Chapters 4 and 5 examine how Singaporean labour conditions and cultural assumptions often conflict with Filipino nurses' expectations, aspirations, and sense of professional status. In the Philippines, nurses are associated with middle-class professionalism and their work is focused on medical tasks, while in Singapore, they fulfill more care-related tasks such as bathing, bedside care, and elder care – duties that are seen as the role of family members in the Philippines. Furthermore, they encounter stereotypical associations of Filipinos with low status, domestic and unskilled care labour. Hence, their expectations of social mobility through migration are undermined by the reality of ethnic stereotypes and the less professional nature of care work expected of them in Singapore. Similarly, their expectations that they will share "Asian values" with Singaporeans are challenged by cultural prejudices that stereotype them as backward and as maids. Singaporeans assert a First World superiority, while Filipinos react by asserting their superiority as more authentic English speakers, more spiritual people (as Catholics), and more caring and family-oriented. In spite of these clashes in ethnic relations and expectations, Amrith points out that nurses do develop bonds of trust with their patients, sharing intimate activities as well as some sense of shared Asianness and sometimes, class identity.

Chapter 6 examines the relations and social boundaries between Filipino nurses and Filipino domestic workers in Singapore. While one might expect social solidarity among Filipino migrants, Amrith demonstrates how nurses engage in boundary maintenance to separate themselves from lower-status domestic workers, given the similarity in care work between these two groups. While domestic workers spend time socializing at the Filipino "Lucky Plaza" on their Sundays off and are involved in community life, nurses avoid this venue and live quiet, private lives at home. Amrith explains that nurses not only seek to separate themselves socially from lower-status, "immodest, noisy, and morally-inferior" domestics; they also see themselves as only temporarily in Singapore on their way to better things. Thus, they spend their time planning their future migrations abroad, connecting with home, and resting in their apartments, rather than investing in a larger Singaporean Filipino community. Domestic workers, in contrast, lack private space since they typically live with their employers, have less possibility of onward migration, and therefore seek to build a social life outside of their isolating domestic work.

Chapters 7 and 8 explore Filipino migrants' sense of Singapore as a transit city, a temporary home on the way to somewhere better, usually the West. Importantly, Amrith adds nuance to studies of migration, by writing not just about migration as a series of circular movements between home and elsewhere, but rather, a sense of moving "on and on" in search of home. Nurses spend a lot of time preparing to move on, by studying for exams, contacting recruitment agencies, putting in applications, and networking, while imagining a future home elsewhere and living quiet lives in Singapore without putting down roots. They romanticise "home" in the Philippines and maintain social ties there, but do not imagine it as a place to live in the future. While they may struggle overseas, they construct narratives of success and when they return home on visits, display symbols of conspicuous consumption, all the while hoping for a better life in the West. Some, however, get stuck in Singapore, unable to move on, and begin to reimagine it as home. Life in Singapore thus represents a series of tensions – between living daily life and imagining a future elsewhere, between aspirations and harsher realities of labour and social conditions, and between a desire for community and a distancing from it through class, aspirational, and ethnic distinctions.

It is these tensions that are at the heart of Amrith's analysis. Her unique contribution is this exploration of the particular tensions experienced by semiprofessional migrants, a group often ignored in favour of studying low-wage, unskilled migrants. In Singapore, this group's identity and aspirations depend upon boundary maintenance within their own ethnic community, while attempting to reaffirm their professionalism in a society that does not afford them the status they expect. Throughout their migrant experience, they attempt to negotiate their place in the world in relation to diverse others, and alter their self-understandings and aspirations in the process. This study aptly demonstrates the layers of complexity involved for migrants who attempt to establish a sense of identity and belonging abroad – not simply examining difficulties in belonging that result from cultural differences – but also those that result from complex gender, class, and inter- and intra-ethnic dynamics as well as perceptions of oneself and one's place in a globalized world.

Jen Pylypa

Atkinson, Will: Beyond Bourdieu. From Genetic Structuralism to Relational Phenomenology. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2016. 175 pp. ISBN 978-1-5095-0749-8. Price: € 19.90

Pierre Bourdieu's influence on a vast array of disciplines, from anthropology to literary criticism, art history, geography, and beyond is evident in the continued engagements with his work well over a decade since his death in 2002. His audiences reach across the globe, and scholars take up different aspects of his work depending upon their own interests and their readings of his prodigious body of writings. This leads to multiple uses and adaptations of Bourdieu's key ideas, and selections from the menu he set out for us of tools for thinking about social life. One of these is the concept of field, which Bourdieu developed in the course of both his understanding of state power (operating in large part through the bureaucratic field) and of the ways in which social domination occurs through strategies to deploy and enhance the value of symbolic and cultural capital in various fields (academic, literary, artistic, economic) that are what Bourdieu considered to be subregions of social space.

