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Abstract

The Cosmopolitan Play: A Biographical Network Approach

The ´Cosmopolitan Play´ is used as a metaphor to reflect the multiple contexts and ways that people act and play with the ´other´ in the contemporary global era. The study expands the cosmopolitan perspective by questioning a widely held assumption in much of the existing literature that cosmopolitanism and a ´cosmopolitan stance´ (Hannerz 1990) – an openness and willingness to engage with the ´other´ - is associated with mobile people. This assumption has led to three dimensions being mainly ignored in the literature, these are: 1) a ´middle group´ of movers that are neither mobile elites nor displaced people, 2) the significance of non-movers, and 3) temporality. Rather than defining the cosmopolitan stance as an elite identity, in this study it is seen as the reflexive contestation of essentialised identities formed around social boundaries such as those based on nationality, social class, ethnicity, religion and so forth (Jones 2007). Hence, the overarching research question posed is how may someone evolve a cosmopolitan stance? To answer this, a biographical network approach was developed to analyse in tandem the life stories and ego-networks of 28 non-elite young (aged 23 – 35) British and Spanish movers and non-movers living in Madrid and Manchester in terms of their cosmopolitan conviviality – the extent and quality of personal relationships initiated and maintained through face-to-face social interaction with others that are objectively different. The approach follows three axes of investigation: convivial horizons (x), people´s social interactions across national boundaries; convivial depths (y), people´s social interactions across social class, ethnic, religious and other social boundaries, within and across national boundaries; and convivial paths (z), the wider biographical contexts of people´s interactions. The study´s findings lend support to the critique of equating mobility with cosmopolitanism (Glick Schiller et al. 2011), yet they show that mobility inside and outside national boundaries together with subsequent settlement is influential for whether people not only transcend social boundaries, but also contest them. Additionally, while nationality, class, gender and so forth shape the parameters of people´s cosmopolitan conviviality and the articulation thereof, they were not seen as decisive in the openness and willingness of people to engage with the ´other´. Instead, a life path that demanded the negotiation of uncertainty and unfamiliarity from an early age due to either familial problems or difficulties of fitting in at school or the wider ´home´ environment was influential in the evolution of a more cosmopolitan convivial stance. The intersection of each axis culminates in a three dimensional view which shows how someone evolves one of four broad but distinctive convivial spheres and stances: national, metropolitan, trans-national and cosmopolitan. The theoretical underpinnings of the biographical network approach enable more complexity and detail of the cosmopolitan play to be captured, which in turn enhances the cosmopolitan perspective. The study illustrates how methods can be mixed in a qualitatively driven way (Mason 2006), and demonstrates the added value of combining qualitative and quantitative methods in network analysis (Crossley 2010, Edwards 2010, Hollstein 2011).
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Introduction

1.1 Prologue

Over the past two decades the dynamics of globalization have led to an acceleration of global migratory flows and human mobility. As a result people of an ‘other’ nationality, race and faith with distinctive cultural heritages and practices are increasingly living side by side. This reality provides the backdrop of a study which focuses specifically on this cohabitation and interaction between people of different backgrounds to explore how someone may gain an understanding and acceptance of the ‘other’.

To date the cosmopolitan literature has tended to focus on the winners and the victims of globalization, the mobile economic, social and political elites on one side versus economic migrants, refugees and so forth on the other. This has come at the expense of exploring the ‘everyday’ interaction between people of different nationalities, races, faiths and classes that are neither elites nor victims. Yet I suggest it is this middle group of people that are more likely in their everyday lives to engage with the ‘other’, be it in their places of residence, work or play. This study explores the consequences of such engagement on people’s attitudes and behaviours towards the ‘other’.

Therefore, the aim of the study is to explore how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance (Hannerz 1990), whereby in and through face-to-face social interaction a person becomes more tolerant, hospitable, at ease with the unfamiliar -a ‘self’ that is open and willing to engage with the other. The ‘Cosmopolitan Play’ is used as a metaphor throughout this thesis to reflect the multiple contexts and ways that people act and play with the ‘other’. The concept of ‘cosmopolitan conviviality’ is used to explore people’s patterns of social interaction, and the diversity and quality of their relationships within this play. However, like any play, this production is dependent on the casting and the direction. Here, the cast consists of non-elite young British and Spanish adults living and working in Madrid and Manchester, who under the direction of a Biographical Network Approach are given the freedom to explore and express their experiences and sentiments surrounding their experiences with ‘others’.

Using the concept of the cosmopolitan stance, this study builds from a simple premise. If ‘self’ is open and willing to engage with the ‘other’, then, for this to occur, the ‘other’ must
simultaneously be open and willing to engage with ‘self’. In practice this means that for the cosmopolitan stance to evolve, ‘self’ and ‘other’ are interdependent co-actors. However, to date, cosmopolitan theorising has tended to focus on the mobile ‘self’ (elite or victim) in favour of the non-mobile ‘self’, and not considered the interaction between them. This short sightedness of not looking at the conviviality of and between movers and non-movers has resulted in empirical and theoretical gaps within the literature which will be explored in Chapter 2. The intention here is not to equate mobility with cosmopolitanism (Glick Schiller et al. 2011), and by doing so, not to marginalise the non-mobile or national ‘self’ within the cosmopolitan debate or overlook their role within social change.

Therefore, to broaden the cosmopolitan perspective, this study gives equal billing to the mobile self and the non-mobile self, movers and non-movers, through exploring the diversity of their conviviality within the Cosmopolitan Play. Additionally, by acknowledging that the ‘other’ may take numerous guises, the cosmopolitan conviviality inside and outside people’s national boundaries is explored. Here, a distinction is made between people’s convivial width, conviviality across the social boundary of nationality, and convivial depth, conviviality across other social boundaries such as social class, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality. These two axes of exploration are complemented by a third temporal axis. Convivial paths explore the familial, local and national contexts in which people evolve their convivial horizons and depths on their life-path from ‘home’ to ‘world’ (Tuan 1996).

Using a social interaction perspective, the study sees objective attributes or social categories as tools used by co-actors to initially navigate social interaction with unfamiliar others to uphold a working definition of the situation and maintain face (Goffman 1990). This study acknowledges that historically social categories, with which social science explores and understands the social world, change and evolve. Yet to explore this change, one remains reliant on these categories. Therefore, the social categories of nationality, class and gender among others are used as the criteria for the casting of actors in this cosmopolitan play, in other words, to construct the purposive sample. The transition from education into working life is associated with the increasing multitude and diversity of ‘others’ with which people can engage. In other words, this stage of life provides a useful lens through which to study the three dimensions of cosmopolitan conviviality. Therefore young adults are cast in all the roles. To further cosmopolitan theorising, the study analyses how these young actors define and discuss difference within and beyond social categories living in an epoch that has been termed by Robert Fine (2002) as an ‘age of cosmopolitanism’.
However using the social interaction framework forwarded by Bjorn Eriksson (2007), I suggest the cosmopolitan stance is associated with the social process of making the unfamiliar familiar, whereby co-actors transcend social categories to develop a relationship based on the emotional value of connection, which provides a source of convivial joy and belonging for both parties. This is an experiential process which involves ‘self’ and ‘other’ shifting from predominantly objective to predominantly subjective social interaction positions. The co-actors develop a relationship where both are subjects to one another, such that a bond exists between them. A bond is distinguished from an objective, more instrumental, tie in that it remains socially present to self even if not physically present; it exists in co-absence as well as co-presence, and is irreplaceable within the biography of the individual. When such a relationship exists between actors, their respective objective differences may remain significant to an outside audience or a ‘generalised other’ (Mead 1984, Goffman 1990), such as an interested researcher. Yet together at the inter-subjective level the co-actors have transcended the particular symbolic boundary or boundaries that initially differentiated them.

Through self-reflexivity co-actors have the possibility of becoming aware of the social boundaries they have overcome, which makes them more likely to contest essentialised identities (Jones 2007), a characteristic used to identify a cosmopolitan stance. By not using essentialised categories or identities such as those based on nationality or ethnicity, both actors potentially become more tolerant, hospitable and at ease with the unfamiliar, knowledgeable that social boundaries can be overcome at an inter-subjective level. Therefore to offer an answer to how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance it is necessary to analyse people’s experiences of cosmopolitan conviviality throughout their lives, the opportunities they have had to transcend social boundaries and contest essentialised identities by developing bonds with others.

Whereas the cosmopolitan literature tends to emphasize the elites or victims of globalization, this study follows the example of Lamont and Aksartova (2002) by looking at non-elites. Lamont and Aksartova explored the strategies that non-college educated white and black workers in the United States and white and North African workers in France use to bridge racial boundaries in everyday life. These strategies they term ‘ordinary cosmopolitanisms’. Whilst not analysing the conviviality between the groups in either location or how ‘self’ may evolve a cosmopolitan stance, they highlight how the groups draw on distinctive yet extensive socio-cultural repertoires to overcome racial difference and develop a wider sense of belonging to humankind. In conclusion they argue,
Cosmopolitan agendas should be extended to understanding how people do boundary work in everyday life across national and structural contexts. We need to get a better comparative grasp on how the elite and the non-elite members of different societies draw and overcome boundaries, because the mechanisms and mutual relationships are different and specific cultural repertoires are shaped by different structural conditions/.../we are arguing for the need for the scholarship itself to open up new theoretical and empirical horizons and contemplate the existence of non-intellectual forms of inclusive thinking and acting. (Lamont & Aksartova 2002:18)

A Biographical Network Approach was developed to direct this production of the Cosmopolitan Play, and responds to the call by Lamont and Aksartova above. It explores and analyses the convivial lives and tales of young non-elite British and Spanish actors in relation to how they act towards and think about the ‘other’. The approach combines the biographical perspective with a formal social network perspective to create a method that is greater than the sum of its parts. The study contributes to the methodological debate surrounding mixed methods (Mason 2006), and answers calls for combining qualitative methods with formal social network analysis (Crossley 2010, Edwards 2010, Hollstein 2011). The Biographical Sociogram Interview (BSI) specifically designed for the study is a ‘mixed method’, merging a life-story interview method with a participant-aided sociogram method. The methodological approach and the BSI method together with its corresponding method of analysis are presented fully in Chapter 3. The method will be of significant interest to researchers looking for an innovative methodological approach to the study of ‘self’ and ‘other’, social networks, and the evolution of social behaviour and attitudes.

In sum, the biographical network approach enables a more thorough exploration of cosmopolitan conviviality in order to see how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance. The theoretical and methodological shift to the inter-subjective acknowledges that selves are social (Burkit 2008), and contributes to the cosmopolitan perspective by recognising the role that non-movers and temporality play within it. The analysis starts with looking at non-elite young British and Spanish movers’ and non-movers’ convivial horizons, followed by an analysis of their convivial depths and paths. By casting non-movers on the criteria that they are acquainted with people of a different nationality, this particular production of the cosmopolitan play does not account for actors that are unacquainted with other nationals.

Over the remaining pages of the Introduction I outline how this study contributes to a broadening of the theoretical, methodological and empirical horizons of the cosmopolitanism perspective. I first justify why I am doing this study and why it comes at an appropriate time. I
then provide a program for this particular production which outlines the structure of the thesis.

1.2 Why this Study and Why Now

When reviewing literature within the field of cultural cosmopolitan (Boon & Delanty 2007), I was struck by the lack of attention that had been paid to the role of non-movers within the cosmopolitan play. Non-mover actors tended to be either pushed into the wings or seen as homogenous national audiences that mobile elites negotiate and transcend, used to juxtapose the more open attitudes and behaviours of mobile elites. Yet from my own life experiences I suspected that the cosmopolitan play involves and is dependent upon much more co-action between non-elite movers and non-movers than the literature acknowledges.

Social scientists draw their intuitions from everyday living. The socio-cultural processes in which they participate and the life experiences upon which they draw for their participation become food for thought in their research activities, in the theories that they develop, and in the academic discourse that they span. It is inevitable that the researchers’ socio-cultural backgrounds shape their research. (Robbins & Kashima 2008:9)

Therefore this study intends to explore the ways and means through which people together within their biographies draw upon and overcome social boundaries, acknowledging that forms of inclusive thinking and acting may come in a vast array of guises and disguises.

Yet while the cultural cosmopolitan literature tends to glorify mobility, favouring the mobile elite, the sociological literature on youth transitions has paid little attention to transnational mobility, instead favouring non-movers. Here, the focus has been on comparing the national conditions that young adults negotiate in their educational and occupational trajectories within their national boundaries. The comparative research on youth transitions to a large extent reflects ‘methodological nationalism’, treating the nation state as a container unit of analysis (Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2002, Beck 2006). When young adult movers are studied, they tend to be more easily accessible actors, such as for example university students on exchange scholarships and not those who are cohabiting and interacting with the native population for lengthier periods of time. From my own life experiences and in light of free EU mobility, I was aware that the role transnational mobility plays within European youth transitions was more complex than the existing literature had acknowledged. And when focused on, whilst recognising that not all young adult movers are students or elites (Favell 2008, Kennedy 2008), the research again tended to glorify mobility neglecting the role of non-movers in the ensuing play. This study attempts to readdress these shortcomings, and the gaps they have produced in
the literature. These gaps will be explored and presented fully in Chapter 2, Cosmopolitan Conviviality.

In sum, personally aware of the significant role that non-movers whom I had encountered in the new socio-cultural contexts within and beyond my own national boundaries had played in my life, and the effect they had had on my perspective on the world, it seemed self-evident that the focus on migration and mobility meant that the cosmopolitan literature had failed to capture a major part of the story. Thus, while the study has an autobiographical motivation, it is also motivated by a desire to contribute to the literature by providing a more complex picture of the cosmopolitan play.

A questioning of the cosmopolitan literature is also particularly timely in light of the global economic crisis and the subsequent political fallout across many developed countries, calling for a curtailing of immigration, protectionism from the ‘other’. Nowhere was this more evident than in the recent 2010 UK general election campaign which followed the ‘British jobs for British workers’ debate and the rise of support for the far right British National Party (BNP) in the 2009 European Elections. In wake of free EU mobility, young British and Spanish adults, like other EU nationals, are free to move and seek employment anywhere within the EU, escaping some if not all the legal and socio-political restrictions associated with cross national mobility and migration. The current global political and economic climate is likely to shape, influence and define interactions within the cosmopolitan play, regardless of specific local conditions. By exploring and comparing the cosmopolitan conviviality of young British and Spanish adults living and working in Madrid and Manchester, the study hopefully can also highlight how difference can prove enriching as opposed to problematic for the individual and for society. I now turn to the organisation of the thesis’s chapters.

1.3 The Cosmopolitan Play – Outline of the Thesis

The theoretical framework for this study is outlined in Chapter 2, Cosmopolitan Conviviality. Here, the literature within the field of cultural cosmopolitanism (Boon & Delanty 2007) is reviewed highlighting three main theoretical and empirical gaps within this body of work that the study intends to fill. The four sub-research questions that are generated from this discussion provide the building blocks for the development of the methodological approach in Chapter 3, Exploring Conviviality. Here, the Biographical Network Approach and corresponding methods of data production and analysis specifically developed for this study are presented. Besides presenting the direction of the play, the rationale behind casting young British and Spanish adults living and working in Madrid and Manchester is given.
In Chapter 4, Convivial Horizons, the first x-axis of cosmopolitan conviviality is explored, constituting the first analytical act of the cosmopolitan play. Specifically, it looks at how transnational mobility provides opportunities for ‘self’ to engage with the national ‘other’ and potentially transcend and contest nationality as a social boundary. In Chapter 5, Convivial Depths, the second y-axis of cosmopolitan conviviality is explored. Here, the extent, variety and quality of relationships subjects have with ‘others’ of a different social class background, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality in relation to their biographies is analysed. Through relating the findings from the x and y axis of cosmopolitan conviviality, the transcendence and contestation of nationality is related to not only subjects’ wider transcendence and contestation of social boundaries, but to also their possible construction. In Chapter 6, Convivial Paths, the third act is along the temporal z-axis of cosmopolitan conviviality, the life-paths and narratives of subjects. Whereas in the previous two acts, the network method guides the biographical method, in this chapter the tables are turned when biographical events that shape the evolution of subjects’ convivial stance are analysed in more depth.

In Chapter 7, Convivial Spheres, the findings from the three axes and previous chapters are drawn together to illustrate four broad but distinctive convivial spheres that capture the complexity of cosmopolitan conviviality in the contemporary age. Finally, Chapter 8, The Cosmopolitan Play – A Review, concludes the thesis by drawing in all the strands together to offer an appraisal of the study and offer suggestions for future directions, actors and stages. Here, each of the four sub-research questions are discussed to offer an answer to the overarching research question – how may someone evolve a cosmopolitan stance?
Cosmopolitan Conviviality

2.1 Introduction

The last decade has witnessed a burgeoning literature written on cosmopolitanism across the social science disciplines. For the purpose of this study I concentrate on reviewing literature within the field that Boon and Delanty (2007) refer to as cultural cosmopolitanism - the study of everyday social encounters between people under the economic and social dynamics of globalisation, a ‘cosmopolitanism from below’ (Calhoun 2003). The concept a ‘cosmopolitan stance’, an openness and willingness to engage with the ‘other’ (Hannerz 1996) is employed to initiate an exploration into how people gain an understanding and acceptance of the ‘other’ within the Cosmopolitan Play.

The argument in this chapter is firstly motivated by three interconnected gaps in the existing literature. These gaps, I shall argue, have helped produce one dimensional performances of the cosmopolitan play. The three dimensions so far mainly ignored in the literature are: 1) a ‘middle group’ of movers that are neither mobile elites nor displaced people, 2) the significance of non-movers, and 3) temporality. Each of these gaps is elaborated on before the concepts that will be used to explore them in this production of the cosmopolitan play are introduced.

The first gap in the cosmopolitan literature has been created by ignoring what I refer to as a ‘middle group’ of movers. One body of empirical literature tends to focus on the attitudes and behaviours of elite movers or highly mobile professionals (Kennedy 2004, 2005, Kesselring 2006, Pilcher 2009) as opposed to non-mobile nationals with respect to their transnational relationships, travel and consumption, (Mau et al. 2008, Roudemetof & Haller 2007, Skrabis & Woodward 2007). Many of these studies set out to illustrate how such transnational practices and socio-economic indicators correlate for example with tolerance to migration (Gerhards 2008), and post-national citizenship (Enjolras 2008) within and beyond an emerging cosmopolitan Europe (Beck 2006, Pichler 2009, Rumford 2007). Across this literature, it is found that younger and more educated cohorts are more likely to display cosmopolitan attitudes and behaviours, though results vary according to the survey questions posed. In contrast to this body of literature, ethnographic accounts on the lives of migrants
and refugees have challenged elitist and normative accounts of cosmopolitanism, asking ‘whose cosmopolitanism?’ (Glick Schiller et al. 2011) – critiquing the notion of equating mobility with cosmopolitanism. Yet I argue that the polarity created in the literature between mobile elites and displaced people has resulted in the neglect of a ‘middle group’ of non-elite movers in an age of increasing mobility both inside and across national boundaries (Urry 2000).

The second gap, linked to the first, is the significance of non-movers within processes of cultural cosmopolitanism and social change. Whereas the first body of literature distinguishes between a national self and an international or cosmopolitan self, implicitly focusing on elites and idealising the mobile as cosmopolitan, the second body of literature (Faist 2000, Pries 2001, Guarnizo, Portes & Haller 2003) emerging from transnational and diaspora studies tends to overlook the role of non-mobile nationals and the significance that mobile populations entering their locales have upon them. Hence both bodies of literature neglect the interactional effects between movers and non-movers, the empirical front-line of a process which Ulrich Beck (2006) has termed ‘cosmopolitanization’ - the transforming of the national self under the unseen consequences of the mixture between the national and the international, the global and the local. In calling for a cosmopolitan perspective, Beck argues ‘cosmopolitanization’ is internalised within national societies, which are no longer, if they ever were, enclosed units of analysis.

In a world which is ever more strongly shaped by globalizing tendencies, this [national] view of things is inevitably becoming anachronistic—in particular when it comes to understanding the younger generation, its situation, orientations, ways of behaving. It is precisely here—that is our central argument—that a cosmopolitan perspective becomes necessary, which privileges the simultaneity and the mutual interaction of national and international, local and global determinations, influences and developments. (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim 2009)

The third gap within the existing literature relates to temporality, and is again linked to the previous two gaps where an anachronistic view of cosmopolitanism neglects the national in complete favour of the international. With the emphasis placed on mobility across national boundaries as the key driver of cosmopolitanism, peoples’ interactions and contexts prior to engaging with the wider ‘world’ inside their national boundaries tend to be ignored. In essence, the focus on the spatial has detracted any focus from the temporal with little attention paid to which social positions and contexts people move, if at all, from on their life-path (Tuan 1996). By introducing temporality, the simultaneity and mutual interaction of the local, national, international and global within cultural cosmopolitanism is opened up for
exploration. So while cosmopolitan research has made significant inroads into outlining new contexts of cosmopolitan conviviality and who are the most likely candidates to display cosmopolitan traits, there is little empirical work on the processes of cosmopolitanism.

The concept which shall be used heuristically to fill these three gaps is a ‘cosmopolitan stance’ (Hannerz 1990), a ‘self’ that has an openness and willingness to engage with the other. There has been little attempt within the empirical work to date to operationalize this concept, yet implicitly within cultural cosmopolitan research is the desire to describe and explain people’s attitudes and behaviours in relation to the ‘other’. Here, the literature has broadened the spatial understanding of cosmopolitan contexts, yet it has added little to our temporal understanding with regards to the transformation of self towards a ‘cosmopolitan stance’ within and outside such contexts. This production of the cosmopolitan play intends to readdress this shortcoming not only by presenting a new cast of actors within it, but also by presenting the development of their characters both inside and outside their national boundaries.

As argued, the empirical work to date within the field of cultural cosmopolitanism tends to focus on either mobile elites or displaced communities, those who are free to choose, embrace and reap the rewards of global mobility and those for whom mobility is not a matter of choice but circumstance or necessity. Second, the emphasis on mobility tends to side-line non-movers, the non-mobile nationals, to the role of a passive control group in the discussion; forever denied the possibility of a cosmopolitan stance and undermining their role in bringing about social change. This study strategically positions itself to incorporate a ‘middle group’ of non-elite movers and non-movers into the theoretical and empirical discussion. And finally by incorporating temporality into the analysis, mobility can be placed alongside fixity to explore the simultaneity and mutuality of the national and the cosmopolitan in the contemporary age.

