I first met Céline Chatigny in 1994 at the IEA conference in Toronto—more specifically, at the symposium on "*Work Analysis and Training*" organized by Sylvie Montreuil and Catherine Teiger. She presented her initial research with Nicole Vézina on how to reduce the risk of musculoskeletal disorders in slaughterhouses (Chatigny & Vézina, 1994; Chatigny & Vézina, 1995). Her demonstration of the importance of knife sharpening was a shining example of clarity. This was already proof of the quality of the research carried out by this group led by Nicole Vézina, which is now widely recognized. But in Céline's presentation, I understood the power that commitment can give when it is driven by a genuine curiosity—as hers is.

At the time, we were about to launch a Master's program in work psychology at the University of Porto, which focused on working conditions that, when harmful to health, contribute to processes of exclusion. Céline's work obviously had a place there, and we invited her to present it. The students found it extremely enriching for the development of their academic work.

This also coincided with the early stages of her doctoral studies at the CNAM. I was a member of her thesis jury: what a pleasure it was to rediscover her remarkable approach to empirical research, combining attention to detail, precision in the data collected, and a concern never to lose sight of the societal issues illustrated by her analyses.

It was thus, with workers operating on water networks, that she advanced her valuable thinking on the shortcomings of workplace training, the inadequacy of allocated resources, and the implementation of meta-functional activities, which are so important yet undervalued, if not prevented altogether (Chatigny, 2001).

However, when discussing her research during the webinar, Céline also said: " You may be wondering what I made of gender in these masculine contexts. These are virile environments where brute strength is valued, and pain is trivialized."

In truth, her question resonates strongly with many of us: we often cut our teeth on projects designed with a general perspective of solidarity, without making any gender distinctions in our analysis of work situations.

This was also the basis of the major movement that, in Quebec in the late 1970s, particularly following an asbestos miners' strike, profoundly transformed both research practices in the field of working conditions and training practices (Teiger & Lacomblez, 2013, Part 2, 2.4).

The main goal was to provide scientific and technical support for workers' actions in the field of occupational health and safety. From the outset, the design of their training activities was very often inspired by Brazilian Paulo Freire's *"Pedagogy of the Oppressed*." (Freire, 1967/2000).

We know how much Paulo Freire's approach was in line with interventions carried out in other parts of the world, notably by the CNAM team, where the advantage of work activity analysis opened a particularly stimulating field for participatory approaches. This is a field that the IEA's Technical Committee *on Ergonomic Work Analysis and Training (*EWAT) has undertaken to develop. This is because activity analysis, using a method that aims to be differential, encourages the identification of what may seem like details but are in fact revealing of factors that challenge the ergonomics project. This is the source of its heuristic power. Catherine Teiger has elaborated on this at length (Teiger & Laville, 1972), and it has become essential reading for Céline.

Furthermore, Karen Messing recognized how gender relations play a role in these differentiating factors (Messing, 1998). The central question then concerns the analysis of the "details" that provide a better understanding of where male and female workers are located within the production process. What do they do, what jobs and specific activities are performed by one and the other, what levels of qualification are they granted, what skills are expected, and what career paths are ultimately pursued or prevented? What health developments are specific to them or shared?

Thus, in 2006, the Technical Committee *on Gender and Work* defined this subject matter for discussion among ergonomists. From the outset, this TC was clearly a continuation of the TC EWAT, accompanying Céline's career and concerns.

I deliberately refer here to the term "concern" because, as I listened to Céline's presentation, I was reminded of one of Kafka's most famous quotes: “In the battle between yourself and the world, act as second to the world” (Kafka, 1917/2022, p. 106).

This is because her understanding of the evolution of our scientific paradigms has always been situated in a broader temporal context, sensitive to the social imperatives of a world undergoing successive upheavals.

Having been trained in the Quebec school of research conducted jointly with trade unions, it is clear to her that the outcome of research and action projects is not solely a matter of scientific progress.

It is also from this perspective that the inherently multidisciplinary nature of her work has emerged.

These are challenges specific to scientists who do not shy away from the ferment of these encounters with union activists or colleagues from other disciplines. They also push them to excel in the contributions they make to their colleagues—and I am happy to refer here to what Céline has achieved in recent years in the field of professional skills development, by emphasizing the link between skills and health, particularly in vocational training centres.

Well done and thank you, Céline.

Marianne Lacomblez

Full Professor Emeritus
CPUP – Center for Psychology at the University of Porto
Faculty of Psychology and Education Sciences – University of Porto
Rua Alfredo Allen, 4200–135 Porto, Portugal
http://www.fpce.up.pt | lacomb@fpce.up.pt

Bibliographical references:

Chatigny, C. (2001). *La construction de ressources opératoires. Contribution à la conception des conditions de formation en situation de travail*. Thèse de doctorat d'ergonomie, Conservatoire National des Arts et Métier, Paris, 293p.

Chatigny, C. & Vézina, N. (1994). Conditions d'apprentissage du métier dans un abattoir : un handicap pour les travailleurs qui utilisent un couteau. *Performances Humaines et Techniques, Dossier Formation,* 71, 29-38.

Chatigny, C., & Vézina, N. (1995). Analyse du travail et apprentissage d'une tâche complexe ; étude de l'affilage du couteau dans un abattoir. *Travail Humain,* 58, 3, 229-252.

Freire, P. (1967/2000). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Kafka, F, (1917/2022). *The Zürau Aphorisms of Franz Kafka* (translated from the German by Shelley Frisch). Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Messing, K. (1998). *One-eyed Science: Occupational Health and Women Workers.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Teiger, C. & Lacomblez, M. (2013). *(Se) Former pour transformer le travail : Dynamiques de constructions d'une analyse critique du travail.* Québec : Ed. Presses

Universitaires de Laval & Bruxelles : Ed. European Trade Union Institut (Partie 2, 2.4 : Détails et nuances au Québec).

Teiger, C., et Laville, A. (1972). Nature et variations de l'activité mentale dans des tâches répétitives : essai d'évaluation de la charge de travail. *Le Travail Humain*, *35*(1-2), 99-116.