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Introduction

Calling into question the existencial relation of physically disabled people with space

Physically disabled people can they really choose their medico-social structure?

Study of residential itineraries of physically disabled people from 20 to 59 years old living into a medico-social structure
Context

• 1975 - Act N 75-535 of 30 June 1975 on the social and medical institutions: provides special institutions with legal foundation and national management rules

• 2002 - Act N 2002-2 of 2 January 2002, ‘renovating social and medico-social action’: new rules and regulations regarding provisions, quality criteria and choice of the users

- A daunting array of special institutions run by associations and financed by the State
Location of the four ‘foyers de vie’

- Capacity (in number of residents)
  - 0
  - [0.01-0.030]
  - [0.031-0.060]
  - (0.060 – [ ]

- Penetration rate (‰)
  - From 0 to 19
  - From 20 to 39
  - 40 and more

- Foyer de vie concerned
## Method (1)

### ‘Foyers de vie’ - synthesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Township</th>
<th>Managing associations</th>
<th>Number of disabled people into the ‘Foyer de vie’</th>
<th>Number of disabled people in the structure</th>
<th>Structure area</th>
<th>Bedroom area</th>
<th>Number of residents/Bathroom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foyer de vie Le Pont de Flandre</td>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>ARIMC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>500 m²</td>
<td>9 à 14 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Résidence Bernard Palissy</td>
<td>Joinville-le-Pont</td>
<td>APF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3 000 m²</td>
<td>22 à 34 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyer de vie Pierre Floucault</td>
<td>Meaux</td>
<td>APF</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>5 000 m²</td>
<td>26 à 28,25 m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyer de vie Louis Fiévet</td>
<td>Bouffémont</td>
<td>APF</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3 200 m²</td>
<td>15 m²</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: N. Rapegno
Method (2)

- 4 structures in Paris area

Interviews:
- 43 residents / 47
  - institutional path
  - admission
  - spatial and social practices (collective and individual)
  - desire

- Manager (organization of the structure)
- Coordinator (activities)
- Medical staff (residents’ disability)

Work shadowing
Results (1)

Interviews:

- a limited residential mobility

- Some difficulties in appropriating their living place
### Geographical origin of the residents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>75</th>
<th>77</th>
<th>78</th>
<th>91</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>93</th>
<th>94</th>
<th>95</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louis Fiévet</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Floucault</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Résidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pont de Flandre</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Résidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernard Palissy</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Nombre of previous foyers de vie attended

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2 et plus</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foyer Louis Fiévet</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foyer Pierre Floucault</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pont de Flandre</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Résidence Bernard Palissy</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Living territory
(structure B. Palissy)

Socio-cultural activities

- Stade de France (Saint-Denis – 93)
- Cinéma (Créteil -94)
- Spectacles (Paris)
- Parc des expositions (Paris)

athletic activities

- Bowling (Joinville-le-Pont – 94)
- Piscine (Joinville-le-Pont – 94)

Economic activities

- Centre commercial (Créteil -94)

Work / studies

- Peinture
- Gymnaqtique
- Théâtre
- Mosaique
- Arts plastiques
- Informatique
- Boccia
- Sarbacane
- Etudes (Paris)

Territory accessibility

- By car
- By foot
- Into the structure

Activity frequencies

- Regular activity (daily or weekly)
- Occasional activity
Living territory
(Structure L. Fiévet)
Shops
- Bar, restaurant
- Delicatessen
- Market place
- Paper house
- Shops

Others
- Foyer de vie
- Bank
- CMP

Weekly path
- Streets highly frequented
- Living territory used by every resident
- Living territory less used

Living territory of the residents in Joinville-le-Pont
Living territory of the residents in Bouffémont
Outlook

PHD:

✔ Studying dynamics of structures’ localization (national scale)

✔ Comparing residents’ daily itineraries and daily itineraries of disabled people living at home (local scale)

Thanks for your attention.