I argue that a cosmopolitan stance, like any stance or perspective, is achieved consciously or not through social interaction, be it face-to-face, mediated or imaginary. This study focuses on cosmopolitan conviviality; the personal relationships initiated and maintained through face-to-face social interaction with others that are objectively different, and it explores the contextual circumstances that facilitate such conviviality. The cultural cosmopolitan literature to date has pictured the world as a landscape of different nations and cultures, which movers’ contend, negotiate and transcend and which non-movers embody, often homogenised under the banner of the ‘host society’. Consequently the literature has ignored the significance of the interaction between movers and non-movers for non-movers. This study works from a simple
premise, that if movers are to be open and willing to engage with non-movers, then in turn non-movers must also be open and willing to engage with movers. From this perspective they are interdependent, where mobility per se is no longer a prerequisite for developing a cosmopolitan stance, but instead provides opportunities for social interaction between people from different socio-cultural, ethnic, religious, socio-economic and linguistic backgrounds. It is this social interaction that I refer to as cosmopolitan conviviality.

By shifting the focus from comparing the subjective practices and social indicators of movers and non-movers, to the inter-subjective realities between them, from individuals to relationships, cosmopolitan conviviality is exposed for exploration. The chapter begins by constructing a working definition of the cosmopolitan stance and the overarching research question. Thereafter the theoretical argument is elaborated, presenting the concepts that shall be employed to explore and analyse the cosmopolitan conviviality of young British and Spanish adults living and working in Madrid and Manchester.

2.2 The Cosmopolitan Stance and the Overarching Research Question

Cosmopolitanism as a concept is rigorously contested, but for the purposes of this study it is defined using two related concepts. First, the notion of an openness to difference (especially tolerance towards otherness, hospitality to strangers and ease in proximity to the unfamiliar), and second, a consciousness of world citizenship (affiliations and loyalties beyond the national, the local and the located) through connection to common values, typically, justice, freedom and equality. (Stacey 2009)

I concentrate on the first of these related concepts, which as mentioned has been referred to as a ‘cosmopolitan stance’ or ‘disposition’ (Hannerz 1990, 1996), ‘an openness and willingness to engage with the other’. The concept is used here as a heuristic device to explore how actors may evolve cosmopolitan traits. Therefore the overarching research question (ORQ) is:

- How as an individual does one become tolerant, hospitable and at ease with the unfamiliar and develop an openness and willingness to engage with the other?

In posing this research question, I want to explore the multiple ways in which individuals may evolve a cosmopolitan stance and simultaneously broaden cosmopolitan theorising. The argument forwarded here is that by placing temporality alongside spatiality in the cosmopolitan perspective, a thicker and more complex production of the cosmopolitan play is presented. Therefore with the cosmopolitan stance viewed as something that possibly emerges
through cosmopolitan conviviality over time in interaction with ‘others’, the study demands a theoretical conceptualisation that acknowledges not only space, but also time and relationality.

### 2.3 Discussion Outline – The Key Concepts

The key concepts which structure the following review and argument will now briefly be outlined. First under the heading *The Local and the Cosmopolitan versus The Self and The Other* the idea that cosmopolitanism in the contemporary age is limited to an elite transnationally mobile class is critiqued. In contrast by taking a relational approach, the focus shifts from a sole mobile actor acting independently to evolve a cosmopolitan stance, to one in co-action with others. This leads on to the notion of *Conviviality* and *Boundary Work versus Homophily*, the transcendence and construction of symbolic boundaries during social interaction between self and other. To expand the argument further regarding boundary work, a more thorough discussion of social interaction theory is presented under *Social Interaction Positions* which outlines that a sense of being in the world evolves through social interaction. The discussion then looks at the notion of multiple attachments and the emotions associated with mobility and fixity using the concepts of *The Hearth and The Cosmos*. The argument continues by linking these ideas to *Personal Communities* which are seen as *Communities in the Mind*.

Finally, under *The Evolving Self*, the concepts of epiphanies, fateful moments, critical moments, self-reflexivity and biographicity are presented and their utility discussed to analyse the temporal aspects of evolving a cosmopolitan stance. The chapter is concluded with a review of the chapter with reference to the four sub-research questions that are constructed in the discussion.

#### 2.3.1 The Local and the Cosmopolitan versus The Self and The Other

The cosmopolitan stance has been often associated with the mobile traveller, who through his/her cross border activities develops ‘affiliations and loyalties beyond the national, the local and the located’ (Kennedy 2008: 128). Through transcending socio-cultural borders and creating transnational networks, the individual develops multiple affiliations and belongings beyond national borders and a greater awareness of the world, becoming more open to other cultures. Or in other words, through mobility one transcends affiliations based on local sedentary roots (Malkki 1992), finding commonalities between people. Mobility is therefore seen as a biographical prerequisite for developing a cosmopolitan stance and multiple belongings. I argue that this tends to glorify mobility and the elite who are able to practice it and can claim to have a consciousness of world citizenship. Subsequently the cosmopolitan
stance and the associated status of being a cosmopolitan becomes the prized outcome of a mobile life. This perspective automatically denies not only non-movers, but also non-elites any opportunity to attain such a stance, and marginalises them in the cosmopolitan discussion. Using the simple equation of self and other, I argue for an analysis that sees movers and non-movers as co-actors. First we need to look at one of the most common and influential conceptualisations of cosmopolitans as a character type juxtaposed to the locals.

The local/cosmopolitan dichotomy was introduced in Robert Merton’s (1968) classic essay, *Patterns of Influence: Local and Cosmopolitan Influentials*, which provided an empirical account of differing types of influential people within one locality. Each ideal type, the local and the cosmopolitan, holds different social positions within the same group, distinguished by their sources and uses of objective knowledge.

The local’s influence rests on *knowledge of acquaintance*, on who he or she knows, while the cosmopolitan’s influence rests, like Simmel’s stranger, on *knowledge about*, on what he or she knows. (Ossewaarde 2007)

Merton could not have been aware how influential his conceptualisation of the local/cosmopolitan dichotomy would be for future theorising within the field. For example Ossewaarde (2007) draws on Merton to conceptualise the cosmopolitan in terms of the stranger, again a mover, contrasting Simmel’s and Schutz’s definition of the stranger. Simmel’s stranger like Merton’s cosmopolitan is called upon by locals for their expert knowledge and their objectivity to provide solutions to local problems. However, unlike Merton’s cosmopolitan, Simmel’s stranger is marginalised from local group life, with their contribution to local life purely instrumental. Schutz’s stranger on the other hand seeks to acquire the necessary knowledge for inclusion into local group life. ‘Yet, for the stranger, this knowledge can never become an integral part of the stranger’s biography’ (Ossewaarde 2007:369) because being able to compare between two different situations they can maintain a critical distance to both cultural patterns. However, in doing this Ossewaarde turns the focus onto the relationship between locals and cosmopolitans.

Ossewaarde concludes that if cosmopolitanism means human beings are unable to observe and follow a cultural pattern, locals no longer know what to think of or expect from each other. Cosmopolitans and locals alike become strangers to others and themselves. For locals the ‘loss of integrative meaning, which is the essential ordeal of cosmopolitanism, is psychologically hard to bear’ (Ossewaarde 2007:385) and leads in global societies to “a longing for the reintegration of local groups and the resistance against strangerhood, through
nostalgia, protest, terror and hope” (Ossewaarde 2007:385). Inevitably equating cosmopolitanism to a society of strangers, Ossewaarde calls for more attention to be paid to sociality in cosmopolitan theorising.

By giving priority to universal, cosmic laws before the cultural pattern of group life, the world citizen is intellectually and morally emancipated from group conditioning and thus de facto stranger to others, including the parents. (Ossewaarde 2007:375)

In a similar vein Calhoun (2003) critiques the type of cosmopolitanism embodied by many theorists themselves, which he has labelled ‘the class consciousness of frequent travellers’, those individuals with the mobility resources that allow them to see the world as an integral whole. “Moreover, the cosmopolitan elites are hardly culture free; they do not simply reflect the rational obligations of humanity in the abstract (even if their theories try to).” (Calhoun 2003:543) Calhoun like Ossewaarde is calling for greater emphasis on sociality in the cosmopolitan framework, recognising that human beings are continually constructing cultural meanings through their everyday social interactions. Hence no human being is free from cultural norms or values, however open or not these appear to be. “Humanity cannot be set apart from, let alone against, the social roles through which members can express themselves.” (Ossewaarde 2007:367)

Cosmopolitanism stresses that in an era of global interconnections, human beings are expected to live, survive or flourish without local, immediate, concrete and exclusive bonds. Cosmopolitanism is a deliberate attempt to make space for strangers, to have world citizens rule in the cosmopolis. Ignorance and fear of strangers is a lack of the will to be part of the world. Such an attempt, however, fails to do justice to classical and current sociology. (Ossewaarde 2007:384)

This argument though fails to account for how sociality is changing in the global era and ignores the human ability for creating shared meanings through social interaction in changing contexts, which in turn help shape social change. Whilst humans draw upon cultural patterns to orientate their social interactions, ‘selves’ and ‘cultural patterns’ are continuously reconfigured in the interaction process (Simmel 1964, Elias 2000). Therefore whilst Ossewaarde bemoans the lack of sociality within cosmopolitan social theory, his argument denies sociality of its essence, the reconstruction of shared meanings when ‘self’ engages with the ‘other’. Through seeing cultural patterns as relatively stable entities, sociality is fixed and a society of strangers thus appears inevitable. In contrast, a relational or interactionist perspective would see the negotiation of difference and potential conflict as integral to reconstructing culturally shared meanings between ‘self’ and ‘other’ in the locale they engage
within. A stranger can thus become familiar, and here I shall argue lays the key to the evolution of a cosmopolitan stance.

Ossewaarde’s society of strangers emerges possibly from the limited conceptualisation of the cosmopolitan within the argument he presents. Positioned at the margins, it is an elite cosmopolitan who not only lacks the willingness to engage with the other, but no longer has an interest or the need to do so in an increasingly stratified global economy. So unlike the original conceptualisation by Merton (1968) where locals and cosmopolitans have interdependent influential orientations, they have become detached in the global age. In this case the ‘self’ never engages with the ‘other’ and inevitably remains a stranger. In Ossewaarde’s argument cosmopolitans and locals no longer share the same predicaments, and the cosmopolitans with their elite social positions neither have the openness nor the willingness to engage in the locals’ predicaments.

While the corrosion of knowledge of acquaintance enables cosmopolitans to move successfully through social disorganization and insecurity, their ‘built-in identity crisis’ (Berger et al. 1974:92) enables them to move onwards and accelerates mobility – not only physical, but also social, mental and ethnic mobility. (Ossewaarde 2007:373)

However, mobility is no longer a characteristic restricted to global elites. More and more people are crossing borders both temporarily and permanently, be this out of their own choice or not under the dynamics of globalization (Urry 2000, Kofman 2007). The subjective reasons behind mobility and fixity shape how the experience is given meaning in the present, both reflecting the biographical past of and guiding the possible future directions for the person concerned. This study aims to fill a gap in the cosmopolitan literature by focusing on non-elite young adults who have geographically moved countries during their life, examining the factors that led to their decision to move. Importantly, these factors are likely to interplay with how they simultaneously construct and narrate their social world, a social world which they cohabit with others.

### 2.3.2 Conviviality - Boundary Work versus Homophily

Paul Gilroy (2005:xv) introduces the concept of ‘conviviality’ as a process “of cohabitation and interaction that have made multi-culture an ordinary feature of social life in Britain’s urban areas and in postcolonial cities elsewhere.” Recognising both sides of the ‘self’ and ‘other’ equation, Gilroy suggests that conviviality contests and “makes a nonsense of closed, fixed, and reified identity and turns the attention toward the always unpredictable mechanisms of identification.”(Gilroy 2005:xv) Although Gilroy’s use of the concept is concentrated on
contesting racial boundaries, it highlights the everyday, diverse and spontaneous nature of sociality in many metropolises – opportunities to meet and confront difference.

The metropolis provided a fragmented and stratified location in which cultures, histories, and structures of feeling previously separated by enormous distances could be found in the same place, the same time: school, bus, café, cell, waiting room or traffic jam. (Gilroy 2005:70)

Whilst sociality, the diverse everyday face-to-face engagement in the metropolis is the key focus of this argument, and a possible reason for attracting people into the metropolis, it does not shed light on the mechanics by which co-actors may evolve a cosmopolitan stance. Yet it does not side-line locals, non-movers, in this melange and with the advent of global media portraying other cultures every day “may now make just about everybody a little more cosmopolitan” (Hannerz 1990:249). Hence mobility may no longer be necessary to become a cosmopolitan in the contemporary age. To support this argument, Beck (2006) refers to the process of ‘cosmopolitanization’, whereby specific places become more cosmopolitan from within their borders in response to the economic and political dynamics of globalisation. Yet while theorists propose concepts to label processes in an age of cosmopolitanism, the conviviality between movers and non-movers, or the daily encounters of confronting difference, remain under-investigated.

The psychological ordeal of cosmopolitanism described by Ossewaarde ignores the possible multiple affiliations of non-movers within and beyond their localities, positing them as purely local. It defines locals as a homogenous entity without any particularities, emphasising sedentary (rooted) senses of belonging and essentialised territorial identities based upon the nation-state and other socio-political territories (Jones 2007). It ignores social actors’ sociality and their ability to develop a coherent sense of self in less homogenous and less coherent social spaces, and essentially stigmatises the locals as purely local, denying them the ability to manage and shape social change. This argument thus produces the first sub-research question, and represents the fundamental shift from the subjective to the inter-subjective.

- Does transnational mobility provide an opportunity for movers and non-movers, self and other in interaction to evolve a cosmopolitan stance?

Paul Jones (2007) succinctly argues that cosmopolitan theorising and empirical research needs to place the contestation and challenging of essentialised identities at its core. This applies not only to national identities, but also to other symbolic and physical boundaries between groups
such as race and class. “Cosmopolitanism is, then, fundamentally an anti-essentialist discourse.” (Jones 2007:79)

While important work is being done by scholars in several fields on how symbolic boundaries translate into social boundaries, it should be accompanied by parallel studies of the reverse process, where the elimination of social boundaries begins with the deconstruction of symbolic ones (Lamont & Aksartova 2002:12, taken from Jones 2007:75)

In other words, how may the transcendence of symbolic boundaries at the inter-subjective level between co-actors lead to the contestation of these boundaries at the social level? Michele Lamont (2000) equates the cosmopolitan stance with “an approach to transcending particularized difference, rather than a fixed descriptor of an elite identity.” (Jones 2007:74)

Whilst not denying that elites have a greater capacity to frame and codify values associated with a wide range of cultural and political meanings (Bourdieu 1989, Skeggs 2002), “cosmopolitanism is underpinned by the potential of reflexive contestations” (Jones 2007:76). Such contestations are labelled by Lamont and Molnar (2002) as ‘boundary work’, a concept which provides a tool to analyse what they refer to as ‘ordinary cosmopolitanisms’ in everyday live. Its applicability remains to be investigated with regards to the conviviality of movers and non-movers where symbolic boundaries such as nationality, class, ethnicity, religion and sexuality are potentially transcended and provide a source of reflexive contestations. Hence the second sub-research question,

- Does the transcendence of nationality relate to the contestation and transcendence of other symbolic/social boundaries such as class, ethnicity, religion, sexuality and age among movers and non-movers?

However, the principle of homophily – the tendency for people to associate with similar others – appears to stand in direct opposition to the performance of ‘boundary work’. Lazarsfeld and Merton (1954) are credited with distinguishing between status homophily and value homophily. Status homophily means that people with similar social status characteristics such as nationality, race/ethnicity, age, gender, class and so forth are more likely to associate with each other. Whereas value homophily means people with similar attitudes, abilities, beliefs and aspirations, irrespective of social status characteristics are more likely to associate with each other. Therefore, in this study I explore whether a cosmopolitan stance is more likely to evolve among those with less homogenous and more heterogeneous relations, i.e. those that display heterophily, the opposite of homophily, in their conviviality.
McPherson et al.’s (2001) review of homophily in social networks clearly illustrates that status homophily is strongly and widely evidenced within networks spanning a multitude of populations and contexts. Whilst many dimensions of status homophily “are largely ascribed or inherited from one’s family of origin”, education, occupation and social class are to a larger extent seen to be achieved statuses in developed societies (McPherson et al. 2001:426). However, as Bottero (2004) among others argues, due to shifts in the socio-economic structure, statuses grounded on education, occupation and social class are not fixed precursors of an absolute location or social identity, but are relative social positions continuously constructed and negotiated in relation to others. In line with the relational and interactionist perspective developed here, while objective class positions such as working and middle are undoubtedly sources of identification, self-referential social class is interpreted in relation to one’s associates. This is the case even if a person’s pool of available associates is socially stratified on grounds of nationality, ethnicity, education, occupation and so on. Therefore, while nationality and race/ethnicity are relatively constant statuses throughout a person’s life, social class is dependent on not only one’s own educational and occupational trajectory, but that of one’s significant others. Thus social distance between self and other, difference based on education, occupation and class, shifts with time.

If we are to equate the cosmopolitan stance “as an approach to transcending particularized difference, rather than a fixed descriptor of an elite identity” (Jones 2007:74), then social distance within cosmopolitan conviviality also needs to be explored. It also implies that network dynamics, the changing content and structure of relationships throughout one’s biography will provide opportunities and constraints for the transcendence of particularised difference. Furthermore, an investigation into how the “the elimination of social boundaries begins with the deconstruction of symbolic ones”, as Lamont and Aksartova (2002:12) propose, demands an analysis into how status homophily along various dimensions is reduced and negotiated within people’s networks over time.

While McPherson et al. (2001:438) acknowledge and call for more dynamic network data to study “the co-evolution of foci and networks”, this call is not founded in an interest to better understand the evolution of people’s attitudes, which then become the possible basis of value homophily. This is apparent in their extensive review paper, where they outline that status homophily is often complemented by value homophily. Here the authors state that people initially choose to interact and develop close personal relationships with similar others or with those they perceive as similar in a given context for the cognitive ease of communication and activity – and hence network “selection almost certainly trumps influence” (McPherson et al.
2001:429) across most domains. However, this perspective falls short of a more detailed analysis of the cognitive processes of social interaction. While it leaves open the possibility for a passive openness to difference, it cannot account for an active willingness to engage with the other, the cognitive attraction of interacting with dissimilar others. Here, the homophily principle possibly conceals more than it reveals about social processes and the evolution of people’s behaviours and attitudes over time. For any lack of status homophily in the network may be accounted for by value homophily, and hence the principle is reaffirmed.

This study intends to explore the process by which dissimilar others become similar others, or how network influence does not trump selection but realigns it. In other words, how people transcend particularised differences such as nationality, ethnicity, religion and social class and may come to share similar attitudes, abilities, beliefs and aspirations. Whereas homophily encourages social reproduction or continuity, I argue heterophily and ‘boundary work’ encourage social change and new patterns of sociality. This is explored by conjunctively looking at young adults’ networks and biographies. In order to do this, the study requires an analytical framework that acknowledges the cognitive complexities of social interaction and relationship formation. It is to this that I now turn to.

2.3.3 Social Interaction Positions

In his critique of existing social interaction theory, predominantly the dramaturgical perspective developed by Erving Goffman (1966), Bjorn Eriksson (2007) proposes a perspective of social interaction whereby actors instinctively seek to transcend symbolic boundaries. Whilst acknowledging that objective categories are fundamental to social interaction in everyday life and society, Eriksson’s aim is to highlight the intrinsic value of social interaction between actors, a means of finding and feeling our place in the world together. Eriksson’s argument is that the dramaturgical perspective’s focus on social interaction between actors in specific roles, as replaceable objects, neglects a significant part of everyday social interaction between familiar actors. Here the interaction is not between role playing actors, but co-actors who are subjects to one another, as I and You. Expanding upon this argument, I suggest that boundary work can be seen to not only mean the contestation of essentialised identities, but an attempt to overcome and see past them, for self and other to interact as subjects. In terms of the homophily principle, here interaction between objectively dissimilar others (status heterophily) facilitates the possible transcendence of nationality and ethnicity for example. Through being open to commonality, co-actors construct new patterns of sociality and as subjects potentially transform their convivial attitudes and outlook. It is at
this juncture that network influence realigns selection, the homophily lens is recalibrated from status to value, and similarity (re)appears. Without a temporal perspective, there is no recognition of the actors’ starting positions and the cognitive processes through which the said similarity was achieved. Here Eriksson’s interactional framework can contribute significantly to an analysis of the co-evolution of foci, networks and attitudes.

Eriksson introduces the idea of interaction positions between co-actors as either objects or subjects (see Table 2.1 below). As actors with objective identifications, nationality, ethnicity, teacher, student, uncle and so forth we inherently either ’stand for’ something or ’act for’ someone (Pitkins 1967). For example I can ’stand for’ a PhD student, or ’act for’ my sister to babysit my niece and nephew. In both instances I am exchangeable: there are many PhD students and my sister could ask someone else to babysit. However, if I tell funny bed-time stories, different to other available baby-sitters, with continued interaction then I and my niece and nephew become predominantly subjects to each other. I am specifically requested to babysit. Yet in the act of social interaction we remain both as subjects and objects to each other, shifting between the two. For example, when I refuse to read another story, I refer to my objective self and again ’act for’ my sister as I turn their bedroom lights out, obviously not before tucking them in.

Table 2.1 Social Interaction Positions (Erikson 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self and Other</th>
<th>Objective Other</th>
<th>Subjective Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective Self</td>
<td><strong>Objective</strong></td>
<td>Asymmetrical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symmetrical (TIES)</td>
<td>E.g. British Male &amp; You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E.g. British male &amp; Spanish female</td>
<td>E.g. I and You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Self</td>
<td>Asymmetrical</td>
<td>E.g. I &amp; Spanish female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subjective</strong></td>
<td>E.g. I and You</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Symmetrical (BONDS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eriksson’s framework acknowledges three possible social interaction positions; objective symmetrical and asymmetrical positions (dramaturgical perspective), and subjective symmetrical position. During social interaction, such as in the babysitting example above, the position can change. As actors we glide between objective and subjective symmetrical
positions, with asymmetry occurring in between. In fact both subjective and objective symmetrical positions are ideal positions, for in both positions there exist traces of our objective and subjective selves. We never interact as purely objects or subjects, but are continually shifting the balance between the two. Whilst Eriksson provides no in depth discussion on asymmetrical interaction\(^1\), for ease of interaction, actors tend to establish symmetrical positions.