Will Atkinson is a sociologist based in the U.K. who, in "Beyond Bourdieu," brings a psychological-phenomenological reading to Bourdieu's analyses of social life and aims to extend Bourdieu's thought, particularly his

concept of field, by focusing more on the individual. The subtitle of the book includes the terms "genetic structuralism" and "relational phenomenology." Bourdieu referred to his own work as a version of the former in his book "The Field of Cultural Production" (1993), insisting that he was interested both in the genesis of social structures and the genesis of the dispositions of social agents (their habitus) who both produce and reflect those structures. His theory of habitus argued that the habitus is itself "generative" and "structuring" of practices. Bourdieu used and developed the concepts of habitus and social space to explore the underlying structures that were not apparent to social actors in their everyday lives. There is a long history to the phrase "genetic structuralism," before Bourdieu applied it to his own approach, which Atkinson does not get into and which I do not have the space to explore here. Atkinson signals in his use of the phrase that he is interested in Bourdieu's understanding of structure, and this phrase is used to briefly sum up what that entails without much elaboration. Instead, the approach of "relational phenomenology," adapted from the work of Lois McNay ("Against Recognition." 2008) and focusing on the "individual's lifeworld," is focus for Atkinson as he re-reads Bourdieu's work and seeks expand to upon it through an engagement with this concept.

Atkinson, who has written extensively about social class, work, and family life in Britain, has a few quibbles with Bourdieu that he hopes to rectify. First, he believes that Bourdieu did not sufficiently address the ways in which fields are related to each other nor upon the processes through which individuals move across different fields. Second, Atkinson believes that Bourdieu neglected to examine those early childhood experiences that would lead to the development of the habitus. And lastly, he does not feel that Bourdieu looked closely enough at the specific ways in which "the family" operates as a field in its own right. To demonstrate both the inadequacies of Bourdieu for these questions and to apply the approach of "relational phenomenology" to better address them, Atkinson devotes four chapters (following the "Introduction") to "The Lifeworld," "The Field of Family Relations," "Social Becoming," and "Gender." An epilogue to the book outlines what Atkinson proposes as a "Sketch of a Research Programme."

Atkinson's overall approach is one of reworking Bourdieu's concepts of "habitat" and "legitimation chains" (neither of which are extremely well known to more casual readers of Bourdieu) into those of "lifeworld" and "circuits of symbolic power." Rather than take "field" as the starting point, as many interpreters of Bourdieu's work have done, Atkinson argues that the individual and their movement across time and space (their lifeworld) which creates and is constrained by "circuits of symbolic power" is a better approach. The battles over Bourdieu's understanding of social agency, it appears from this book, continue to thrive. In some ways, Atkinson throws Bourdieu's theory on its head, since Bourdieu wanted to dismantle the entire dichotomy between structure and agency but in so doing focused more on social relations rather than specific individuals (the "epistemic" person or social agent, rather than the "empirical" person). Atkinson offers a corrective by placing the accent on the individual without forgetting the structures of power.

In some places, Atkinson overstates or simplifies Bourdieu's work to make his points. His charge that Bourdieu was not interested in the relationship between fields is hard to fathom. This seems based on a lack of understanding the difference between social space and field in Bourdieu's thought. For example, Atkinson (15) claims that Bourdieu's notion of "cleft habitus" arose from "movement within one field, the social space." This ignores an understanding of the role of regional geography in Bourdieu's understanding of the divisions of French social space, as well as the academic field that produced this split habitus. The social space is not one field, but composed of many fields, including the field of power.

Atkinson situates his work within other existing and previous scholarship on Bourdieu, primarily English-language sources, but fails to mention the work of two key writers – one of whom is a fellow sociologist, Derek Robbins, who has written several important books on Bourdieu's work; and the other anthropologist Deborah Reed-Danahay, whose book "Locating Bourdieu" (2005) is also relevant to the arguments made by Atkinson.

I sympathize with the author's claim that Bourdieu did not focus enough on exactly how it is that "real" individual people navigate social life and (re)produce structures of domination in their everyday lives. I also sympathize with his claim that too much work has taken "the field" too narrowly as the basis for adopting Bourdieu's approach. However, I also wonder if this book strays a bit too far out of the orbit of Bourdieu's key theoretical and empirical contributions. In any case, it is worth considering Atkinson's arguments, and following how he develops them further in future work. This book will be of particular interest to scholars in the sociology of education, psychological sociology, the family, and gender studies.

Deborah Reed-Danahay

Banerjee, Supurna: Activism and Agency in India. Nurturing Resistance in the Tea Plantations. London: Routledge, 2017. 204 pp. ISBN 978-1-138-23842-8. Price: £ 105.00

In her recent ethnography "Activism and Agency in India," the anthropologist, Supurna Banerjee, looks at tea plantations in Dooars in the northeast Indian state of West Bengal. She argues that most of the literature on plantations has been focused on plantations as economic spaces, whereas her study wants to look at plantations as social spaces instead. It is based on 15 months of ethnographic fieldwork, which she conducted between 2010 and 2012 in the course of her PhD research. A comparative approach between two plantations as fieldwork sites is central for the author to understand findings in a broader context through juxtaposition. Therefore, she picked two plantations that differ from each other in size, profitability, and political organisation. Her research is guided by the main question of, "how do agency and activism play out within a gendered space" (9). Banerjee regards a class