete outcome data.<br/> 3.4 Yes: the confounders are accounted for in the analysis.<br/> 3.5 Yes: during the study period, the exposure occurred as intended.</p>   |
| <p>Rousseau, M. (2017). La densité fait-elle la mixité? <i>Sociétés contemporaines</i>, 107(3), 23–50.</p>   | <p>S1. Yes: there are clear research questions.</p> <p>S2. Yes: the data allows to answer the research questions.</p> | <p>1.1 Yes: the qualitative approach is appropriate to answer the research questions.<br/> 1.2 Yes: the qualitative data collection methods are adequate to address the research question.<br/> 1.3 Yes, the findings are adequately derived from the data.<br/> 1.4 Yes: the interpretation of results is sufficiently substantiated by data.<br/> 1.5 Yes: there is coherence between qualitative data sources, collection, analysis and interpretation.</p>   |