It is within the objective symmetrical position that the vast body of social interaction theory has been concentrated, tending to emphasise the instrumental over the emotional significance of everyday social interaction, where relationships are seen as either strong or weak ties (Granovetter 1973). Eriksson instead argues that the starting point for the analysis of social interaction, both its attraction and function, has to be within its intrinsic value of meaning creation, what he refers to as its interaction value. Not only and simply as I have commented on earlier, that meaning is constructed in social interaction, but that this meaning creation has a value in itself for those involved. It is this value, the joy of interaction in the subjective symmetrical that we seek, the means to which we place our selves in the world and in which I argue lie the seeds of contesting essentialised identities based on nationality, ethnicity, social class and so on. Eriksson argues further that this interaction value is fundamental to other social interaction, in that other values established in interaction are dependent upon its presence. It is this core value that provides us with the energy to engage in our more objective positions; the emotional thus becomes the prerequisite for the instrumental.

This interaction value and its significance is greater when the social interaction position is subjective symmetrical, where, as subjects both actors are un-exchangeable, and bonds exist between actors. Where exchangeable ties in the objective symmetrical position are often fleeting and temporary in nature, bonds are stable and continuous and have the ability to outlive the social circles or organisational foci in which they were initiated. Ties may develop into bonds, but more importantly bonds do not need propinquity to remain active and meaningful. It is in this co-absence between actors that Eriksson argues distinguishes his perspective from the one developed by Goffman.

The (bond) relationship between actors is such that even in each other’s absence they can maintain an imagined continued interaction with the other, an imagined interaction which in time can also be realised. Both can be conscious of the other’s bodily absence but at the same time keep him or her as socially present. Through thinking of the other, through mentally connecting the other or

---

\(^1\) This can also occur when new actors enter the social interaction. E.g. The moment when intimate diners switch from a subjective to an objective symmetrical position when the waiter addresses the table.
connecting oneself to the other, through anticipating the other’s actions and the alike, widens the interactive area to something a lot greater than Goffman’s co-presence. (Eriksson 2007: 185 – own translation from Swedish)

Therefore we could redefine evolving a cosmopolitan stance as the ability of actors to achieve subjective symmetrical interaction positions with others from diverse objective positions and establish bonds (see Table 2.1 – process signified by arrow). It is these bonds, and the interaction value produced both in co-presence and co-absence, which I suggest facilitates multiple attachments and a sense of belonging in the world. Therefore the openness and willingness to engage with difference is perhaps associated with the ability to look beyond it, becoming accustomed to doing so and hence learning to be at ease with unfamiliarity. Or, in other words, the cosmopolitan stance is the ability to make the unfamiliar, the strange and the stranger, familiar. To explore this argument, the following sub-research question is posed,

- Is the cosmopolitan stance associated with the willingness and ability to look beyond objective differences in developing bonds of close personal relationships?

Expanding on the framework proposed by Eriksson, where the intrinsic value of social interaction is emotive, providing a sense of convivial joy and attachment to the world, I suggest actors shift from formal co-action to an everyday co-existence. Within cosmopolitan theorising this notion is not particularly new as Martha Nassbaum (1994:3-4), with reference to the Stoics in ancient Greece, explains:

The Stoics stress that to be a citizen of the world one does not need to give up local identifications, which can frequently be a source of great richness in life. They suggest that we think of ourselves not as devoid of local affiliations, but as surrounded by a series of concentric circles. The first one is drawn around the self; the next takes in one’s immediate family; then follows the extended family; then, in order, one’s neighbours or local group, one’s fellow city-dwellers, one’s fellow countrymen – and we can easily add to this list groupings based on ethnic, linguistic, historical, professional, gender and sexual identities. Outside all these circles is the largest one, that of humanity as a whole. Our task as citizens of the world will be to “draw the circles somehow towards the center” (Stoic philosopher Hierocles, 1st 2nd CE), making all human beings more like fellow city dwellers, and so on.

Eriksson’s framework provides a means to explore cosmopolitan conviviality, between those circles we draw in and the ones we do not. The discussion now continues by looking at the concepts of the ’hearth’ and the ’cosmos’ which assist in shedding light on the emotive value of mobility and fixity, and how this is experienced through and with others.
2.3.4 The Hearth and The Cosmos

To plot only “places of birth” and degrees of nativeness is to blind oneself to the multiplicity of attachments that people form to places through living in, remembering, and imagining them. (Malkki 1992:38)

Tuan’s (1996) concepts of the ’hearth’ (home) and the ’cosmos’ (world) correspond to our dual nature as human beings (Easthope 2009:66), and provide a framework for studying how movers and non-movers develop multiple attachments to places.

Tuan says that these two terms correspond to the fact that we are both body (which desires the hearth) and mind (which reaches out to the cosmos) (Tuan 2001:66) /…/ While Tuan’s terminology is reminiscent of Cartesian dualism, he recognizes that while the cosmos and hearth are two theoretical extremes, “the worlds and experiences that these terms conjure often overlap” (Tuan 2001: 319). Tuan says that both the hearth and the cosmos contribute to a sense of self, but in different ways. The hearth offers security while the cosmos offers adventure. (Easthope 2009:66)

Tuan’s (1996) ’cosmopolites viewpoint’ is proposed in response to what he sees as a growing shift, favour and fervour towards equating ’place’ directly with ’hearth’ “in the world generally, [where] cultural particularism and ethnic heritage carry greater resonance – arouse more positive feelings – than cosmopolitanism and universalism” (Tuan 1996:1). This fervour for nostalgia, of recreating and feeling at ’home’ in place, is supported by empirical research. Based on extensive interview data with native residents from four different areas of Greater Manchester, Savage et al. (2005) broaden the theoretical discussion on belonging by introducing the aspects of choice and temporality through the concept of ’elective belonging’, the idea that people decide to locate themselves to a certain area with the aspiration of residing there long term. On the concept of ’elective belonging’, Savage (2008) argues

It leaves the possibility, then, for nostalgia to be deployed, not in terms of specific claims about how particular communities actually ’used to be’, but as a memory of a different forms of doing local social relations. It is this that explains the appeal of nostalgia and the continued concern to re-create community even though elective forms of belonging and attachment are socially and politically dominant. (Savage 2008:161)

Savage et al. (2005) found that the ’cosmos’ instead is inferred through people’s connections to other places, “the multiplicity of attachments that people form through living in, remembering, and imagining them” (Malkki 1992:38), and not particularly to any transcendence or contestation of social boundaries. While ’elective belonging’ may be symbolic of a need to find ’hearth’ in the face of globalisation, it could also be argued that it
represents the desire to live among one’s own, to avoid the other, possibly turning one’s back on the world. Tuan argues,

At a basic (reflex) level, the shift is surprising if only because the life-path of a human being moves naturally from ‘home’ to ‘world’, from ‘hearth’ to ‘cosmos’. We grow into a larger world. Not to do so is to lead a stunted life. In all human cultures, one’s stages of maturation are celebrated, because at each stage one enters a larger sphere of activity and responsibility. (Tuan 1996:2)

In response, Tuan suggests the notion of a ‘cosmopolitan hearth’, where ‘the emphasis is on “hearth” rather than on “cosmopolitan”’ (Tuan 1996:183). He argues,

Knowing places other than our own is a necessary component of “cosmopolitan hearth”. The unique personality of our small part of the earth is all more real and precious when we can compare it with other climes, other topographies. Perhaps this is another way of saying that exploration (moving out into the cosmos) enables us to know our own hearth better – indeed, “for the first time.” Difference contributes to self-awareness, and that is one reason why high modernism is in favour of difference. But, curiously, awareness of commonality, rather than destroying local distinction, can subtly add to it by giving it greater weight. (Tuan 1996:183)

In sum, the hearth offers security, and the cosmos adventure, an opportunity of personal transformation and the often unknown consequences of such. The concepts shift the focus from types of individuals such as cosmopolitans versus locals as homogenous entities with particular distinct characteristics to orientations used and sought by individuals. This is achieved through shifting the focus to individuals’ relationships in relation to social spaces and places, how they are experienced as opposed to how they are physically transcended. Instead of concentrating on the sedentary objective attributes between people, this shift helps illuminate emotions and desires, both the feelings of home (the hearth) and the feelings of adventure and transformation (the cosmos), which all people alike seek. In summary these concepts offer a framework to interpret the mobility and fixity experiences of individuals, where the common human conundrum of balancing between the hearth and the cosmos is shared by movers and non-movers alike.

With respect to mobility used as a resource by individuals in the transition to adulthood, Thomson and Taylor (2005) illustrate through empirical interviews that notions of mobility are central to young people’s accounts of self. The authors also stress that these accounts are historically and culturally specific to current youth transitions. Thomson and Taylor suggest that ‘young people are torn between competing forces in relation to notions of home, tradition and fixedness on one hand and of mobility, escape and transformation on the other’ (Thomson & Taylor 2005:337). Therefore they argue against using fixed typologies in relation
to what they term localism and cosmopolitanism, instead suggesting “localism/cosmopolitanism can be understood as a single, interdependent term through which feelings about space and associated status can be expressed” (Thomson & Taylor 2005:337). This conceptual framework the authors use accounts for varying orientations towards mobility among respondents, where “cosmopolitanism and localism make sense of strategies and tactics in which young people draw on familial and cultural resources in the process of forging adult identities and pathways.” (Thomson & Taylor 2005:338) In another study Easthope (2009) employs Tuan`s concepts of the ‘hearth’ and the ‘cosmos’ in her study of young returnee Tasmanians to discuss how identity is linked to both place and mobility.

In this study the ‘hearth’ and the ‘cosmos’ are seen as more suitable concepts than ‘localism’ and ‘cosmopolitanism’ because they do not equate mobility with cosmopolitanism. Whilst the notion of cosmopolitanism or the cosmos may motivate mobility, a need to escape and transform, any such transition will likely entail an initial loss of hearth as migration “often entails the severing of community ties, the loss of social networks and familiar bonds – it can mean the loss of taken for granted sources and systems of meaning” (Sonn 2002: 205). To overcome this loss, new relationships will need to be established in the new context, if not already existing, to reconstruct new sources and systems of meaning and belonging. Here, the ‘hearth’, and specifically a ‘cosmopolitan hearth’, enables a notion of multiple affiliations and belongings, transcending original locales, acknowledging that familiarity and security can be generated in numerous places with numerous others. On the other hand, it suggests that a strong sense of the hearth in one’s local origins may restrict mobility, as the perceived sense of loss of familiar bonds may outweigh any potential gains from mobility. The social grass is not always considered greener on the other side, even if mobility is an unequally distributed resource and coveted value in the contemporary age (Bauman 1998:2). In this case the cosmos may be achieved through more mediated means and temporary travel. By concentrating on the emotional value of the hearth and the cosmos constructed through social interaction with others, the significant role of personal relationships in everyday life is highlighted.

In summary, Tuan’s concepts of the hearth and the cosmos facilitate an analysis of the dialectic interplay between personal relationships, mobility/fixity and place(s) to understand peoples’ senses of self and belonging. I now discuss the web of relationships through which cosmopolitan conviviality is experienced using the idea of Personal Communities as Communities in the Mind.
2.3.5 Personal Communities as Communities in the Mind

As human beings we are born into a set of existing relationships and an objective world not of our own making (Berger & Luckman 1966, Burkitt 2008), in which the ‘self’ is socially constructed and continually reconstructed through social interaction with others.

The development which takes place among ideas finds an analogue in the relationship of individuals to each other. At first the individual sees himself in an environment which is relatively indifferent to his individuality, but which has implicated him in a web of circumstances. These circumstances impose on him a close coexistence with those whom the accident of birth has placed next to him. This close coexistence represents the first condition of the phylogenetic and ontogenetic development, whose continuation aims toward the association of homogeneous members from heterogeneous groups. (Simmel 1964:128)

Whilst lending some support to the core arguments forwarded thus far, particularly with regards to inter-subjectivity over subjectivity and co-existence over co-action, Simmel suggests that engaging with different others is an integral part of personal development over the life-course. Here, interaction with dissimilar others is one means through which a person develops a sense of self, their own individuality, and possibly attachments beyond their original circumstances. Or to paraphrase Tuan, this is part of the natural life-path from ‘home’ (the hearth) to the ‘world’ (the cosmos), where “at each stage one enters a larger sphere of activity and responsibility” (Tuan 1996:2). Therefore it is necessary to consider how mobility/fixedness, social as well as geographical, that exposes people to different others is facilitated or hindered. I suggest networks of personal relationships are the missing link between mobility/fixedness and place(s), providing both the source of the hearth and the embodiment of the cosmos.

Networks of personal relations evolve over time. They reflect and go with socialisation. Their history and dynamics contribute to their present structure. (Bidart & Lavenu 2005:359)

Seen in a visual perspective, the personal community is a biographical map of self-evolution. I argue that personal communities or networks provide a ‘looking glass’ through which to see how a sense of self is constructed in interaction and co-existence with others. As Bidart and Lavenu suggest, networks of personal relationships reflect both the temporal and spatial elements of individuals’ biographies. However, throughout our lives, relationships are established and maintained whilst others fade and diminish in importance. The current set of relationships reflects the present and the past array of social contexts and places experienced by the person concerned. As Eriksson (2007) suggests, it is not simply in co-presence that we experience others, but also in co-absence. People have the cognitive ability to remain
connected to others across both space and time. This is congruent to what Pahl (2005) refers to as ‘communities in the mind’.

While all social encounters occur in a given time and space, co-absence acknowledges that personal relationships are not tied to specific places, even if the coordinates of the initial encounter may reflect people’s temporal and spatial attachments. Hence our sense of belonging or hearth is simultaneously coupled with and decoupled from place. My view is that people may use mobility and places as sources of identity, yet both are experienced through and given meaning in social interaction with others. It is through these others, our bonds and our personal communities of inter-subjectivities that senses of self and belonging evolve.

Through social interaction and its intrinsic interaction value one continuously finds one’s place in the world, is made aware of one’s co-existence, wherever the location of the interaction is. Thus one is able to transcend difference in co-presence and co-absence to evolve a cosmopolitan stance. Personal communities or networks and the analysis thereof are ideal tools for developing a new sociology with a cosmopolitan perspective.

The new sociology should investigate the uneven reach of diverse networks and flows as they move within and across borders, and how they spatially and temporally interconnect. (Kofman 2007:241)

Whilst personal communities were not the key analytical focus of Thomson and Taylor’s (2005) and Easthope’s (2009) research, their findings illustrate the importance of significant others in shaping the narratives of the practice and understanding of mobility experiences. Similarly Paul Kennedy’s (2007, 2008) findings from over 60 interviews with young foreign professionals living and working in Manchester confirm that personal relationships are an essential element of the mobility experience. Not denying that mediated notions of mobility are important, he argues mobility is predominantly experienced and given subjective meaning through face-to-face social interaction with others within the new location. Kennedy found that the majority of their close relationships in the city were with other young foreign professionals, hence not with non-movers. However, a significant percentage had native British associates, including intimate relationships, which for some had been their motive for moving to the city. This latter group of interviewees tended to have more contacts with British natives generally, although it is unclear if these natives were from the city or elsewhere. Yet with the focus entirely on the present set of relationships in the new locality, Kennedy was unable to analyse how the current ‘world’ experience was narrated and understood in relation to the ‘home’ from whence they came.
Therefore, what becomes clear is that a closer investigation into the cosmopolitan conviviality of movers and non-movers is necessary, and that it must not only entail the relationships people are blessed with in co-presence, but also those in co-absence. The idea of personal communities as communities in the mind, that span space and time, allow for such an investigation. They provide an interpretive lens to study how the cosmopolitan stance may or may not evolve. The discussion now focuses on concepts to analyse an evolving self.

2.3.6 The Evolving Self

I suggest the temporal aspects of the cosmopolitan stance have often been overlooked in the literature due to the dominance of the spatial aspects, particularly the focus on the mobility culture of comfortable middle-class travellers, intellectuals and business people. Kofman (2007:240) argues that “mobility also needs to be situated against and conjoined with notions of fixity and rootedness, from which it is too frequently divorced.” Here, the transnational and diaspora literature in contrast has contributed significantly by studying the cross-border linkages between mobile and non-mobile members of particular national and ethnic communities over time. However, these bodies of literature at polar opposites along the mobility distribution miss a significant part of the mobility/migration story, one which is fundamental to understand the story in its entirety, namely, why some move and others do not.

On the one hand, the vast body of comparative quantitative migration research in dedicated journals such as the Journal of International Migration and Integration, and International Migration Review describes and monitors migrants and ethnic minority communities’ adaptation within and across different nation-states. Here, social outcomes in terms of health, education, income, civic participation and so forth are compared across migrant communities and the indigenous population. The analytical play thus begins post migration, where with fresh data the dominant migrant story is one of readjustment and adaptation, one which may be continued and monitored across subsequent generations. On the other hand, in journals such as Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, and Ethnic and Racial Studies more qualitative approaches are employed which outline relational linkages that span national and ethnic boundaries. However, while relational approaches are taken here, they again concentrate on contexts and trajectories of mobile actors2 and hence, perhaps unwittingly, they neglect the

2 A Special Issue of Ethnic and Racial Studies Vol. 34 (3) entitled ‘Cosmopolitan Sociability: Locating Transnational Religious and Diasporic Networks’ “features ethnographies that examine the trajectories of mobile people within particular places, moments and networks of connection” (Glick Schiller et al. 2011:399) (emphasis added)
trajectories of less mobile or non-mobile actors. Additionally by concentrating on one particular ethnic or diasporic community, the trans-national story starts from when the community transcends national boundaries. The prime focus here is the transformation of the community in its many guises, and the effect it has on the community and the locales they are embedded within.

What is missing on both sides is the story prior to migration for the movers, and the story of non-movers is inherently outside their remit. As a result, we are left bereft of an explanation as to why some move, while some fellow compatriots, neighbours, relatives, friends and so on do not. By introducing temporality to explore the details behind people’s decisions of mobility and fixity and how they intersect with their conviviality, a more complex plot of cosmopolitan conviviality within this production of the cosmopolitan play is enabled.

Through an approach that acknowledges non-elite movers’ and non-movers’ negotiations of the ‘hearth’ and the ‘cosmos’, and their life-paths between ‘home’ and the ‘world’, a more complex analysis is facilitated. Here, cosmopolitanism is viewed not only along one international dimension, but also along a further two dimensions to produce a three dimensional view of the cosmopolitan play. Along the first x axis is convivial width\(^3\), which refers to interactions between actors across national boundaries. The second y axis, convivial depth, refers to interactions between actors across social class, ethnic, religious and other social boundaries inside and outside their national boundaries. The third z axis refers to people’s convivial paths across time, the wider relational context of actors’ life-paths from ‘home’ to ‘world’. Exploring the full backstory, the convivial path taken by actors to their current convivial width and depth, is a means to analyse how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance.

Beck’s (2002) definition of cosmopolitanism as a ‘dialogic imagination’ of a clash of cultures and nationalities within one’s own life, the internalised other, that is, in which the individual reflects upon, critiques and understands contradictory certainties and in which cultures are interpenetrated within an individual. (Kofman 2007:244)

Through expanding the analysis to three dimensions, other events beyond mobility are incorporated. In essence, it extends the exploration of cosmopolitanism by acknowledging that the contradictory certainties upon which people reflect and critique also occur within certain cultures and nationalities. As significant events or periods within life-paths are relayed,

\[^3\] Convivial width and horizons are used interchangeably, however in Chapter 4 convivial horizons are used more to describe different types of width.
these may provide opportunities for reflexive contestations that mirror a deeper ‘dialogical imagination’ than the cosmopolitan perspective to date has considered. Hence the final sub-research question,

- How are the biographical events that expose people to difference influential in the evolution or not of a cosmopolitan stance?

Now that the case for why temporality needs to be included in a study of cosmopolitan conviviality has been made, I introduce suitable concepts that enable an investigation and interpretation of life stories in terms of reflexive contestations. The approach that will be used is interpretative biography (Denzin 1989), which seeks to obtain stories or narratives based on people’s life experiences. These stories are often organised around certain pivotal events or turning points, referred to by Denzin as epiphanies.

Epiphanies are interactional moments and experiences which leave marks on people’s lives. In them, personal character is manifested. They are often moments of crisis. They alter the fundamental meaning structures in a person’s life. Their effects may be positive or negative/…/These are existential acts. Some are ritualised, as in status-passages; others are even routinized/…/Still others are totally emergent and unstructured, and the person enters them with few if any prior understandings of what is going to happen. The meanings of these experiences are always given retrospectively, as they are relived and reexperienced in the stories persons tell about what has happened to them. (Denzin 1989:70pp)

Similarly Giddens (1991:113) proposes the idea of ‘fateful moments’, which individuals experience whilst embarking on a ‘project of self’ in late modern society, “where self-identity is constituted by a reflexive ordering of self narratives, as key to participation in the contemporary affective practice of intimacy” (Adkins 2002:15). Such moments provide crossroads in people’s lives, demanding of the individual to risk assess the consequences of particular choices and actions. These moments can arise from both within and beyond the actor’s actions and control; also recognising that fortune and chance play a role. In empirical practice, building on the above concepts, Thomson and her colleagues (2002) developed the idea of ‘critical moments’ to interpret young people’s transitions, defining them as a narrative device on which a life story turns. More importantly for the purpose of this study, while such events may result in a reorientation of a person’s life, Thomson and colleagues look at the ability of young people to utilise resources in response to such events.

…the notion of the critical moment offers an important addition to this analytical repertoire, enabling comparison across narratives and raising questions about whether, how and why people respond in different way to similar events. The descriptive concept of the critical moment provides
us with a way of seeing how social and economic environments frame individual narratives and the personal and cultural resources on which young people are able to draw. (Thomson et al. 2002:351)

However, transitional events around critical moments will probably involve a confrontation with difference for the individual concerned, either in terms of social context, social position or both, and a reconfiguration of personal communities. Working on the premise that we see ourselves through social interaction with others, what Charles Horton Cooley (1983) referred to as ‘the looking glass self’, such transitional events or critical moments retrospectively are likely to generate self-reflexivity. It is suggested here that in the narration of life stories, reflexive contestations of nationality and other social boundaries are potentially outlined and elaborated on. Hence, by taking a relational and a biographical approach, the study can explore if the transcendence of social boundaries generates the contestation of these boundaries or not, and under which circumstances this may or may not occur.

What is at issue is a thoroughly new constitution of life forms and modes of interaction with late modernity with new types of bonds, ties, actions, contracts, communications and networks are all being formed in the face of reflexive modernisation. (Adkins 2002:15)

The idea of self-reflexivity is where “agency reflects on itself and there is increasing self-monitoring” (Adkins 2002:14) in late modernity. Generally the theory of reflexive modernization promotes the idea that social actors have increasingly overcome many of modernity’s key collective categories of attachment and association such as nationality and class through the life-course decisions they make.

In short, reflexive modernity/modernization refers not simply to new forms of organization but rather to the constitution of a new form of sociality and the emergence of new life forms that have been created via the retrocession of structural forms of determination and the ‘unleashing’ of agency from structure. (Adkins 2002:15)

However, Lisa Adkins (2002) questions the universalising claim that reflexivity is equally distributed, and instead argues that reflexivity is a resource itself, which legitimizes and hence maintains social stratification. Similarly Adams (2007:147) argues that self-reflexivity “may be conditioned by already-existing delineations” of gender and class. Adkins thus argues that reflexivity can become a means of classification in itself. For the purpose of this study, it needs to be considered if cosmopolitan conviviality is structured around already existing delineations of gender, class, ethnicity, and so forth.
In terms of gender and class at least, the fault lines of an effective reflexivity seem to run a similar course to long existing social structures, rather than transcending them once and for all. (Adams 2007:148)

While Adams (2007) instead proposes that self-reflexivity is subject to the relative social positions and associated resources people can access. In line with the previous argument forwarded by Thomson et al. (2002), self-reflexivity is related to the opportunities available to initiate meaningful choices and responses. Another concept which mirrors the idea of self-reflexivity is that of personal competence of ‘biographicity’ (Alheit 1995), the individual ability to reference the social within the construction of the self, and place oneself in relation to society. It means a continual reinterpretation of life through each new context, which are themselves ‘mouldable’ and ‘shapeable’ (Alheit 1995).

Acknowledging that self-reflexivity is not unbounded, increasing attention theoretically and empirically has shifted towards the social boundaries that people negotiate in order to understand and analyse how they act and reflect upon their actions.

If what we are and how we comprehend what we are is so infiltrated with the messages and meanings derived from relationships with others, then self-reflexivity has to be understood as something much more embedded in those relationships, and more broadly, it is something which is always encultured and socialized in particular ways. (Adams 2007:163)

The concepts of epiphanies, fateful and critical moments compliment self-reflexivity and biographicity within an analytical tool bag to explore the evolution or not of self towards a cosmopolitan stance. However, as the above authors have indicated, the reflexive contestation of nationality and other social boundaries may mirror existing delineations of class and gender. The group of actors which shall be employed to analyse such theoretical arguments are young adults. The study of which is often referred to as youth transitions. I now briefly review and outline an underexplored feature of this literature which the study will contribute to. Thereafter the chapter is concluded with a summary and a preview of the study.

### 2.3.7 Youth Transitions

The youth transition literature has expanded significantly from focusing on linear school to work transitions as young people increasingly take prolonged and divergent pathways in terms of their education, careers, housing, and relational lives (Maguire et al. 2001, Pais 2003, Plug et al. 2003). With marriage and family formation increasingly delayed or postponed (Pais 2003), and people moving in and out of education, a myriad of adjectives and concepts have evolved to describe contemporary youth transitions and the extension of this phase of life. While here
is not the place to introduce these, they support the claim by Alberto Melucci (1996: 120) that “youth becomes a mirror held up for the whole of society, a paradigm for the crucial problems of the complex systems.” The variable circumstances and opportunities that young people face make them ideal actors for this production of the cosmopolitan play.

Yet with the increase in international comparative studies within the youth transition literature, ‘methodological nationalism’, the equating of the nation state as a natural and somewhat homogenous unit of analysis has been exposed. For example, numerous European funded research projects (EGRIS 2001, Up2Youth 2006, Van de Velde 2005) have systematically compared the opportunities and constraints young people face in their respective countries. Here structure or national transitional regimes (Walther 2006) are employed to describe how transitions differ along lines of gender, class and education within each country. However, and in light of free movement within the European Union (EU), and the inherent difficulty in studying European movers, the life-paths of young European adults that move and confront and negotiate different education systems, employment markets, socio-cultural and socio-linguistic environments remain underexplored (Rechi 2008, Favell 2008). With the casting of young non-elite movers and non-movers to narrate their life-path from ‘home’ to ‘world’, this study is able to explore how mobility is “situated against and conjoined with notions of fixity” (Kofman 2007: 240) in contemporary youth transitions. In doing so, the study intends to enlarge the cosmopolitan perspective and simultaneously better illustrate the reality that many young adults face within in an increasingly interconnected Europe.

2.4 The Cosmopolitan Play – A Preview

To conclude, I review the main argument forwarded in this chapter as well as the research questions that have emerged from the discussion, and provide a preview of the Cosmopolitan Play that this thesis focuses on.

The aim of this study is to explore how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance, and simultaneously broaden theorising within the cultural cosmopolitanism debate, highlighting through empirical investigation the contradictions and complexities of cosmopolitan conviviality. Hence the overarching research question (ORQ) is,

- How as an individual does one become tolerant, hospitable and at ease with the unfamiliar and develop an openness and willingness to engage with the other?
The ORQ is used as a heuristic device to guide and direct the exploration of cosmopolitan conviviality. Here, relational and temporal elements play alongside the spatial, often the dominant and overbearing feature of cultural cosmopolitan studies. As a guide, the ORQ remains constantly in the wings until it is answered in the final concluding chapter.

From the review of the existing literature, four sub-research questions arise from a simple premise that to date has been overlooked within the cultural cosmopolitan literature. The premise that if self evolves the cosmopolitan stance through engaging with different others, then obviously different others must also have the opportunity to evolve the stance. Therefore a relational perspective is taken in this study, which while recognising that self and other are initially posited as different, they are interdependent co-actors in the cosmopolitan play.

As argued, the empirical work to date within the field of cultural cosmopolitanism tends to focus on either mobile elites or displaced communities, and as a result tends to emphasise and glorify mobility over fixity, and distinguishes movers from non-movers. When referred to, non-movers are often portrayed as a homogenous group of national locals, juxtaposed to the movers with culturally open and supranational attitudes and behaviour. Not only does this tend to equate mobility with cosmopolitanism, it posits a national outlook and a cosmopolitan outlook as mutually exclusive. Yet with no reference to mobility in the definition of the cosmopolitan stance (ORQ), it is surprising that the significance of non-movers within cosmopolitan conviviality has often been overlooked. One of the major empirical and theoretical contributions of this study is to give an equal billing to movers and non-movers. This study deliberately avoids focusing on mobile elites and displaced communities, at contrasting ends of the mobility spectrum, and instead contributes to the study of cultural cosmopolitanism by examining the cosmopolitan conviviality of young non-elite British and Spanish adults living in Madrid and Manchester. Hence, the second research question (RQ2),

- **Does transnational mobility provide an opportunity for movers and non-movers, self and other to evolve a cosmopolitan stance?**

This research question opens the analytical play in Chapter 4, Convivial Horizons, which is dedicated to studying the variable widths of cosmopolitan conviviality. Here, after initially mapping the contexts of actors’ conviviality, the concepts of homophily and boundary work are used to analyse the extent to which interaction with people of different nationalities provokes the reflexive contestation of nationality as an essentialised identity. Additionally, using the concepts of ‘the hearth’ and ‘the cosmos’, people’s feelings that are coupled and decoupled from place are discussed. However, as this study intends to analyse the
relationships between movers and non-movers, it is unable to discuss the conviviality of non-movers in either city who are unacquainted with people of a different nationality.

The prior emphasis on movers within the literature is primarily I argue due to a one dimensional view of cosmopolitanism. This view tends to picture the world as a patchwork canvas of homogenous nations and cultures, which movers transcend and non-movers embody. Gilroy’s (2005) definition of the postcolonial metropolis posits it as a place of melange, a mixing of people who once separated by enormous distances are now found in the same place at the same time. This supports the notion that one may never have to move from ‘home’ to meet the ‘world’ (RQ2), with a mosaic of unfamiliar cultures existing within national boundaries. Yet it also affirms to some extent a one dimensional view of conviviality, disguising the depth of conviviality within national boundaries in terms of social class, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality. Another major contribution of the study is to introduce the depth axis of cosmopolitan conviviality. RQ3 addresses convivial practices within national boundaries as well as those across them:

- Does the transcendence of nationality relate to the contestation and transcendence of other symbolic/social boundaries such as class, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality among movers and non-movers?

Convivial Depths are the subject for Chapter 5, where the distribution of different others within people’s life-paths comes under closer scrutiny. Here the homophily of people’s relationships in terms of social class background, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality is analysed in relation to the biographical distribution of different others, i.e. when did they enter into people’s lives. This is done in order to explore the extent and quality to which people have transcended social boundaries across their biographies.

Using Eriksson’s (2007) social interaction framework, I suggest that the cosmopolitan stance is more likely to evolve among people who have experience of transforming ties with objectively different others into subjective bonds. A bond as opposed to a replaceable tie exists in co-absence, in that it can remain socially present without being bodily present. Hence, not only are objective differences in terms of nationality, social class, ethnicity and so on transcended in the evolution of a bond relationship, but as part of a ‘community in the mind’ the bond relationship transcends space and time. Eriksson argues that within these relationships, the interactional value of meaning making is at its greatest, and provides a means of finding and feeling our place in the world together. However, there is no guarantee that the transcendence of social boundaries transfers automatically into the contestation of social
boundaries, and the construction of new meanings. Hence the fourth research question (RQ4),

- *Is the cosmopolitan stance associated with the experience and ability to look beyond objective differences in developing bonds of close personal relationships?*

To answer this question, which plays a major part in analysing convivial horizons and depths in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively, the idea of personal communities or networks is applied. By acknowledging a distinction in relationships, bonds as opposed to ties, an analysis of the entire array and distribution of relations across the life-path is necessary. Again, with mobility overshadowing fixity, the story of cosmopolitan conviviality often starts from the act of movement. In this study, to analyse the width and depth of people’s conviviality, the story begins at ‘home’ in order to gain greater understanding of people’s convivial ‘worlds’. This brings the third theoretical contribution, and as will be demonstrated in the next chapter, a major methodological contribution to the study of cultural cosmopolitanism. Therefore, to explore how the cosmopolitan stance is temporally and spatially connected, how difference is confronted and negotiated over time, the final research question (RQ5) is posed,

- *How are the biographical events that expose people to difference influential in the evolution or not of a cosmopolitan stance?*

While this question is particularly focused on the third axis of exploration in Chapter 6, Convivial Paths, the temporal element plays a continuous role through each of the analytical chapters. Therefore concepts relating to an evolving self are applied when appropriate throughout the analytical play.

To conclude, a theoretical framework for exploring cosmopolitan conviviality has been illustrated. A methodological direction is now required for this production of the cosmopolitan play. To fill the gaps outlined within the existing literature, 1) a ‘middle group’ of movers that are neither mobile elites nor displaced people, 2) the significance of non-movers, and 3) temporality, a biographical network approach was developed. The approach incorporates temporal and relational aspects alongside the spatial to broaden theorising and understanding around cultural cosmopolitanism in the contemporary age. The approach, along with the corresponding methods of data construction and analysis are now presented in the following chapter, Exploring Conviviality.
3

Exploring Conviviality

3.1 Introduction

To explore how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance, a biographical network approach was developed and employed for this study. It is an approach which bridges the biographical and the network perspective, between the life as told and the life as lived. In doing so, the approach is greater than the sum of its parts. Specifically, it was used to analyse the dialectic interplay between people’s ties and bonds with others throughout their lives, the socio-structural conditions and transformative events within their biographies, and the narration and articulation of attitudes. In practice, the Biographical Sociogram Interview (BSI) method enabled people to feel at ease to discuss their life stories in conjunction with their networks and make reflexive contestations (Jones 2007, Beck 2006, Kofman 2007), which as I have argued are characteristic of a cosmopolitan stance.

The BSI was developed to analyse the three axes of cosmopolitan conviviality (width, depth, path) of twenty-eight young British and Spanish adults (non-elite movers and non-movers) living in Madrid and Manchester. As outlined in Chapter 2, width (x-axis) refers to difference in terms of nationality, depth (y-axis) refers to difference in terms of social class background, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality, and path (z-axis) refers to the relational contexts through which x and y evolve over time. The four sub-research questions presented in Chapter 2, and summarised in section 2.4, provide the blueprint for a cosmopolitan research design.

In the first half of this chapter, the methodological stance and a cosmopolitan research design are presented, together with the rationale behind a Biographical Network Approach. Thereafter the Biographical Sociogram Interview method is introduced, followed by the corresponding method of data analysis developed and used in this study.

3.2 Finding Commonality through Difference

Looking at how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance prompts an exploration into the process through which people develop cosmopolitan behaviours and attitudes. The behavioural element of the cosmopolitan stance was explored through analysing the presence, variety, longevity and most importantly the quality of personal relationships people had
established, developed and maintained within and across social boundaries. Here, relations are seen as either replaceable ties or irreplaceable bonds that people have with objectively similar and different others. Here the bonds people have with different others in terms of nationality, social class background, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality are seen as residual evidence of potential ‘boundary work’, the negotiation and possible contestation of social boundaries.

However, relationships are not developed, maintained or legitimated within a vacuum of unbounded agency, they are coupled to the social structure(s) individuals are born and socialised into, and are articulated in terms of the current structure(s) they are embedded in (Berger & Luckman 1966). Seeing the self as essentially a social structure that arises in social experience with others (Mead 1984), personal networks are a lens through which people’s social lives can be studied and interpreted. Through a comparative analysis of participants distinctive in terms of nationality, mobility, gender, occupation, age, and so on, common themes across people emerged. However, whilst people’s bonds with different others is behavioural evidence of the negotiation and transcendence of social boundaries, it is insufficient evidence to claim that this provokes or equates to the contestation of boundaries.

To explore this attitudinal element of a cosmopolitan stance, the BSI provided opportunities for the participants to openly discuss different others and difference per se, whereby they could reflexively contest social boundaries. In terms of Eriksson’s social interaction positions discussed in section 2.3.3, the BSI procedure developed an interaction position in which participants primarily discussed their experiences as subjects, ensuring the credibility and authenticity of the data produced. The young adults who agreed to partake in the study, approximately 50% of all those approached, were in some way highlighting a degree of willingness and openness to engage with the other and enter into an unfamiliar context. Obviously rapport was achieved to varying degrees across the sample, which, as I will illustrate in the forthcoming chapters, enriched the findings. I acknowledge that this variation was influenced by time constraints in some cases, the location and environment of the interview, and my own sensibility and iterative refinement of my interviewing technique over the course of the field work.

In sum, through comparing the extent and quality to which different cases transcend social boundaries across their biographies, coupled with their reflections and life stories, common threads and events that promote or constrain the evolution of a cosmopolitan stance were discovered.
3.3 Cosmopolitan Research Design

A cosmopolitan research design was achieved through the choice of settings and the sampling strategy employed. The design is an attempt to move beyond ‘methodological nationalism’ in relation to existing youth transition and cultural cosmopolitan literatures, and towards a ‘methodological cosmopolitanism’ where new socio-cultural patterns of sociality can be explored and analysed (Beck 2006). However, the settings and sample were selected using these bodies of cross-national comparative work. This illustrates that any cosmopolitan research design has to acknowledge the complex simultaneity of the local, the national and the cosmopolitan in people’s lives (Kofman 2007:253). To explore this complexity, yet make substantive findings, two sets of young adult nationals, British and Spanish, in two cities, Madrid and Manchester were studied.

First the cities of Madrid in Spain and Manchester in the UK are both metropolises and centres of cosmopolitan conviviality. Second the heightened conviviality of young adults and their desire to experience the ‘cosmos’, “a mirror held up for the whole of society, a paradigm for the crucial problems of the complex systems” (Melucci 1996:120) make them ideal subjects for this study. A cosmopolitan research design explores the complexities of this conviviality, where social interaction provides opportunities for both ‘self’ and ‘other’ to transcend social boundaries and construct new socio-cultural patterns of sociality.

3.3.1 Tales from Two Cities - The Settings

Madrid and Manchester are both postcolonial metropolises where “cultures, histories, and structures of feeling” can “be found in the same place, [and at] the same time” (Gilroy 2005:70). This diversity provides opportunities, both structured and spontaneous, for ‘self’ to engage with ‘others’ across the social boundaries of nationality, class, ethnicity, sexuality, and so on, and are therefore both suitable settings to explore cosmopolitan conviviality.

Two cities from different countries as opposed to one or two cities in the same country are explored in order to highlight the differences and commonalities between two distinctive socio-cultural and linguistic contexts with regards to cosmopolitan conviviality. Whilst both are distinctive cities within their own countries, features of their social milieu are also reflective of the overall social patterns in Spain and the UK respectively. At both a socio-cultural and structural level, Spain and the UK are considered distinct in terms of family and friendship, religiosity, education and training, the labour market and welfare state, and so on (Walther 2006, Van de Velde 2005). Through comparing people’s subjective experiences of
negotiating mobility and fixity within and across these distinctive socio-cultural and structural milieus, both similarities and differences in the form and content of cosmopolitan conviviality were uncovered.

With English as the de-facto global language and Spanish becoming increasingly important, coupled with the greater ease of travel within Europe and beyond, cities like Madrid and Manchester have become increasingly attractive and viable locations for foreign nationals to reside and work. Together with the freedom of mobility within the EU, a new generation of young adults are being socialised into an open European space, one in which national borders are increasingly permeable. With multinational corporations, large service sectors and foreign language centres located in both cities, foreign nationals of differing educational and occupational backgrounds can find employment and develop a working life within both settings. To enable and support this movement, and the fieldwork, the proliferation of low-cost flights in and out of both cities' regions opens mobility to a continually widening group of young adults who seek the 'cosmos', and the opportunity to learn a global language.\(^4\)

The city of Madrid has an estimated population of 3.4 million, with 5.8 million in the entire metropolitan area. This is more than double the population of Greater Manchester metropolitan area at 2.6 million, in which 484,000 live in the city borough of Manchester. However, official statistics show that they both have a similar percentage of inhabitants born outside the country, 16.2% and 15% respectively.\(^5\) The residential and occupational distribution and cultural leisure patterns of movers living within each metropolis no doubt differ, influencing the opportunities for cosmopolitan conviviality across both areas. However, through personal experience I would suggest that the comprehensive and affordable municipal transport system in Madrid, which incorporates the metro and the bus services, promotes greater conviviality across the city than what is currently facilitated by the public transport system in Manchester. Therefore, I suspect that cosmopolitan conviviality is more segregated in Manchester, concentrated to certain suburbs and the city centre.

Finally, in Madrid and Manchester, both education and commerce are conducted primarily in the country's national language, which makes them attractive and viable locations for migrants from both within and outside their respective national borders. Barcelona and London were considered as alternative settings for the study, but both were considered too distinctive to enable substantive comparisons across cases. First, Barcelona was disregarded due to the primacy of the Catalan language in education and commerce which prevents many young adults from learning the national language.\(^4\) Second, language skills are relatively low in both countries in comparison to the rest of the EU.\(^4\)

---

\(^4\) Second language skills are relatively low in both countries in comparison to the rest of the EU (Juliá 2002)

\(^5\) The national average of foreign born residents in Spain and the UK are 11% and 10.6% respectively
Spaniards from moving to the city, and which potentially acts as a convivial barrier for foreign residents. London was considered inappropriate for comparison due to its greater population size, which is twice as culturally and ethnically diverse than Barcelona, Madrid and Manchester. I would also argue that neither Barcelona nor London are particularly representative, politically and economically, of cities in Spain and the UK. I acknowledge that both of these cities could be argued to have more of a cosmopolitan profile than Madrid and Manchester, having and attracting a greater number of international corporations and tourists. However, I suggest that this is based upon an elitist notion of cosmopolitanism biased towards commerce and the frequent traveller, one which tends to neglect the everyday conviviality of residents.

### 3.3.2 The Story Tellers – The Sample

**Nationality and Mobility**

Having lived in Madrid prior to the doctoral research, I was aware not only of the large and diverse international population living in the city, but also of the considerable number of Brits working and living in the city. The official British population living in the Madrid Municipality as of January 2010 stands at 11,041, which constitutes around 1% of the total migrant population. However I was unaware until moving to Manchester of the significant presence of a young Spanish community living and working in the city. The Spanish Consulate in the city 'has a number of 1758 Spanish people registered with an address in Manchester'. Although in both settings it is difficult to give precise figures for the foreign populations due to the transiency of young adults that constitute the majority of these foreign populations. EU citizens may officially register due to national or local administrative requirements for seeking employment, welfare and the alike and may be under some obligation to unregister when leaving the country. However, due to free movement within the EU, the true figures of young foreign adults living in both settings are difficult if not impossible to determine (Kennedy 2008, Rechi 2008), with some suspecting that numbers could often be double the size estimated by local and national institutions (Favell 2008).

I concluded that there was sufficient evidence, from my own experience, and from official statistics, that exploring the cosmopolitan conviviality of young British and Spanish adult movers together with non-movers in both locations was feasible. Simultaneously I

---

6 The figures for foreign born residents in Barcelona and London are 13.9% and 31% respectively.
7 Email from Spanish Consulate in Madrid dated 16/03/2011.
8 Over 2000 Spanish utilise a group page called Éspanoles en Manchester on the social networking site Facebook to organise their movement to, residence and social activities in Manchester.
acknowledge that many other nationalities reside in both settings, and would have been suitable movers for exploring cosmopolitan conviviality. However through choosing to explore the convivial biographies of young adults with the same socio-cultural backgrounds as the two settings, the socio-structural variance was minimised and this allowed for more critical and integral inferences to be substantiated regarding cosmopolitan conviviality. Young British and Spanish adults provided two distinctive socio-cultural and socio-linguistic groups for comparison (Walther 2006, Van de Velde 2005), and by also focusing on these two groups both within and outside their native contexts, i.e. as movers and non-movers, comparisons in terms of cosmopolitan conviviality between Madrid and Manchester could also be made.

Having set up the intersecting categories of nationality (British/Spanish) and mobility (mover/non-mover) to create four sub-groups within the sample, a further two criteria constructed the sampling framework. These are discussed below. Thereafter in selecting actors, variation was the guiding principle to enable substantive findings to be made.

**Variable Conviviality**

The first criterion was that all the participants had friends, family or colleagues of other nationalities. Therefore they potentially had the opportunity to have developed bonds with other nationalities, defined as behavioural evidence of transcending nationality. Thus, in the case of the movers, they had all lived at least or approaching to one year in Madrid or Manchester. This ensured that they had had opportunities to develop friendships in the city and possibly reflect over changes in their personal communities. As regards the non-movers, they either had resided in the city for at least one year or they were originally from Madrid and Manchester and had recently returned.

The second criterion was that all the participants were or had been in employment. Previous studies on the evolution of young adults’ personal communities shows that entry into working and adult life is characterised by a significant renewal of personal relationships, as work colleagues and interest based friends both complement and replace relationships from adolescence and education (Degenne & Lebeaux 2005, Grosetti 2005, Bidart & Lavenu 2005). Similarly Fischer (1982:4) argued that “by adulthood, people have chosen their networks”. Hence entering adult and working life is associated with negotiating greater social diversity, through which one chooses ones friends. Therefore to explore how cosmopolitan conviviality is involved in this process, only participants that had exited full-time education were eligible. An upper age limit of thirty-five years was set as the working definition of a young adult.
Finally over and above these criteria, in order to find commonality through difference, variation across the sample was achieved through selecting participants that differed in terms of gender, age, educational background and attainment, occupation, subjective social class background, ethnicity, sexuality, marital status and length of residence in the city. The diversity of the sample was achieved by not only recruiting participants through gatekeepers, i.e. friends of friends, but also by directly approaching people socialising or working in bars, clubs and restaurants and people I met whilst travelling between the two settings.

Table 3.1 Interview Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MOVERS</th>
<th>NON-MOVERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MADRID</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 British males</td>
<td>4 Spanish males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 British females</td>
<td>3 Spanish females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MANCHESTER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Spanish males</td>
<td>4 British males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 Spanish females</td>
<td>3 British females</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In sum, 28 interviews (15 men and 13 women) were conducted with young British and Spanish adults between the ages of 23 and 35. Fourteen were with non-movers (7 British and 7 Spanish), people that reside and work in their native context, and fourteen were with movers (6 British & 8 Spanish), people that reside and work in a different national context to the one of their childhood and adolescence. Six of the 15 interviews with young Spanish adults were conducted in Spanish and one was conducted in English and Spanish. The remaining interviews were conducted in English. The interviews were partly transcribed and translated when necessary.

3.4 A Biographical Network Approach

To adapt Jean-Paul Sartre’s phrase: people are condemned to individualization. Individualization is a compulsion, albeit a paradoxical one, to create, to stage manage, not only one’s own biography but the bonds and networks surrounding it and to do this amid changing preferences and successive stages of life, while constantly adapting to the conditions of the labour market, the education system, the welfare state and so on.” (Beck & Beck-Gernsheim 2001:4)

A biographical network approach combines the merits of a biographical perspective with the merits of a network perspective to overcome each perspective’s shortcomings. Through their
complementarity, a biographical network approach is greater than the sum of its parts. Here I briefly outline the merits and shortcomings of these two perspectives to justify the approach used here.

A biographical perspective aims to understand people’s lives holistically, whereby for an interviewee the retrospective narration of one’s life story is a meaning making process to organise and understand particular life experiences within the larger project of self. Through allowing the methodological lens to view all aspects of a person’s life, be it education, work, family and so on, the complex interplay of how people negotiate these different social spheres in their everyday lives is highlighted (Henderson et al 2007). Through opening up the empirical field to what is subjectively pertinent in a person’s life, the entirety of experiential life is included, which can be viewed through the double lens of agency and structure. However, previous youth transition research highlights that whilst individual choice, control and agency are often symbolic of many young adults’ narratives, the subjective opportunities and resources - economic, social and cultural - to materialise them differ (teRiele 2004, Thomson et al. 2002). This last sentence signals both the inherent nature and limits of a biographical perspective, the discrepancy between the life as told and the life as lived, i.e. through which circumstances are the stories told? While any life story narrative is grounded in the life lived, it is a narrative construct, a rendered presentation of self. As such, Holland & Thomson (2009:464) argue that “if one-off life stories are our only form of data, we are limited in what we can see.”

Three elements are important in a biography: the factual events in the person’s life; the meaning these have for him or her; and the way the story about them is told. All must be interpreted with reference to the different layers of context within which a life unfolds. (Brannen & Nilsen 2011:609)

Therefore a life story requires contextualisation if the researcher’s task is to go beyond the life as told and gain insight on the life as lived, to uncover and understand the provisionality of subjects’ narratives within the larger project of self (Holland & Thomson 2009). Used alone, the biographical approach struggles to account for the significance of social relations in mediating the dialectic understanding and articulation of self in relation to society. Taking the theoretical perspective that we construct and see ourselves through interaction with others, the presentation of self is essentially a relational construct. While biographical studies recognise the importance of social relations for gaining insight into the life as lived within the life as told (Holland & Thomson 2009), seldom are they formally analysed as a contextual layer in its unfolding. Here, a network perspective can assist on two levels; data construction
and analysis. First, the benefit of visual methods such as relational mapping (Emmel 2008), time-lines (Bagnoli 2009, Brannen & Nilsen 2011) and other audio-visual techniques to enrich qualitative interview data has not gone unnoticed.

The tangibility of the map is an important feature. This allows the interviewer and participant to return to features of the map in the interview and subsequent interviews to unfold the process of description—elaboration— theorisation (Emmel 2008).

However, if substantive comparisons between cases are to be made with regards to how social relations (evidence of the life as lived) translate into the life as told, then formal network analytical tools are fit for purpose. Used in tandem, the life story and network analysis allow the research to “capture contradiction, dissonance and repetition” (Holland & Thomson 2009:464) in the narrative. I argue that together they provide a means to look beyond the rendered mask of self. In sum, and with reference to the opening quote by Beck and Beck-Gernsheim, the biographical approach can only partially explore how life-stories are created and stage managed through successive stages of life, as it does not explore the bonds and networks surrounding this life project. It lacks a thorough analysis of the meso level of social relations in which individuals are embedded, the level through which everyday life is experienced (De Federico de la Rúa 2007). I therefore call on the network approach to assist in the exploration of cosmopolitan conviviality.

The network approach was originally developed in response to the theoretical detachment of structural-functionalism from everyday experiential life, with the recognition that structural-functionalism’s explanations of human behaviour could not account for social change. The basic underlying assumption of the network approach is that actors, be they individuals or organisations, are interdependent with other actors and that this interdependency has consequences for social behaviour and hence social change. “The network analogy indicates that people are dependent on others, not on an abstract society” (Boissevian & Mitchell 1973:viii) adhering to the theoretical position of a social or relational self. (Boissevian & Mitchell 1973, Boissevain 1979)

Basically, network analysis is very simple: it asks questions about who is linked to whom, the nature of that linkage, and how the nature of the linkage affects behaviour. These are relatively straightforward questions, the resolution of which is fairly simple. (Boissevain 1979:393)

Ego-network or personal network analysis (PNA) explores the width, depth and quality of a person’s (ego’s) network of relationships with others (referred to as alter) and the consequences of the composition and structure of the network on ego’s behaviour and
attitudes (Laumann 1973). The network structure is constructed by asking ego to name the existence and qualities of relationships that exist between alter. With both the composition and the structure of the network based on ego’s recollection and relational judgement of alter, they are also referred to as cognitive networks. However, cognitive networks are not simply figments of an individual’s imagination when the self is a social structure that arises in social experience with others (Mead 1984). A biographical network approach makes use of personal networks as a looking glass or a lens to view the social structure of self. A visual map used to orientate the interpretation of biographies and the narrative articulation thereof in order to achieve better understanding.

Networks of personal relations evolve over time. They reflect and go with socialisation. Their history and dynamics contribute to their present structure. (Bidart & Lavenu 2005:359)

Whilst it is acknowledged that the longevity or duration of personal relationships are an important element of their quality, and contribute to their present structure, the biographical details of ego’s relationships are often overlooked in network analysis (Boissevain 1974, McPherson et al. 2001). Similar to the argument forwarded earlier on cultural cosmopolitan theorising, the temporal element of networks, their evolution over time has not received sufficient qualitative attention within the literature in order to gain the further understanding into ego’s behaviours and attitudes. Yet this is what a network approach aims to uncover. The study of the dynamics of networks is an emerging and growing field within network analysis, with longitudinal methods increasingly used to map and compare personal networks, focusing on their size, composition and structure across time (Degenne & Lebeaux 2005, Bidart & Lavenu 2005, Grosetti 2005). However, as social network software packages have developed, the quantitative analysis of network dynamics has overshadowed the longevity and quality of personal relationships as a predictor of social behaviour and attitudes. The network approach developed here gives network dynamics and the quality of personal relationships an equal billing by introducing a biographical perspective, to provide the story of self behind the network (Crossley 2010). In doing so, it “humanizes social analysis by reintroducing "people," as opposed to "roles," and their choices and actions into the stream of events that constitutes [life] history.” (Boissevain 1979: 393)

In his reappraisal of social network analysis over thirty years ago, Jeremy Boissevain (1979: 393) warned against methodological involution, stipulating that used alone network methods “cannot deal with the social forces underlying long-term processes” such as for example transnational mobility and cosmopolitanization. However when “used alongside other research methods and forms of conceptualisation, /…/, it can provide important additional
dimensions” and thus contribute to theory on social behaviour and processes. Or, in the words of Sanjek (1974:589) "one does not study networks; one uses network methods to answer anthropological [research] questions."

If those who have used network analysis consider that it can provide valuable insights, let them demonstrate this to their sceptical critics by making their results and methods relevant and understandable. (Boissevain 1979:394)

The biographical network approach used in this study returns network analysis to its origins, a method to gain insight into human behaviour and attitudes, and it provides the biographical method with a worthy sparring partner to better place and understand life stories in a relational context. It as an attempt to re-illustrate the benefits of networks as an explorative and analytical tool to gain insight into personal and hence social change, as such it responds to calls for new kinds of networking thinking (Knox et al. 2006).

In sum, the biographical network approach is an integrated approach and responds to calls for mixing methods in a qualitatively driven way (Mason 2006), and combining qualitative and quantitative elements in network analysis (Crossley 2010, Edwards 2010, Hollstein 2011). Over the remaining pages of this chapter I present a novel mixed method of data construction and analysis. The Biographical Sociogram Interview is able to capture relationships and networks as process, and as such gives the content and the form of networks equal billing (Crossley 2010). The synergy in the method of data construction opens up an analytical space where both quantitative and qualitative methods can meet and play, and takes advantage of complexity and detail for a fuller sociological understanding of networks and social life.

3.5 The Biographical Sociogram Interview

The Biographical Sociogram Interview method was designed specifically for the purposes of this study to explore the complex interplay between people’s networks and biographies. It simultaneously epitomises the theoretical and methodological stance of the study, that biographies and the self are relationally embedded. More specifically, the method was calibrated to explore each specific research question. It therefore not only constructed data on the broader contextual conditions of cosmopolitan conviviality, but also the relational and biographical consequences of this conviviality on participants’ opinions and attitudes. Hence the method allowed me to explore whether their experiences of cosmopolitan conviviality had resulted also in the reflexive contestation of essentialised identities. (Jones 2007, Beck 2006, Kofman 2007)
Drawing on the methods of participant-aided sociograms (Hogan et al. 2007), and biographical life story interviews (Atkinson 2001), the convivial width and depth of participants’ personal communities were measured in conjunction with their life-paths and the stories thereof. To reiterate, convivial width is specifically defined as the quantity and quality, or the extent and variety, with which people interact with others of a different nationality (RQ2 & RQ4), whereas convivial depth is the extent and variety to which people interact with different others in terms of social class, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality (RQ3 & RQ4). To analyse the process of how the width and depth of cosmopolitan conviviality emerges, is maintained and possibly dissipates within biographies, the networks were constructed in relation to successive stages of life (RQ5) as defined by the participants. While the biographical sociograms provide an ‘objective’ ‘outsider’s view’ of conviviality, the life stories not only provide the contextual base of this conviviality, a subjective ‘insider’s view’, but also a base on which participants could discuss difference and potentially make reflexive contestations. While the life story interview method is often adopted to explore the evolution of self in relation to others, and a means of uncovering personal life philosophies and biographicity (Atkinson 2001), in combination with the biographical sociogram, a thicker description of cosmopolitan conviviality was achieved.

The data on each participant were constructed in two stages. Firstly through a questionnaire, the data of which provided the base for the second stage, an interview. I now elaborate on the design of the questionnaire, and the subsequent organisation and analysis of the data prior to its application in the interview. I conclude the section with some methodological reflections.

3.5.1 Interview Questionnaire

Introduction

Together with the questionnaire (Appendix B), a copy of the consent form and the information sheet (Appendix A) was emailed to potential participants outlining the study entitled ‘The Cross-Cultural Interaction of young British and Spanish adults living in Madrid and Manchester’. It was stated that ‘the research is interested in your social interaction with others who are culturally and socially different from you in terms of for example nationality, ethnicity, social-class, as well as in how your social interactions have changed over your lifetime.’ Participants agreed to partake in the study by completing and returning the questionnaire, where they also were asked to suggest a suitable time and location for a face-to-face interview which was estimated to take two hours. The questionnaire consisted of three parts over three excel sheets, and participants were made aware that all three needed to be
completed prior to the interview. Where it was apparent that the participant had misunderstood or misinterpreted instructions within the questionnaire, it was returned with clarification of the instructions for corrections to be made.

I. Personal Details - Sample Variation

On the first sheet titled ‘Personal Details’, background information on each participant was obtained, firstly their name, age, nationality and self-identifiable social class. Other details included were the arrival date in Madrid or Manchester, highest educational attainment and colleges/universities attended, occupation and workplace, and level of foreign languages spoken. This information was controlled so that participants fell within the sampling framework and to ensure variation across the sample was achieved.

II. Social World - The Name Generator

On sheet two, the personal network data were produced through the use of a multiple name generator consisting of six relational questions (Q1-Q6). The design draws upon the Social Support Interview Scale (ASSIS) by Barrera (1980) and a multiple name generator developed by Marin & Hampton (2007). Through the combination of exchange, role-relational/attribute and affective questions, data on the quality and variety of cosmopolitan conviviality within participants’ social worlds were obtained. Most of the concern over the reliability of name generators to attain network measures is related to the use of network analysis to study social support. (Martin & Hampton 2007) However, in this study, the prime intention of the name generator was to study the convivial width, depth and quality of people’s bonds and ties. To assist participants to recollect people, they were instructed that they could refer to their contacts in their mobile phone, email and in the social networking site Facebook.

The first two exchange questions below were used to elicit people that provide emotional support (Q1) and companionship (Q2). These specific questions were used to obtain bonds, the people whom they predominantly interact with in a subjective symmetrical position, and through which they may transcend social boundaries (RQ2-4). Marin & Hampton (2007) found these two single questions to be the most consistent and reliable for attaining alter and hence predicting network size.9 More importantly, unlike exchange questions pertaining to instrumental and informational support, they are less dependent on propinquity for their exchange. Hence, they are more suitable to attain both co-absent and co-present relationships.

---

9 62% of all alter named across the sample were given under these two questions, supporting those findings of Marin & Hampton (2007)
- Q1. With whom do you discuss important personal matters?
- Q2. With whom do you enjoy socialising and travelling?

Participants were asked to not repeat names listed in Question 1 for Question 2 to provoke reflection over the type and quality of their social relations, and for the same reason, ‘travelling’ was added to Q2\(^\text{10}\). For more settled and mature participants, not being able to repeat confidants (Q1) as companions (Q2) tended to be a point of contestation as they recognised the multiple roles of their social relations, whereas for younger and more socially active participants this was less the case.\(^\text{11}\)

These first two lists, I found that interesting because I thought they are a very similar group of people, people who I’d give my time to, especially like travel and socialise with which is important time isn’t it, are the kind of people who I’d also talk to about what’s going on in my life so it could be a little while to think of other people who perhaps, who perhaps weren’t, I don’t know what you call it, top level people who I would socialise with/…/ I think holiday time is like, that’s how I measure who are my best, my absolute best friends are the ones I share holiday time with, because you can’t risk holiday time can you, because it’s expensive…(Iwan, 34)

You know, you don’t do those things with different people, everyone is, you know some people have their roles in your life as different things but mostly the people you discuss personal things with, you do stuff with as well, so that was hard, but mmm, everything else, you suddenly realise how small your social circle really is, because I was going through the names of people on my phone, I didn’t bother with Facebook, because you know Facebook is just for being nosy…(Katie, 30)

The next three questions were role-relational and attribute based in that participants were asked to name friends, colleagues and family with a specific attribute. The interpretative ambiguity of the terms friends, colleagues and family across different socio-economic and socio-cultural contexts was reduced by asking participants to name people with a specific attribute difference. (Marin & Hampton 2007) Question 3 specifically obtained data on the width of their cosmopolitan conviviality, the total number of other nationals they considered friends, colleagues and family.\(^\text{12}\) The nationalities of those named were obtained during the interview, enabling the socio-cultural heterogeneity of the networks to be analysed.

- Q3. Name friends/colleagues/family with a different nationality to you

\(^{10}\) Travelling was also added to provoke discussion on travels and adventure
\(^{11}\) Questionnaire discussed in initial stages of interview
\(^{12}\) This also ensured that they fulfilled criterion 1 of the sampling strategy
Question 4 obtained data on one particular depth of cosmopolitan conviviality, those people they considered as having a different social class background. Again further qualitative details were obtained and discussed in the interview.

- Q4. Name friends/colleagues/family with a different social class background to you

Question 5 was a deliberately ambiguous question to explore how participants defined difference; which different social and symbolic categories did they see within their social worlds? This also was taken up and discussed in the interview.

- Q5. Name friends/colleagues/family whom you consider different to you in some way

For Questions 3-5, participants were allowed to repeat names previously given as confidants (Q1) and companions (Q2). Therefore the extent to which cosmopolitan conviviality (Q3-5) had led to the transcendence of social boundaries could be explored further in the interview. However these three questions also elicited names that potentially would not normally be generated by a standard multiple social support name generator predominantly used in personal network studies. This potentially conflated the network sizes. However, the significance of these particular alter/relationships were clarified during the interview.

The final affective question, Question 6 asked them to name people who were ‘especially close’, this was used as a catch all question to allow participants to name bonds not encapsulated in the previous five questions.

- Q6. Name anyone who is or has been especially close to you

While not temporally specific in their wording, Question 1 to Question 5 would tend to draw names of people who were currently active in participants’ networks, those with significant levels of conviviality and co-presence. To elicit relationships that were characterised by co-absence, the words ‘or has been’ were incorporated into Question 6. Here the intention was to stimulate participants to think of and name people that had been active in their network at some previous point in their biography.

III. Life Events/Story

On the final sheet participants were asked, ‘If you were to write your autobiography what would be the titles of the book’s chapters?’ It was also suggested that if they desired, to provide a title for their autobiography. They were prompted that they could name as many
chapter titles as they wished. The two prime purposes of the question were, one, the chapter titles would provide the structure for both the life story narrative and the biographical sociogram constructed during the interview, and two, to get participants to start reflecting and organising their autobiography prior to the scheduled interview.

3.5.2 Interview Preparation

On receipt of the questionnaire and with a designated time and location for the subsequent interview arranged, some prior analysis of the data was necessary to prepare the materials for the construction of the biographical sociogram during the interview.

Biographical Sociogram

The names elicited through the name generator were first cross referenced and categorised for writing onto different coloured ‘memo tip’ notes which would form the nodes of the sociogram. The purpose of this was to ensure the clear identification of alter during the interview to assist further probing on the establishment of relationships with different others across the life-path.

All the names listed with a different nationality were written on red notes, different social class background on green, those considered different in some way on yellow and the remaining names on blue notes. However when the same name appeared under different questions, the name was written only on one coloured note. The rule used for determining the colour was that nationality (Q3) superseded social class (Q4), which superseded considered different in some way (Q5) which in turn superseded discuss important personal matters (Q1) and enjoy socialising and travelling (Q2). For example someone named as a companion (Q2) and considered different in some way (Q5) would be written on a yellow note. Therefore a blue note indicated that the person was either a confidant, a companion or especially close, was of the same nationality as the participant and not considered different in social class background or in any other way by the participant. Through this preparation, discrepancies and interpretive errors of the questionnaire by participants were identified, which were then either returned for corrections or alternatively resolved in the interview. The autobiographical details of sheet three were copied alongside the details of sheet two, so that during the interview participants could see on the laptop screen both the names and the chapter titles they had provided, details that formed the structure of the interview.
The second step was to prepare the A2 sheet of paper that the sociogram was to be constructed on (see Figure 3.1). This was done using the data from sheet three of the questionnaire. After drawing a small circle in the centre of the paper to represent the participant at the centre of their social world, for each chapter title given additional concentric circles were drawn in pencil, using the whole sheet of paper. A further one or two circles were drawn to allow for manoeuvrability during the interview. This produced a series of rings which represented the autobiographical chapters, which in most cases were organised chronologically. This produced an archers’ target where the bull represented ego, its circumference representing when ego was born and the outer drawn circle representing the present day. Within this temporal grid the labelled notes of names would be placed by the participant during the interview.

*Figure 3.1 - A2 Template of Biographical Sociogram*

### 3.5.3 The Interview

The face-to-face interview was divided into three parts, the life story, the biographical sociogram, and final questions and discussion linking the previous two parts. The interviews were digitally recorded with the participants’ consent.
Introduction & Ethics

After initial introductions, the three part interview procedure was outlined to the interviewee and the consent form was explained and co-signed. It was at this juncture that it was fully explained to participants that they need not discuss issues they considered private and sensitive, and if they felt uncomfortable at any stage during the process, they could pause and/or stop the interview. Additionally it was explained that the information given was confidential and that the data, including names of people provided would be anonymised in the final thesis. Prior to the life story, one participant explained that they would rather not discuss a certain traumatic incident. Another participant became observably upset during the life story, here, I instructed the participant that they need not discuss this any further and that we could take a break if so wished. Whilst they declined the offer, I took the opportunity to go to the toilet to give the participant a break.

Following the interview guide (Appendix C) and to ensure that each participant had equal opportunity to discuss issues openly in the final part, time was allocated accordingly to each of the three parts. It was confirmed that the interview would take approximately two hours. However it was established if it would be possible to overrun two hours, allowing for some leeway in the schedule. The shortest interview due to time restrictions was just over 1 hour and the longest just over 3 hours, the average length was 2 hours and 9 minutes.

During the initial stages with Spanish participants it was confirmed in which language they wanted to be interviewed. In Manchester, one of the eight Spanish movers was interviewed in Spanish. This was due to the fact that our correspondence prior to and leading to the interview had been in Spanish. In Madrid, one of the seven interviews was conducted in English for the same reason. However at times during many of the interviews with Spanish participants, expressions and phrases in both languages were used.

Prior to the start of their life story, participants were asked how they had found the questionnaire. If they had had any difficulties, doubts, or queries, these were discussed and any problems resolved, assisting to ensure the validity and reliability of the questionnaire data.

The Life Story

Participants were then asked ‘Please, using your autobiographical chapter titles, tell me your life story, you may start where you wish’. Placed in front of the participant, was the laptop screen with the names and titles they had provided in the questionnaire. Whilst the name
generator used in the questionnaire was designed to elicit both currently active, co-present, and previously active, co-absent relationships, the telling of their life story was likely to provoke not only past memories, but also past relationships of biographical and personal significance. Therefore following the initial instruction, an additional instruction was given, ‘when going through your chapter titles, if possible, please refer to people that you have listed here (pointing to the laptop screen), though if you happen to mention other people of importance not present here, that is not a problem, as I will write them down in my pad and we can add them to your social world later.’

The chapter titles provided the structure for their life story, a means to narrate it. If the interviewee needed encouragement, or was confused by the instructions, clarification was provided by adding ‘I see your chapter titles as the skeleton of your life, I would like you to now put some flesh on the bones’. The interviewees had between four and fifteen autobiographical chapter titles to describe, with an average of around eight. With the number of chapter titles known prior to the interview, the first part of the interview schedule could be organised and controlled with appropriate prompting. The aim was to evolve a relatively informal style, which at times, as exemplified in the interview passage with Maribel below, resembled a ‘conversation with a purpose’ (Burgess 1984:102 as cited in Mason 2002: 62). These were conversations predominantly conducted within a subjective symmetrical interaction position. When probed on her self-referential status as the black-sheep of her family, Maribel iterates she identifies with this as it symbolises the following of her dreams.

N. So you finished your degree and…
M. Yes, I decided to become the black-sheep of my family, not going back to [my home town] to work in the pharmacy
N. And it was expected that when you finish your degree that you would go back?
M. Err, I think, my mother, my parents didn’t want me to go back to the pharmacy I guess, because like they thought that I could get better things or whatever
N. They realised that you’d gone beyond that
M. Yeah, so, but I think my aunt was kind of, let’s see if she comes back and stuff, so I’m the only pharmacist in my family who doesn’t work in a pharmacy, or has worked in a pharmacy, because I have two more cousins who are pharmacists and they are working in a pharmacy
N. Not in the same but in different places
M. Yeah, exactly
N. So you decided I’m not going to work in a pharmacy and I’m not going to go home
M. No
N. But you consider yourself to be the black-sheep, or?
M. No, it’s just an expression, like, you know…
N. Yeah, but you quite like the idea of being the black-sheep?
M. I love it, I love it because precisely, I was just following my dreams13, I really loved when I was studying pharmacy, I really loved all the micro-biology and the molecular biology, so I used, I was really lucky I mean, I’ve been lucky kind of my whole life, so
N. Don’t you think that you make your own luck?

Generally the chapter titles were organised and narrated chronologically, and in a few cases future chapters were provided and elaborated on. If one was provided, they were asked to comment on the title of their autobiography. On completion of their life story, the participant was thanked and given a couple of minutes break while the materials for the sociogram were organised.

**Constructing the Biographical Sociogram**

*The Social Map – Refining the Grid*

The A2 sheet of paper was then unveiled and the grid explained, whereby the rings represented chronologically the autobiographical chapters of the participant’s life14. Participants were asked to write their name in the inner circle, thus placing themselves at the centre of their social world. An arrowed line or radius was drawn from the edge of this inner circle outwards the outer edge of the sheet cutting through all the rings and labelled time, explaining that the start of the line represented their birth, and the edge of the outer circle was the current point in time in the interview. I referred to the grid as their social map.

The next step was for them to choose if they so wished the same chapter titles they had provided and narrated to structure the map, or if they wished to change or merge chapters according to events that had arisen whilst telling their life story. When these were established, the participant wrote the title in each respective chronological ring, any superfluous outer rings were ignored. Having constructed the temporal frame for the sociogram, the purpose of the coloured notes was then explained. They were then asked which of the additional names that had arisen during their life story narrative they would like included in the map. These were written on purple notes to distinguish them from the people elicited in the questionnaire.

*Positioning of alter & alter attributes*

Participants were then asked where they would like to start placing people on their map, and were shown with the first two names how to place them, perpendicular to the circumference

---

13 ‘Following My Dreams’ was one of Maribel’s autobiographical chapter titles
14 This in essence combines the idea of time lines with relational mapping into a formal network method
on the radius. They were instructed to place people in the respective chapter/ring they had entered into their lives. This enabled not only to see how different others were spread across the biography, but also the longevity of relationships. Participants generally found it easier to place them chronologically, working from the inner to the outer rings. They could also distinguish temporally between people in the same ring by placing the notes either closer to the inner or outer of the ring. This was done so that processes of network and convivial evolution could be explored later when alter-alter relations were attained. Participants were also instructed to use the whole of the map as they saw fit, but to keep in mind to place people who knew each other close to each other or within a similar radius when they had entered in different chapters. With the names present on the laptop, the interviewee requested one name at a time to place on the map. As more names were added, the adhesive notes could be moved and rearranged as the interviewee saw fit. When doing so, this confirmed that the participant understood the temporal and relational logic behind the sociogram. While most participants found the logic straightforward, some made a few mistakes before finding their rhythm. The process continued until all the notes, including the additional purple notes had been arranged on the map to the satisfaction of the interviewee.

The context of where and how ego knew alter was attained as names were placed on the map, unless this information was already clear from the life story. When all the names had been placed, the specific attribute difference of alter provided for Questions 3 to 5 were established. Abbreviations for nationalities and social class background were written on the notes. Through getting each person to explain why they considered certain alter to be of a different social class background, subjective understandings of social class were explored and discussed. This process was repeated for those people considered different in some way, exploring how participants defined and understood difference. This was a deliberate ploy to prompt a discussion regarding difference and different others within their social world, whereby they potentially would have the opportunity to contest or affirm essentialised identities. Thereafter they were asked to identify any other objective differences they may or may not have already identified within their social world, such as ethnicity, age, religion, sexuality and so on.

As regards how participants distinguished between confidants (Q1) and companions (Q2), this was then raised and discussed at this juncture, if it had not already arisen earlier when discussing the questionnaire at the start of the interview. At this stage the network composition and the biographical distribution of participants’ alter were established, what remained to be attained was the network structure; the relationships between alter.

Notes were attached to the edge of the A2 sheet so that respondents could take alter as they saw fit
Participants were then asked to identify groups of two or more people. They were provided with a red and a blue marker pen to distinguish between the type and strength of groups and relationships between alter. First it was explained and exemplified on a separate piece of paper, where I showed them to demarcate strong groups in red by drawing around the notes, to signify that everyone included in the group ‘were close or knew each other well’. After establishing these groups, they were then to use the blue marker pen to identify weak groups, whereby ‘people knew each other but were not close’. People were allowed to belong to more than one group, and strong groups could be nested within larger weak groups. When all the groups were established, participants were asked to provide and write group names on the map to which they would be subsequently be referred to on the recording. Through doing this could not only cliques be identified, but the process of attaining the remaining relations was made easier and more efficient for constructing the relational matrix for further data analysis in UCINET 6. Thereafter strong and weak relations between groups, alter inside different groups, and alter outside groups were drawn between either the notes in the case of alter or edges in the case of groups. For a more thorough description of a participant aided procedure to construct the network, and the construction of the relational matrix for further analysis, see Hogan et al. (2007)

Network Reflections

When all the relations had been established to the satisfaction of the participant, they were asked for their thoughts on their map. With now both the width and depth of cosmopolitan conviviality visualised, no longer simply a list of names and chapters, participants were allowed time to make observations and comment on their network. Similarly this allowed for me to prompt them on certain aspects of the network that had now emerged through its visualisation. This enabled a more thorough exploration into cosmopolitan conviviality. To verify the data on confidants and companions, participants were asked which people within the network were the most important in their lives. These network reflections prompted a discussion that led into the final part of the interview.
Final Questions & Discussion

The interview was concluded with specific questions relating more directly to behaviour and attitudes associated with the working definition of a cosmopolitan stance, as presented in section 2.2. These questions as outlined in the interview guide (Appendix C) were used as prompts to initiate discussion on topics such as hospitality received and reciprocated, personal development and future plans. With the social map constructed and laid out in front of the participant, this was used when appropriate to answer specific questions or elaborate on a specific point. On many occasions, the discussion beforehand had covered topics that the questions were designed to prompt, and therefore specific questions could be overlooked. This confirmed that the interview design had generated relevant data not only on their cosmopolitan conviviality, but also on their opinions, thoughts and reflections regarding this conviviality. The interview was concluded by thanking the participants and asking them if they
so wished to provide and write a title on their social map, if they had not already provided one in the questionnaire. Leaving the digital recorder recording each participant was asked how they found the interview experience and if they had any questions regarding the research. Their concluding remarks proved fruitful as they reflected further on the topics covered and the interview process itself, often embodying the rapport that had developed during the course of the interview.

Data Storage

To safeguard the sociogram data prior to leaving the interview location, a digital photograph of each participant’s social map was taken. It was then rolled up and safely stored for further analysis. A data file was created for each participant on an encoded flash drive, within each were stored the jpeg photograph (as Photograph 3.1), the digitally recorded audio file and the excel file with the questionnaire data. With further analysis, files were added to each participant’s case file.

3.5.4 Methodological Reflections

Sociogram as Narrative Tool

With the life story preceding the construction of the sociogram, the biographical narratives were not shaped by the network. This ensured that the full benefits of a biographical method (the life as told) were not encroached upon. With participants allowed the freedom to construct their life stories, assisted by the chapter titles, greater contextualisation was achieved. This enriched the network data (the life as lived) through them also naming other significant people in their lives (ai), both past and present. However, during the life story, while some found it relatively easy to incorporate actors given in the questionnaire (aq), others constructed narratives around descriptive chapter titles, often devoid of significant others. When the latter case was prevalent, participants were asked when appropriate to name protagonists before they moved onto the next chapter.

The construction of the sociogram transformed a list of names and chapters into a cohesive whole with which participants and I alike, now familiar with their life story, could use to refer to and prompt further discussion. By using a paper approach, chapters/rings without any alter placed within them, alter not previously discussed, and isolates were visually revealed and could be probed on further. The sociogram enabled participants to enrich and exemplify their life stories. Here for example, it was elaborated on how friends of friends had become integral
people in their lives, what distinguished work colleagues from work friends, and why significant others from the past were no longer co-present. Therefore the formation, maintenance and dissolution of social relations could be analysed relative to their quality. Additionally, with social relations linked to and residual evidence of organisational foci (school, university, work, neighbourhood, house), the BSI could explore participants overlapping and multiple convivial arenas and identities. In light of its visual quality, practical consideration had to be taken to ensure that participants’ gesticulations towards the sociogram were accompanied with them or me referring to the group or alter name on the audio recording. In future, this slight interruption could be overcome by videoing the construction and discussion of the sociogram from above.

When piloting the method, an alternative interview sequence had been tried. Here, the sociogram was initially constructed, and thereafter the ‘dummy-runner’ was asked to take me through their chapter titles using the sociogram. Again, additional alter (ai) could be added. In this scenario, network dynamics (the life as lived) tended to dominate the narrative, steering the life story. This alternative method would be best suited for a study where network dynamics are the main focus, or on a larger sample, or where time is a restriction.

**Limitations & Alternative Applications**

While the method used exposes the duration and biographical distribution of relationships, it cannot claim to uncover the entirety of interviewees’ networks at successive life stages. As any cognitive network, the names elicited are dependent on the specific stimuli provided; here the name generator and the telling of the life story. The use of a questionnaire by email assisted in preparing the participant for the interview and allowed for more time in the interview to be dedicated to the life story. The paper based participant aided sociogram approach, opposed to an electronic approach, not only saved considerable time but placed the participant at the heart of the process, assisting them to make notable reflections during and after its construction.

Similar to life story narratives where some events are included and others excluded, the composition of the network is subject to participants’ selection and powers of recollection. However, due to its temporal logic and contextual detail it is able to explore and illustrate that the relationship between network selection and influence is dialectic. The method is fit for purpose to study the co-evolution of organisational foci and networks (McPherson et al. 2001). More importantly, the richness of data produced enabled a thorough analysis of
cosmopolitan conviviality, its evolution within biographies, and the consequences of this conviviality on ego’s attitudes and behaviour. The method probed conviviality deeper than if either a biographical or network method had been used alone. I now turn to the method of analysis used which concludes the chapter.

3.6 Biographical Network Analysis (BNA)

The richness of the data constructed by the BSI method required a method of analysis that would highlight and illustrate this richness and simultaneously permit cases to be compared systematically. Here, formal quantitative network analysis was combined with qualitative network analysis in relation to the life stories; I refer to the method developed as Biographical Network Analysis (BNA). Here, the quantitative and qualitative analysis techniques are presented separately for clarity. However, in practice the analysis was iterative and circular, continually moving between an ‘objective outsider’s view’ of the networks as mapped and the subjective ‘insider’s views’ of their networks as narrated situated within the wider context of their life stories.

3.6.1 Quantitative Personal Network Analysis

Attribute Data

First the alter attribute data was collated and summarised in the form of an excel spread-sheet, forming sheet 4 of the participants excel file, and was cross referenced with the questionnaire data to ensure internal reliability. Attribute data obtained during the interview were added to the data elicited from the questionnaires, including nationality, ethnicity, approximate age, sexuality, group membership(s), and former relational status (eg. Ex-partner) and any other qualitative attributes named on the recording. Within the excel file alters were listed in chronological order, working from the inner to the outer ring of the biographical sociogram. This enabled the relational matrix that constructed the network to be analysed, when applicable, at different life stages in UCINET 6 and visualised using Netdraw and VennMaker.

Network Size Measures

Three main network size measurements were used to compare the cases; the biographical network \((Bn)\), the convivial network \((Cn)\) and the friendship network \((Fn)\).

- The biographical network is the entire network that consists of alter generated from the name generator in the questionnaire \((aq)\) plus the additional alter attained during
the interview (ai). The smallest biographical network contained 21 alter and the largest 60 alter, with a mean of 36.9 alter across the sample, summarised as follows (21 ≤ Bn ≤ 60, $\bar{x} = 36.9$). Where, $Bn = (11 \leq aq \leq 52, \bar{x} = 29) + (1 \leq ai \leq 22, \bar{x} = 7.9)$

The $Cn$ and $Fn$ are both nested networks, embedded within the $Bn$. The $Cn$ contains ties and bonds, while the $Fn$ contains just bonds.

- The convivial network is the biographical network with the exclusion of family relations (parents, siblings, cousins, and so on). These relations were removed so as not to bias the network compositional measurements of national homophily and socio-cultural heterogeneity. The $Cn$ represents more accurately the notion that by adulthood, people have chosen their networks (Fischer 1982). ($17 \leq Cn \leq 53, \bar{x} = 31.8$)

- The friendship network is the part of the convivial network that consists of confidants (Q1), companions (Q2), and especially close people (Q6) ($4 \leq Fn \leq 44, \bar{x} = 18.14$)

The biographical structure of the sociogram and hence matrix enables an exploration into people’s convivial paths, how certain events or periods in their life have influenced the distribution of alter across their life-path. Hence the relationship between the interconnectedness of the network (structure) and cosmopolitan conviviality (composition) could be interpreted in relation to the life-path and story.

**Network Composition Measures**

Krackhardt and Stern’s (1988) E-I index was used to calculate network homophily/heterophily. Here -1 denotes a completely homophilious network and +1 a completely heterophilious network. This was used to measure and compare the tendency of cases to interact with similar or dissimilar others in terms of nationality, language spoken (1st or 2nd), social class background, ethnicity etc.

Unlike homophily which is based on an arbitrary binary construction, for example the tendency for someone to interact with others of one’s own nationality (co-nationals) versus other nationalities (other nationals), heterogeneity measures the total diversity of network composition with regards to a particular attribute. Blau’s index, also referred to as the diversity index, was used to calculate the socio-cultural heterogeneity of the networks. Here measures can range from 0, totally homogenous, to 1, totally heterogeneous. To calculate this, six socio-cultural categories were created from the nationality attribute data; Co-Nationals
(British/Spanish), European, Anglo-Saxon (North American, Australia, New Zealand), Hispanic (Central & Latin America), African/Caribbean and Asian. By using ‘co-nationals’ as one category within the calculation, the measures of national homophily and socio-cultural heterogeneity are correlated.

The compositional measurements were used to analyse how the width and depth of cosmopolitan conviviality relates to the transcendence of social boundaries across the biography.

**Network Structure Measures**

The relational matrix of all alter-alter ties was constructed in UCINET 6. Strong alter-alter relations within strong groups and other ties were given a score of 2, weak groups and ties a score of 1 and a score of 0 when no relationship existed between alter. The degree centrality of each alter was calculated using the above scores, the total sum of connections each alter has to other alter. These scores were used to analyse the extent to which different others were embedded within the networks, and how this differed along lines of relational quality, i.e. if bonds tended to be more central/embedded than ties for example. The degree centrality scores were also used in the visualisation of the networks in VennMaker.

Network density scores, a measure of the overall connectedness of the network, were calculated in UCINET 6 also using the above relational weightings, measuring the average matrix score. Hence the density scores can range from a minimum of 0, no connections exist between alter, to a maximum of 2, where all alter are strongly connected. However a substantive comparative analysis of cases with regards to degree centrality and network density was not possible due to variable network sizes. As most often is the case in ego network analysis, ego’s ties with alter were excluded from the above structural measurements.

### 3.6.2 Qualitative Personal Network Analysis

**Relational Quality**

The context and quality of ego-alter and alter-alter relationships were examined through analysis of the recordings together with analysis of the sociograms and the network visualisations. First, how participants determined and discussed confidants (Q1) and companions (Q2), and how they had distinguished between these. Second, why the people named as especially close (Q6) were not listed as confidants or companions. Finally the relational quality and context of additional alter (at) were established, identifying the reasons to
why they were not originally named in the questionnaire (aq). Together, this data was used to answer RQ4, is the evolution of a cosmopolitan stance related to the development and maintenance of bonds with objectively different others.

**Network Visualisation, Dynamics & Interpretation**

Whilst the sociogram provided a narrative tool for the participant to elaborate upon their conviviality, such as tie formation, maintenance and dissolution, network visualisations in Netdraw and VennMaker provide an additional tool to qualitatively analyse the interplay of network composition and structure with regards to the life story. Here, the quality and strength of ego-alter and alter-alter relationships, and alter degree centrality are displayed holistically, providing another contextual layer with which to interpret the life stories and their affirmations and/or contestations of essentialised identities. As mentioned previously, with the temporal ordering of the sociogram, the biographical distribution of alter provides a further contextual layer through which life stories can be interpreted.

**3.6.3 The Three Acts of Analytical Play**

The analysis and the presentation thereof follow the three axes of cosmopolitan conviviality outlined in Chapter 2: width (x), depth (y) and paths (z), each of which constitutes an act in the cosmopolitan play. In the following two chapters, Convivial Horizons and Convivial Depths, the network method guides the biographical method to analyse the social boundaries people transcend and possibly contest. In Chapter 6, Convivial Paths, the biographical method takes centre stage to analyse the contexts through which people evolve their horizons and depths. The findings from each act are then drawn together in Chapter 7, Convivial Spheres, where through the intersection of each axis four broad but distinctive convivial stances within the cosmopolitan play are presented. The analytical play will now commence.
4

Convivial Horizons

4.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the width of cosmopolitan conviviality is examined through looking at the extent to which participants interact with people of a different nationality, inside and outside of their own specific national boundaries. The second axis of cosmopolitan conviviality, its depth, the extent to which people interact across other social boundaries is explored in the following chapter.

Here, the discussion starts by exploring whether transnational mobility provides opportunities for movers and non-movers alike to evolve a cosmopolitan stance (RQ2). It is shown that the mobility of movers and non-movers had facilitated opportunities for national ‘boundary work’. Second, it is shown that this cosmopolitan conviviality had for the majority led to the development of bonds with others of a different nationality (RQ4), which at times was supported by the reflexive contestation of nationality as an essentialised identity.

In Moving Targets, the width of cosmopolitan conviviality is contextualised through exploring where and how movers and non-movers come into contact with each other. Here Biographical Network Analysis (BNA), specifically analysis of the national composition of people’s networks, critically questions the categories of ‘mover’ and ‘non-mover’ as concepts to understand conviviality in a time of increased geographical mobility. Whilst all the participants interacted regularly with others of a different nationality, referred to here as ‘other nationals’, the extent to which they had developed bonds with people of distinctive socio-cultural backgrounds differed. This difference is illustrated under Convivial Horizons, where three types of width are presented. The theoretical and methodological consequences of the findings are discussed and concluded under The Cosmopolitan Play – Act I.

4.2 Moving Targets

In Chapter 2 I argued that research within the field of cultural cosmopolitanism had overlooked temporality in favour of the spatiality in terms of transnational mobility. As a result it concentrates on the experiences and consequences of mobility for corporate elites, migrants and refugees, and pays little attention to the role of non-movers within cosmopolitan conviviality, and the consequences of this conviviality for non-movers. Whilst somewhat
straightjacketed by the existing spatial nomenclature, the integration of the temporal through the biographical network approach uncovers both the fixity and mobility within participants’ lives. In an age when mobility is more regular and widespread, the approach accentuates and refines the spatial analysis as it posits the “self” as a moving target in both space and time.

4.2.1 The Fixity and Mobility of Cosmopolitan Conviviality

The movers and the non-movers alike had experienced periods within their lives of fixity and mobility inside and/or beyond their own national borders, with more than half of the non-movers having spent some limited time living abroad. For some, transnational mobility had occurred during childhood and adolescence due to family relocation, while for others it occurred later when moving to start university studies, to find employment, following a partner or to simply move to another culture and learn a new language. The non-movers and movers are summarised separately before substantive findings are drawn.

The Non-Movers

The Spanish in Madrid

With regards to transnational mobility, the experience of residing, working or studying in another country, all of the seven Spanish non-movers interviewed in Madrid had experienced at least a few months living abroad during their adult life. However, sampled as non-movers, clear differences emerged with regards to how their earlier experiences of mobility correlated to the width of their convivial practices in Madrid. So while some had sought out other nationals on their return, others had not. Therefore, as will be illustrated, personal mobility certainly influences cosmopolitan conviviality, but does not determine it.

The majority had spent between 6 to 12 months abroad either studying or working. As movers they would have fallen outside the sampling criteria of this study. For five of the seven, it was through either partaking on a student exchange program or an organised work placement. These transnational experiences could be labelled as extended sojourns within participants’ biographies because they were institutionally and temporally organised, they were aware of when they would end and return to Spain. The majority were comfortable conversing in one or two languages other than their mother tongue.

With the networks structured biographically, Krackhardt and Stern’s (1988) E – I Index\(^\text{16}\) was used to measure national homophily at different biographical intervals to see which effects

---

\(^{16}\) E-I index = no. of dissimilar alter – no. of similar alter / total number of alter
mobility had on their cosmopolitan conviviality. In Table 4.1 below, three separate national homophily measures of each Spanish non-mover’s biographical network \((Bn)\)\(^{17}\) are collated. The index measures of the entire \(Bn\) (a), the \(Bn\) abroad (b), and the \(Bn\) since their return to Spain and/or Madrid (d). With data on the nationality of each alter attained during the interview, the extent to which participants had interacted with fellow movers as opposed to natives during their time abroad was calculated (c).

**Table 4.1 Biographical Network Composition of Spanish non-movers in Madrid**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>Biographical Network (Bn)</th>
<th>Bn Abroad</th>
<th>Bn in Madrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Duration Abroad</td>
<td>Purpose of move</td>
<td>Other Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Foreign Studies</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacho</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Language/Work Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Work/Language Studies</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>Erasmus Studies</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernan</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>Erasmus Studies</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magda</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10 months</td>
<td>Erasmus Studies</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For all the non-movers in Madrid, transnational mobility coincided with their first experiences of interacting regularly and developing ties and bonds with other nationals. Hence cosmopolitan conviviality, either in Madrid or elsewhere in Spain, had not been a feature of their everyday lives prior to their extended sojourns or time abroad.

Miguel had the most heterophilious network whilst abroad (b=0.6) and since returning to Madrid (d=0.93), resulting in him having the most heterophilious \(Bn\) (a=0.27). The majority of associates during these extended sojourns were fellow movers and sojourners. The exception was Hernan (c=1) who named only native French associates from his year of Erasmus studies and internship in Paris. The extent to which contexts of cosmopolitan conviviality were prevalent or were actively sought by non-movers on their return to Spain varied considerably, from Hernan who had added no new other nationals (d=−1) to Miguel who had added fifteen new other nationals.

---

17 The Biographical Network \((Bn)\) includes all the alter attained from the questionnaire \((aq)\) and the interview \((ai)\)
Like Miguel (d=0.93), Nacho (d=0.53) and Luis (d=0.57) had developed nationally heterophilious relationships in Madrid and as a result their biographical networks (a) were the most heterophilious of the Spanish non-movers. Nacho and Miguel motivated their friendships with other nationals in the city through their earlier transnational experiences, having deliberately sought opportunities to interact with other nationals on their return.

Without deliberately seeking out cosmopolitan conviviality, the most common contexts that non-movers came into contact with movers in Madrid was through their working environments, in multi-national/global companies and public service organisations that employed foreign nationals, and, but to a much lesser extent, through house sharing experiences with other nationals. For example whilst Magda (a=-0.65) and Alicia (a=-0.71) had the most nationally homophilious biographical networks, they had gradually become more heterophilious since moving to Madrid for work six and nine years ago respectively. In the case of Lola insufficient time had passed since her Erasmus studies, titled in her autobiography as ‘The Best Year of my Life’, to determine whether her friends from this sojourn will remain in her network, or if it will have an influence on her cosmopolitan conviviality in the future.

Apart from Nacho, a geographically settled childhood and adolescence were the norm prior to either moving to start university studies in Spain or their extended sojourns abroad. Three of the seven non-movers originated from Madrid, and the remaining four had moved from other regions of Spain primarily due to the better employment opportunities within their respective fields in the capital city.

In sum, interacting regularly with other nationals first occurred during the non-movers’ extended sojourns abroad, and was predominantly with fellow movers and sojourners. For some living abroad had promoted an active willingness and openness to engage with different nationals in their everyday lives in Madrid, while for others it had not.

**The British in Manchester**

Unlike the Spanish non-movers, only two of the seven British non-movers interviewed had previously lived abroad. The first mobility experience for all of the British non-movers was to start university studies within their own national boundaries. Three originated from Manchester, the remaining four originated from towns in the north of England and had resided in the city between three and twelve years, originally moving to the city for studies or employment (see Table 4.2). Apart from Dylan who had recently returned to his native Manchester and was looking for work, they were all in full-time employment. However work
was not the sole motive for living in the city, with family, friends and partners playing a significant role in them moving to, returning to and staying in the city. Therefore in Table 4.2 the national E-I index measures pertain to participants’ Bn either before they moved to Manchester or the period they have spent outside of Manchester (b), and the time they have spent in Manchester (d). The mover/non-mover E-I index (c) is calculated for Katie and Brad, the two cases with experience of living abroad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>Biographical Network (Bn)</th>
<th>BnBefore/Outside Manchester</th>
<th>Bn in Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tayla</td>
<td>30, Born in City</td>
<td>Studies/Friends</td>
<td>12, 0.04</td>
<td>4, 0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>23, Born in City</td>
<td>Family/Friends</td>
<td>16, -0.14</td>
<td>15, 0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>30, 12 years</td>
<td>Studies/Love</td>
<td>12, -0.25</td>
<td>2, 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>33, 4 years</td>
<td>Work/Love/Friends</td>
<td>17, -0.33</td>
<td>11, -0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>31, 3.5 years</td>
<td>Work/Friends</td>
<td>16, -0.42</td>
<td>0, -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwan</td>
<td>34, Born in City</td>
<td>Friends/Faith</td>
<td>8, -0.56</td>
<td>2, -0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>28, 3 years</td>
<td>Work/Friends</td>
<td>10, -0.61</td>
<td>10, 0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally the British non-movers’ first experiences of interacting regularly and developing friendships with other nationals was through travelling, family ties, and studying or working with other nationals in London before living in Manchester. Apart from Dylan (d=-0.8) and Brad (d=-1), the majority interacted regularly with other nationals in the city, either through work or social activities such as attending church in the case of Iwan. Tayla had the most nationally heterophilious Bn (a=0.04) with other nationals distributed throughout her convivial biography. This was a result of having grown up in a diverse neighbourhood in Manchester and of living and working in London. Both Dylan’s (a=-0.14) and Katie’s (a=-0.25) cosmopolitan conviviality occurred predominantly through working in hospitality. Similarly to Miguel, Nacho and Luis in Madrid, Katie’s experiences of living and working abroad related positively to her cosmopolitan conviviality in Manchester (d=0.05), where she consciously employed other nationals in the café she now managed.

Brad and Robert were the only two non-movers who could converse in another language than English, with Brad having lived in France and Spain during his Erasmus studies. However, similarly to Hernan and Alicia in Madrid, this experience had not resulted in Brad (d=-1)
acquainting other nationals in the three years since living in Manchester. Whereas Robert’s (d=0.23) involvement in playing music and attending a local Spanish bar had brought him into contact with many other nationals living in the city.

In sum the British non-movers’ experiences of geographical mobility and cosmopolitan conviviality was more varied than their Spanish counterparts in Madrid. For some British non-movers, their cosmopolitan conviviality had evolved due to the presence of other nationals in Manchester, something to which they alluded to as a benefit and an attraction of living in the city as opposed to other cities they had lived in the UK.

The Movers

*The Spanish in Manchester*

The eight Spanish movers had resided in Manchester between one and eleven years, and all had significant experience of cosmopolitan conviviality in the city. Their original motivations for moving to the UK and specifically Manchester varied. They tended to centre on the struggle to find employment in Spain within their respective fields, coupled with the opportunity to experience and learn another language and culture. The move to Manchester was encapsulated in chapter titles such as ‘Learning a New World’ and ‘The England Years Part 1: How to survive working part time and earning the minimum wage’.

The Spanish movers were all, to varying degrees, dependent on length of residence, comfortable and fluent in expressing themselves in English. One of the most fluent was Ria who on arrival to the UK in 2001 knew very little English. She moved to Manchester in 2004 to pursue her career as a professional musician after graduating and meeting her English husband at a British Conservatoire. Whilst others had moved without any clear intentions on how long they would stay in Manchester, changing global economic circumstances and local employment opportunities in the city combined with changing family situations meant that some had begun to reconsider where their futures lay.

In Table 4.3 below, the national E-I index measures were calculated for the entire $Bn$ (a), the $Bn$ before arriving in Manchester (b), and since living in Manchester (c). Here, the extent to which Spanish movers interacted with fellow movers opposed to native non-movers since living in the city were also calculated (d). Apart for Jesus and Ria, the move to Manchester was their first transnational mobility experience, and prior to this they all had experienced limited geographical mobility during their childhood and adolescence. This settlement was typified in chapter titles like ‘Living in a familiar and typical Spanish village’ and ‘Sigüenza, a happy place’.
The mobility that they had experienced within Spain was due to their parents moving for work, parental divorce and/or themselves moving to start university studies. However, the move to the UK and Manchester was clearly the most important in regards their experiences of cosmopolitan conviviality, with only Jesus \((b= -0.33)\), Carmen \((b= -0.11)\) and Ria \((b= -0.29)\) naming more than one other nationals prior to them moving to the city.

**Table 4.3 Biographical Network Composition of Spanish movers in Manchester**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>Biographical Network ((B_n))</th>
<th>(B_n) Before Manchester</th>
<th>(B_n) in Manchester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Duration In Manchester</td>
<td>Purpose of move &amp; stay</td>
<td>Other Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Language/Work</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribel</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Work/Language</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Language/Work</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Language/Work</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasper</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Language/Work</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Work/Love</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>Work</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Manchester the movers’ cosmopolitan conviviality centred on their current and previous workplaces, periods of studying and cohabiting with other nationals. While two of the movers currently worked full-time within the field of Spanish language education, the remainder worked in diverse positions, from kitchen manager to bio-medicine researcher, with English the main language of communication at work. Whilst Gasper \((c=1)\) and Maribel \((c=1)\) had deliberately avoided socialising with other Spanish people since moving to the city in order to learn and improve their English, evidenced in their completely heterophilious networks in Manchester, the majority had established at least a few new Spanish friends in the city.

The extent to which they interacted with fellow movers and non-movers varied considerably, and similar to the British movers in Madrid, this depended on their occupation and workplace, housing arrangements, leisure activities and their length of residence in the city. For example, Jesus \((a=0.11)\) who had the most nationally heterophilious \(B_n\) of the Spanish movers, had socialised predominantly with his British housemates and workmates (non-movers) since
arriving the year before (d=0.43). He was dating an English girl, whom he met at a Spanish bar where he initially worked shortly after arriving, and received advice on housing and employment. Likewise, Andres six years previously had initially socialised and received work leads from compatriots in a bar frequented at the time by the Spanish community, certain members of which he now refers to as his ‘second family’. In contrast, Carmen who supplemented her first job as a ‘Learning Co-ordinator’ with language teaching tended to socialise with fellow compatriots (c=0.08) and movers (d=-0.71).

To summarise, the transnational mobility of the Spanish movers to Manchester had generated cosmopolitan conviviality for British natives.

**The British in Madrid**

For four of the six British movers, the move to Madrid represented their first transnational mobility experience. In each of these cases they had moved with or to live with their partner, whereby moving to the city was part of a joint project to improve their living standards in terms of employment and lifestyle as a couple. For the other two British movers, both of whom had previously experienced extended sojourns abroad through employment internships, the initial move to the city centred on them starting their careers. All six were employed and working, with English Language teaching the mainstay income for half of them. Their experiences and sentiments about moving and living in the city were encapsulated in biographical chapter titles such as ‘Into the Sunshine’, ‘Continental Drift’ and ‘Viva Madrith’, through which lifestyle choices were paramount when motivating their mobility to the city.

Prior to moving to Madrid, the extent to which geographical mobility occurred within the British movers’ biographies varied significantly. While some had resided in the same location throughout their childhood and adolescence, others had moved due to family relocations both inside and beyond the borders of the UK. Mark was the only mover who had not moved to start university studies in the UK, instead attending his local university, and hence his move to Madrid with his Spanish partner and now wife was his first and only relocation experience.

In Table 4.4 below, like in Table 4.3, four separate E-I index measurements are calculated. As a reminder these are the entire Bn (a), the Bn prior to Madrid (b), the Bn since living in Madrid (c), and the extent to which they interacted with fellow movers as opposed to native non-movers in Madrid (d). As one might assume, in each case the national heterophily of their biographical networks had increased through their move to Madrid. This was particularly the case for Claire (b=-1 to a=-0.6) and Laura (b=-1 to a=-0.67), both of whom named no other

---

18 Jesus, like Lola in Madrid was adamant after being asked that he wanted to do the interview in English
nationals prior to moving to the city. These two cases had the most nationally homophilious $Bn$ (a) of the British movers.

The transnational mobility of Mark (d=0.27), Max (d=0.3), Claire (d=0.14) and Laura (d=0) has provided boundary work opportunities for non-movers in Madrid, with each of them associating with native Spaniards. However, all the movers had British or native English speaking associates in Madrid as they stressed the need to be able to have a few drinks and talk English from time to time. The other nationals named prior to them moving to Madrid had either been met through their foreign partners or through previously living abroad such as Penny (a=0.2) who had the most heterophilious $Bn$ of the British movers. The national composition of Max’s $Bn$ (b=-0.79 to c=0.92) and Mark’s $Bn$ (b=-0.63 to c=0.63) had changed the most among the British movers due to their conviviality in the city.

### Table 4.4 Biographical Network Composition of British movers in Madrid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>Biographical Network ($Bn$)</th>
<th>$Bn$ Before Madrid</th>
<th>$Bn$ in Madrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Duration In Madrid</td>
<td>Purpose of move</td>
<td>Other Nationals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Lifestyle/Work</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>Love</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2 years</td>
<td>Work/Lifestyle</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>Love/Work/Lifestyle</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>Love/Lifestyle</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Lifestyle/Work</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Madrid, the most common contexts in which movers experienced cosmopolitan conviviality was within their multi-national and global working environments, through their partners and/or their leisure pursuits. The degree to which they interacted with compatriots, fellow movers or Spanish non-movers in the city was closely related to their competence in the Spanish language on arrival and their subsequent opportunities to practice it in their social and working lives. They had lived in Madrid between one to five years.

Claire, an English teacher with the most nationally homophilious network in Madrid (c=-0.18), bemoaned and felt some shame over her level of Spanish after living in the city for four years. She, like Penny and Adrian tended to socialise with other nationals and their few Spanish friends in English. Laura (c=0.33) on the other hand, like her English boyfriend with
whom she had moved to the city the previous year, was comfortable conversing in Spanish on arrival and now had friendships in Spanish with work colleagues, neighbours and language exchange friends.

In summary, the majority of opportunities for the British movers to interact and develop associates with other nationals came through their move to Madrid. The degree to which they socialised with fellow movers or Spanish natives in the city depended significantly upon their Spanish language skills on arrival. This in turn often determined their occupation and working environment, and subsequently their language development. Hence, their cosmopolitan conviviality was significantly dependent on their linguistic ability to interact with other nationals. Here, mediating factors were their choice of leisure pursuits, and, if they had moved as a couple, the nationality of their partner.

To conclude, the transnational mobility of British movers to Madrid and Spanish movers to Manchester had provided boundary work opportunities for other nationals, movers and non-movers alike with whom they worked and socialised. With regards to the non-movers, for many, interacting with other nationals was part of their everyday lives through their work and leisure practices in Madrid or Manchester. While for some non-movers, cosmopolitan conviviality was not linked to the current city of residence, but instead originated from a stage in their lives prior to their move or return to the city. However, there is sufficient evidence to indicate that Madrid and Manchester are centres of cosmopolitan conviviality.

Finally, a quick note on whose cosmopolitan conviviality was explored in the study. While many non-movers initial experiences of cosmopolitan conviviality originated from their own extended sojourns abroad, their convivial width thereafter differed considerably. However, more research is needed to explore the cosmopolitan conviviality of non-movers without such mobile experiences, and that of movers and non-movers without tertiary education.

4.2.2 Complex Conviviality

Parallels can be drawn regarding the contexts of cosmopolitan conviviality in Madrid and Manchester, in relation to how and where movers and non-movers meet and establish relations with other nationals. In both cities young adult movers and non-movers tend to first interact within the organisational foci of work, study and housing, but also through organised social events.\(^\text{19}\) However the extent to which these relationships move beyond the regulated confines of such organisational foci, such that they become independent of the context that

\(\text{19}\) Many of the participants were attained via gatekeepers who either studied or worked with them
originally facilitated them, varied significantly. This variation, whilst influenced by, was not determined by personal experiences of transnational mobility within the biography. Therefore, for some cosmopolitan conviviality entailed a passive openness to interact with other nationals within administrative formations, for others it entailed an active willingness and openness to engage with other nationals outside the arenas of work, study and home. However the openness and willingness to engage with the other nationals cannot be detached from the linguistic ability to engage with diverse others.

What becomes clear through this initial analysis is the ambiguity of the ‘mover’/ ‘non-mover’ distinction. The categories only capture the participant’s current location, a snapshot, which conceals the fixity within mover’s lives and the mobility within non-mover’s lives. The biographical network approach exposes this frailty and highlights how the ‘cosmos’ and the ‘hearth’ are interlocked and negotiated within and through people’s relations and life stories.

The autobiographical chapter titles of Carmen in Manchester exemplify and clarify this point. The fixity of her childhood and adolescence is described in her opening chapter ‘Living in a familiar and typical Spanish village’. The cozy yet somewhat overbearing ‘hearth’ that Carmen portrays in this chapter is juxtaposed with mobility experiences and distancing herself from her family in subsequent chapters. ‘Living in the city BUT under control’ entails her struggle for greater freedom after leaving the parental home for university studies. Her pursuit of the wider ‘cosmos’ is finally realised through her move for further studies and then employment in Malaga before ‘Travelling "the only university of life"’. The autobiography concludes with the chapter ‘Be all Human’, pertaining to her convivial stance on life after evolving an extremely heterogeneous network of different nationalities. However when questioned about her future plans, the notion of the ‘hearth’ re-emerges. As shown by Carmen’s network data in Manchester (see Table 4.3), it is dominated by fellow movers ($d=-0.71$), and she expresses concerns over the precariousness of her ‘hearth’ and connection to the city as friends met in the city leave. As a consequence she predicts that she will be moving on sooner rather than later but to where, she is not sure.

As in the case of Carmen, the categories ‘mover’ and ‘non-mover’ prove useful to explore and analyse the associations people make when residing in new and unfamiliar locations during extended sojourns or lengthier residences abroad. Here the mover/non-mover distinction highlights the extent to which participants ‘hearth’ is embedded in transient and/or more geographically stable relations.
If the terminology conceals rather than exposes subjective experiences of fixity for movers and mobility for non-movers, then presumably this also applies to alter, those that ego associates with, as in the case of Carmen’s friends above. Here the life stories and sociogram discussions assist to unpack the character of people’s associations within cosmopolitan conviviality. Therefore while the categories do not particularly work as nominal categories of individuals, they help to direct and focus further exploration into the myriad forms and contents of cosmopolitan conviviality. They serve their purpose to illustrate how the participants’ “repertoires and pathways of being simultaneously cosmopolitan, national and local” (Kofman 2007:253) is both relationally embedded and dependent. The categories’ weaknesses further illustrate the complexity of cosmopolitan conviviality in the modern age, and demonstrate how the ‘hearth’ and the ‘cosmos’ are negotiated in multiple ways.

Whilst levels of fixity and mobility varied, all the participants had at some point in their biography interacted regularly to varying levels with other nationals. The findings confirm that transnational mobility provides opportunities for self and other to evolve a cosmopolitan stance (RQ2). The approach highlights that movers have been non-movers and vice-versa. The research design exposes how contrasting experiences of both fixity and mobility shapes cosmopolitan conviviality.

I now turn to interrogate more closely this conviviality in relation to the ties and bonds people develop with other nationals. While not abandoning the temporally fixed mover/non-mover categories, the width of participants’ cosmopolitan conviviality remains the focus of the discussion. Here relational measures derived from the convivial and friendship networks, specifically national and linguistic homophily/heterophily and socio-cultural heterogeneity are used to present and discuss differing convivial horizons.

4.3 Surveying Convivial Horizons

As mentioned, the attention now turns to the ties and bonds people establish and maintain with other nationals. Whereas the previous section confirmed that transnational mobility provides opportunities for self and other to evolve a cosmopolitan stance (RQ2), this section explores if such opportunities have led to the development of bonds with other nationals (RQ4). More importantly, this section explores if participants’ transcendence of nationality at the inter-subjective symbolic level was mirrored by a contesting of nationality at the social level. Before presenting the three convivial horizon types, the national homophily and socio-cultural heterogeneity of the sample’s convivial and friendship networks are discussed.
4.3.1 Transcending Nationality

Except for a few anomalies, the compositional analysis of the networks shows a positive correlation between the national homophily/heterophily of the convivial networks and the friendship networks. Hence, the greater tendency that participants’ interacted with other nationals in relation to co-nationals, was mirrored by a greater likelihood that participants established bonds with other nationals. The convivial networks \((C_n)^{20}\) ranged in national homophily measures from -0.83 to +0.65, with a mean of -0.01. The friendship networks \((F_n)^{21}\) ranged from -1, with three cases having no close friendships with other nationals, to a high of +0.71, with a mean of -0.27. 37% of all bonds named across the sample were other nationals. The most heterophilious and homophilious networks \((C_n \& F_n)\) belonged to two older Spanish women. Marta named predominantly other nationals, all met since her move to Manchester from Catalonia twelve years previously. Conversely Alicia named just a few other national work colleagues, all met in her current workplace, since moving to Madrid from Castile and León nine years previously. Here, settlement within or outside their national boundaries had proved significant for the national composition of their networks.

Qualitative delineations emerge more clearly between the cases with regards to socio-cultural heterogeneity, the diversity of nationalities within the networks. As would be expected, a positive relationship between heterophily and heterogeneity existed across the convivial networks; but this becomes significantly more evident within the friendship networks. The network data clearly illustrates that the propensity to have other nationals as bonds was mirrored by the increased likelihood to have more socio-culturally diverse bonds.

With the BSI name generator specifically designed to elicit other nationals, the convivial networks are more heterophilious and heterogeneous than would be randomly expected if a standard social support name generator had been used. However, the clarity of the heterophily/heterogeneity and homophily/homogeneity correlation across the friendship networks, justifies the decisions made regarding the selection of participants. The findings clearly show that the more one transcends nationality, the more open and willing one is to transcend other national and socio-cultural boundaries, broadening ones convivial horizons.

---

20 All alter \((aq + ai)\) minus alter identified as family relations including grandparents, aunts, uncles and cousins
21 Alter named under Q1, 2 & 6 as bonds. i.e. as confidants, companions or people that are or have been especially close and embedded within \(C_n\)
4.4 Convivial Horizons

Using the network compositional measures, three broad convivial horizons emerge in terms of transcending nationality: faint, stable and wide. I discuss these below by interrogating further the compositional data of the networks together with the biographical and relational narratives. The measures of the cases in each horizon are summarised in a series of Tables (4.5, 4.6 & 4.7). Here, the national homophily of the Cns (a) and Fns (c) are collated together with their respective language homophily measures (b) and (d), the participants’ tendency to interact with others in their native mother tongue opposed to another language. The sociocultural heterogeneity measures of the Cns (e) and Fns (f) are calculated with Blau’s Index using the socio-cultural groups constructed (see section 3.6.1 for details of these). In the tables, to distinguish between movers and non-movers, the latter are written in italics.

4.4.1 Faint Horizons

Six non-movers are representative of this horizon, three British cases and three Spanish cases. The main characteristic of these networks is the weak relationship between cosmopolitan conviviality and bonds, such that interacting with diverse other nationals had not led to any significant behavioural evidence of transcending nationality (Fn National E-I ≤ -0.78). They are either older and somewhat settled, or young and open to mobility.

**Table 4.5 Network Composition Measures of Faint Horizon Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Convivial Network (Cn)</th>
<th>Friendship Network (Fn)</th>
<th>Heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Other Nationals</td>
<td>National E-I index (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwan</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magda</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hence whilst they all had studied, worked or socialised with other nationals, their friendship networks and ‘hearts’ remained homogenously British or Spanish (f ≤ 0.198). Here native school friends from one’s original town and neighbourhood during a settled childhood, particularly for the Spanish, combined with those from university studies and other organised foci, dominate their everyday conviviality and friendship networks. However school friends
for the British on the whole were now people they only randomly kept in touch with through social networking sites or email, or met coincidentally when visiting their parents or hometowns. On the whole, their most recent bonds, met through work, were co-nationals while other nationals remained just colleagues.

All of those with faint horizons were non-movers whose transnational mobility was limited, and when experienced, it was through extended sojourns such as an Erasmus program or a work exchange program. Any friends made during such periods abroad tended to be fading or long forgotten. For example Alicia when talking about her Erasmus experience in Italy over a decade earlier with her then Spanish boyfriend, comments

> I got to know a lot of people from different countries, and of course at the time we invited people to come and visit us in Spain later, especially with one or two, but finally with the distance, it was difficult to maintain these relationships. OK, in the beginning we’d send emails and there was a lot of enthusiasm to meet up, ‘oh let’s visit each other’, but in the end it was not possible or I couldn’t and apart from that one, we lost contact … (Alicia, 35)

Second language skills tended to be non-existent in the case of the British and weak in the case of the Spanish within this horizon, restricting their opportunities to develop a more diverse conviviality \( F_{\text{Language E-I}} \leq -0.80\). Yet while a range of diverse nationals were or had been (and potentially could once again become) a part of their convivial lives, they tended to be just faint figures emerging or fading on their convivial horizon. In addition to the weak evidence of transcending nationality, there is little evidence of contesting nationality as an essentialised identity. On the contrary, there is evidence in some cases that cosmopolitan conviviality had led to the affirmation and reconstruction of nationality as a symbolic boundary within their convivial horizons.

For example Alicia, who works in a British organisation, stressed distinctive cultural differences between her Spanish and British colleagues in relation to work practices and relationships. She acknowledged her difficulty with the organisations structure and administration which she found too structured, constraining and impersonal. However, when questioned, she assigned this not to the organisation per se, but to the ‘cold and contained’ nature of the British as opposed to the ‘warm and expressive’ nature of the Spanish, and referred to other Spanish friends of hers that worked alongside Brits who felt the same. Hernan on the other hand, identified with the French culture and working life, stressing a desire to return to Paris to further his PR career in the fashion industry. He also mentioned that he feels more at home in metropolises due to their diversity and opportunities to meet more like minded people than in the kind of towns he grew up and studied in. However when
I questioned Hernan if he would go elsewhere to further his career, Milan for example, where a friend (a) from university now worked, he answered

Maybe, but I don’t speak Italian and I don’t like Italians, no I don’t like Italians (N. boys, girls?), no, in general, well, the same thing happened for me with the Americans, I only have met them and Italians on holiday, but I don’t like their style, they are too cocky [chulos], no, they are too much into their own style, no I don’t like them at all. OK, the French are known to be, mmm, how you say, arrogant, but when I was there, and I didn’t know them before, I found out it’s just a way of being, but the Italians, no… (Hernan, 27)

So while Hernan, unlike Alicia, could be argued to have transcended nationality, learning to understand the French ‘way of being’, this had not transpired into a contestation of other national boundaries and nationality. When talking about his month working in New York, which Hernan loved, he stressed his total lack of affinity with Americans and American culture. When talking about his time spent in London, he was hesitant to share any feelings and attitudes he may have towards the British and British culture with his British interviewer.

In contrast to Alicia’s and Hernan’s bi-national work experiences, Dylan’s multi-national work experience in London bars and restaurants, where more often than not he was the only British staff member working, provided a context for boundary work.

I was just as much a foreigner in this little land as they were, but you never really, unless you’re going home ‘going home’ next week, I’m going back to Manchester, I’m going back to Lithuania, I’m going back to Romania, I’m going back to Brazil, I’m going back to bla, bla’, whatever it might be, then that’s the only time you really talk about home, other than that you’re like, ‘I got a speeding ticket, I’m doing this, I’ve got to pay my rent, I haven’t paid my rent, council tax, I didn’t pay any of that, are you going out on Thursday, how are we going to go out, who’s going to the pub’, that’s what you talk about, it doesn’t matter where you’re from (Dylan, 23)

With the smallest friendship network across the sample, stressing that he confides in very few people, Dylan’s transcendence of nationality is grounded in his extremely heterogeneous convivial network (e=0.650). While he also acknowledges that former colleagues are now fading into the background, his convivial stance is likely to broaden his convivial horizons.

4.4.2 Stable Horizons

Ten cases are representative of this horizon type (six movers and four non-movers). Within this convivial horizon we start to witness clear evidence that cosmopolitan conviviality had led to the transcendence of nationality, and the establishment and maintenance of bonds with other nationals. Of the friendship networks, between 20% and 40% consist of other nationals with a corresponding heterogeneity ranging between 0.320 and 0.540 (see Table 4.6). Unlike
faint horizons the socio-cultural diversity within the convivial networks is mirrored within the friendship networks of those with stable horizons. They tend to be older and settled.

Transnational mobility is prominent to varying degrees within their biographies. They are either non-movers whose extended sojourns abroad have had an indelible mark on their relational outlook, or movers, who now settled have stable bonds with other nationals, including non-movers. They not only regularly interact and socialise with other nationals, but at times confide in them on more personal matters. However on the whole, native friends from childhood, adolescence, university and working life remain the backbone of their relatively stable convivial horizons.

Table 4.6 Network Composition Measures of Stable Horizon Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Convivial Network (Cn)</th>
<th>Friendship Network (Fn)</th>
<th>Heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Other Nationals</td>
<td>Language E-I index (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasper</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, for movers, maintaining these durable relationships requires significantly more energy than it does for non-movers. With a bifocal ‘hearth’, which tends to initially create some dizziness and disorientation, they regularly fly ‘back home’ for festivities with ‘old mates’ and family in the UK or Spain. The British in this position, whilst missing friends and family, have no strong intentions to return to the UK, while the issue of return or to move on is more contentious for the Spanish in Manchester. Through settling, the movers are able to converse in the local language, thus broadening their convivial horizons with other nationals. When asking Gasper how he had found meeting British people during his two years in Manchester, he replied

It is not difficult to meet people, sometimes it’s difficult to keep the people, because you can meet for one day, two days but maybe after three weeks it’s gone the possible relation, the friendship,
it’s gone /…/ it’s normally quite nice, quite easy to meet people, and spend the night out with different people and have a good time, but maybe next day it’s different… (Gasper, 30)

The above quote highlights a limitation of the approach used in this study, its inability to explore the spontaneous nature that constitutes much of cosmopolitan conviviality in the metropolis. Like Gasper, the approach has difficulty to capture the chorus of different others that make living in the city enjoyable, and which undoubtedly generate feelings of ’hearth’.

However, and maybe not surprisingly, their closest relationships, with friends and partners, remain conducted in their mother tongue. Laura, who had only moved to Madrid the previous year with her British partner, was particularly reflective on the composition and quality of her friendship network, which had undergone a significant transition during this period.

So I think in terms of actually meeting people it’s really easy, I don’t know yet how easy it is to actually make proper friends, and I don’t know how, I don’t know how, how much I need to have proper friends, and also if I think all those people there, well they are people I’ve been friends with for years, n years n years and been through a load of shit with so that doesn’t just come does it? (N. No) it does take time to have that kind level of closeness and for people to really know you as well, so that’s what I’m missing here at the moment… (Laura, 31)

When probing her further if she feels this is a linguistic or a temporal issue, she reiterates “I think it’s a time and shared experiences thing”. However, after a recent argument and fall out with a confidant from her university undergraduate days in the UK, she changed her convivial strategy.

…it made me think right, ok, screw you I’m going to put some more time and energy into the people here and give them the, you know, (N. a chance) yeah, give them a chance really so that’s what I’ve been doing, and it works, I think it works if you just give people a little bit of vulnerability or you know something and they grab onto it (Laura, 31)

However movers’ stable horizons are not only maintained through travelling ‘home’, but also through ‘home’ coming to visit them, which has consequences on their network structure. Here, weak ties between alter in Spain and the UK are established as family and friends from ‘home’ visit and are introduced to their convivial lives in the city. These relational bridges enable them to share and relate experiences across their biographical network. Continued settlement permits continued visits from ‘home’, and new friends to accompany them on their own visits ‘home’. This enables them to draw their concentric circles of conviviality closer together, and as a result, movers start to experience their ‘hearth’ as less bifocal and more monofocal.
However, significant new life events can raise new challenges to the hearth. For example Matias’ parents were visiting Manchester the day after the interview to see his new born son and when I asked him what the next chapter title in his life would be he replies ‘The Return to Spain - possibly’. Having put their house up for sale, both Matias and his Spanish partner intend to return so that their son can enjoy the secure and happy childhood that they enjoyed, “safe to play all day in the street”, and enjoy a close relationship with his grandparents. They believe this outweighs any benefits of raising a child in the UK, especially in their current neighbourhood, where they see children as ‘unhappy’. Hence since starting his own family, Matias no longer has only his own hearth to consider. He also refers to ontological reasons for wanting to return to Spain, displaying significant reflexivity in the process

I don’t want to spend the rest of my life thinking about moving back to Spain, and have an idealised idea of Spain that when I actually return no longer exists, you know/…/the thing is, this is what happened to the father of [confidant], her father is Spanish and her mother as well, they live in [neighbourhood], she was born here, but her father spent all his working life as a waiter here thinking about one day returning to Madrid, and the Madrid he had in his head was the Madrid of the seventies, and when he returned it no longer existed, and I don’t want this to happen to me, and now he is a sad man, you know, suddenly a project of life without meaning…(Matias, 35)

Ria, aged 31 and married to an Englishman sees her future, possibly with a family, in the UK. Ria’s opening title ‘Surviving Childhood’ in Spain relates to the problematic relationship with and between her parents. This coupled together with her stable horizon primarily based around both other and Spanish nationals encountered and maintained after nearly a decade in the UK, she neither shares Matais’ desire to return nor vision of family life in Spain. Whereas for Gasper, 30 and single, his attitude to the future was far more contingent, happy to stay in Manchester until something happened, “until I suddenly go nuts” or maybe until his next intended chapter title, ‘I Fall in Love’.

For non-movers, other nationals tend to be old study or work friends now living in distant locations to which they occasionally travel to visit, and/or people with whom they currently socialise in the city. Whilst they may have some knowledge of and skills in a second language, their friendships are predominantly conducted in their mother tongue. Unlike the movers, their monofocal ‘hearth’ is not a cause of disorientation, and the cosmos is experienced through travel and socialising with other nationals. Non-movers acknowledge that they are attracted to difference and different cultures, characterised by their hospitality towards other nationals. To a degree they recognise and appreciate the reciprocity of their relationships with movers, where they provide a touch of Spain or Britain in exchange for the ‘cosmos’.

22 English Translation of “se le cruzan los cables”
For example, Katie explains how her friendship with confidant Beatrix started, a Spanish girl who works as a staff trainer at the coffee house they work at, and who now comes to her house for dinner when she is up on assignment from London.

K. With the other people it would just be OK there's your milk, there's the sandwiches, 'how's it going, yeah great, see you later', whereas I'm like 'let's go for dinner, let's have drinks'…

N. Why do you think that is?

K. I don't know, I'm a friendly person, it was as simple as that, I didn't yeah, I didn't, I never see work or any reason not to make friends with people, and I felt, it's going to sound awful, I felt a bit sorry for them, because they come up, there's two of them mainly that come up, /…/ Masimo I first went to dinner with, and he and Beatrix are close/…/but yeah, I just felt like they were coming from London to Manchester sometimes spending up to four nights just sitting in a hotel room, I was like 'god that's got to be boring, let's go out for dinner, at least for one night' and then it became me, Beatrix and Masimo and then it was just me and Beatrix and another girl. (Katie, 30)

Similarly Luis in Madrid, through arranging travels, has introduced his French companions from work to his lifelong confidants from his neighbourhood. Both Katie's and Luis' previous experiences of residing abroad have not only drawn them to work in multinational environments, with Katie deliberately employing foreign people, it has facilitated them to engage with and introduce other nationals to their native friends. Hence their previous experiences of being dislocated from home permits them to empathise with other movers, broadening not only their own horizons, but also those of others.

Robert on the other hand, who has deliberated for some time about residing abroad, “at least for some period of time”, empathises with and is attracted to people who have moved, “they must have something about them”. Hence through previously living abroad, or having the curiosity to do so, the non-movers empathise with the movers’ loss of ‘hearth’ and/or their search for the ‘cosmos’. Non-movers are open and willing to share their stability with movers. The movers on the other hand, whilst appreciative of this ‘hearth’, have a sense of nostalgia for the hearth they had ‘back home’, acknowledging and realising after settling that this is difficult if not impossible to replicate.

…the main thing is that from my point of view is that it feels like a different life... here, but the people that I remember most clearly were from when I was growing up. So it was very difficult to think, right OK, are there people here that fit into that category, well no, not really, ...., only apart from my wife, her friends and her family and the people I work with. (Mark, 30)

With regards to contesting nationality, the evidence is less conclusive and comprehensive. For the movers, the struggle to overcome dislocation and establish ties and bonds in the new socio-cultural context, most often in their second language tends to generate greater reflexivity
and heightened self-awareness. Whilst movers professed some difficulty in meeting either British or Spanish non-movers, the heterogeneity of their friendship networks was primarily a result of bonds with non-movers. However, they did not directly assign the difficulty of meeting non-movers to different national traits and interests, but more due to the contexts that they worked and socialised in.

Claire, 34, confessed that her level of Spanish was not great, which prevented her from having a wider convivial horizon “that’s my problem, yeah, working in English, English boyfriend and English speaking friends”. However, through supporting the same English football club, she had met Spanish companions and British confidants (f=0.393) at the English Pub she frequented, commenting “all of these have made life in Madrid worthwhile//and something stable.” While not openly contesting nationality, movers were aware that the cultural differences they had negotiated and continued to do so in their everyday lives were both a cause of frustration and enjoyment. These experiences provide a source of reflexive contestation as in the following excerpt between Mark and his Spanish wife in Madrid illustrates.

M. But as Raquel can tell you, there are things that still piss me off. Consideration for other people sometimes, from city dwellers. Especially on the roads for me, I moan quite a lot about that don’t I dear?

W. Yeah

M. People on the roads, they are psychos, I have no idea what they are thinking of half the time, and, it can be very frustrating when you are in every day, like I was on the street, people don’t have any consideration for where you are or who are and what you’re doing. It takes a bit of getting used to, but, I am not sure so, I’m not so sure much it’s a city thing, but the more and more I think about it, when we go to places like Almeria or when we go places outside of Madrid, it’s very, very obvious that it’s purely city, ...

W. I think, there are differences, like, English people are more considerate when they drive, they just are...

These contradictory feelings had led them to have less deterministic and opinionated views of nationality as a means of categorisation. This subtle contestation of nationality was sporadically evident in the life stories of non-movers with stable horizons. As in the case of Brad, when I probed him on why he had named the people he considered different (Q5).

Different nationalities, it was one way of distinguishing, everybody else is English as opposed to others, but I didn’t, I couldn’t think of what difference means because they’re all, even though they are foreign, they’re not particularly different, they’re just my mates (Brad, 28)
Here, cosmopolitan conviviality had not led to the affirmation of nationality as a symbolic boundary within non-movers’ horizons. Yet with the stability of a monofocal ‘hearth’, they generally had less cause to contest nationality as a social boundary. Instead non-movers on the whole enjoy and celebrate the cultural differences embodied in their networks.

To summarise, through achieving a level of fixity in their lives, movers and non-movers attain stable horizons. It is the horizon which most epitomizes the argument that transnational mobility provides opportunities for both self and other to evolve a cosmopolitan stance. Yet evidence suggests that the personal experience of confronting another culture remains decisive in whether someone goes beyond simply transcending nationality to contesting it.

4.4.3 Wide Horizons

Twelve cases are representative of this horizon (eight movers and four non-movers). Wide horizons are characterised by other nationals having become of equal or of greater stature than co-nationals within their friendship networks ($F_N \text{ National E-I} \geq -0.03$ – see table 4.7). Additionally, not only are other nationals more prominent in their everyday convivial lives and an integral part of their ‘hearth’, confidants and companions also come from more diverse socio-cultural backgrounds than those with faint or stable horizons ($0.464 \leq e \leq 0.768$). On the whole, bar a few cases, a significant part of their convivial lives and the bonds within are conducted in their second language, complementing those they maintain in their mother tongue from childhood and adolescence. They either tend to be young, single and currently leading heightened convivial lives with many companions, or older, settled in Madrid or Manchester where they socialise with a few key confidants and companions.

Cosmopolitan conviviality, in the main a result of their own transnational mobility, has left an indelible mark on their relational lives and outlook. This is represented by their extremely heterogeneous socio-cultural networks. However, differences exist in relation to the stability of their wide horizons. While a few share the fruits of having wide and stable horizons, combining a diverse array of other nationals with co-nationals to form a stable ‘hearth’, the majority sense that mobility, not only their own but that of close friends, is always lurking around the biographical corner. This brings instability to their ‘hearths’ as bonds formed in the city move on. Personally, for some, mobility is an unwanted distraction, feeling they may have to move to further their professional careers. Whereas for others, it is seen as a calling to continue broadening their horizons and to continually reconnect with the ‘cosmos’.
Table 4.7 Network Composition Measures of Wide Horizon Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Convivial Network (Cn)</th>
<th>Friendship Network (Fn)</th>
<th>Heterogeneity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size</td>
<td>Other Nationals</td>
<td>National E-I index (a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayla</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacho</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribel</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These distinctions are characterised by nuances in their experiences and contexts of cosmopolitan conviviality, which in turn influences their contestation of nationality and self-perception. For purposes of clarity, these distinctions are illustrated below by exploring two ideal types in the Weberian sense. The two types, Difference Junkies (DJs) and Cosmopolitan Hearts (CHs) represent diverging directions of convivial practices and characteristics among those with wide horizons.23

**Difference Junkies (DJs)**

For DJs, the national and socio-cultural differences embodied in their everyday lives are paramount to their self-perception. DJs are aware that they are familiar and comfortable transcending nationality, and although they do not see socio-cultural differences as insurmountable, they have clear convivial preferences. Their current cosmopolitan conviviality is characterised by them embracing difference and using their own objective differences and/or the many embodied within their networks as a means to distinguish themselves from others without foreign bonds. This becomes central to their self-perception. They, like their bonds tend to be young, mobile, single and value the spontaneity of cosmopolitan conviviality.

…I told him like listen, I need to do my things, I need to travel, I need to experience things, do what you want, and we can meet sometime because you know for the romance and things, but, I don’t feel now stable to have a stable life, you know what I mean, and for me boyfriend is when

23 As ideal types, not one case perfectly fits in either, however they show tendency for one or the other
you got a stable life /.../ because as well I can see myself, I am not very stable, like someone stop me to do this, and also I don’t understand like boyfriend as well sacrifice to do things for someone, I don’t want to sacrifice someone to stick with me (Carmen, 26)

I know people from all over basically, I know people from lots of genres, and lots of different types of jobs and everything, and, I would, people I make friends with I just kind of keep them as friends whereas people say you know you need to be more selective, or this person has got a patchy past or this, that or the other but I just kind of thought I like this person and they are going to be part of my life and people kind got a bit bothered about things like that /.../ I met Binju through this the other guy, who, yeah and this other guy I just bumped into on the street, but I like randomness though, you meet, you have the best of times, you’ve just got to go along with random stuff, do you know what I mean (Tayla, 30)

Mover DJs, and to a lesser extent, non-mover DJs, perceive mobility as a desirable and inevitable part of their future plans to reconnect with the cosmos and encounter difference, thus maintaining their wide horizons and self-perception. The balance between the desirability and the inevitability of future movements is inherently linked to the nature of their ‘hearth’ and their life projects. In the case of mover DJs, through tending to associate with fellow movers on a mobile life project, their bonds become increasingly dispersed and co-absent. Aware of the inevitability that they or their companions will be moving on, sooner rather than later, future plans remain contingent on the shifting and evolving nature of their multifocal ‘hearth’.

For non-mover DJs, the inevitability of mobility can be avoided due to the propinquity of old confidants and companions, providing a more stable ‘hearth’. It is their extended sojourns abroad or in other metropolises which entail a ‘change of perspective’ that has consequences for network selection. More often than not, comfortable conversing in a second language, non-mover DJs exploit the opportunities the metropolis offers to engage with other nationals much more actively than non-movers with stable horizons. They purposely co-habit with movers and attend social events such as language exchange nights24, contexts of guaranteed cosmopolitan conviviality. Through these practices over time, other nationals become a large and integral part of their social lives, as friends of friends are added and incorporated into their networks and vice versa. However, whilst highly valuing their bonds with other nationals, when these mover DJs move on, they recognise their own desire and calling to reconnect with the ‘cosmos’ and join the mobile movement.

DJs are continuously reminded of the opportunities for mobility, as friends and friends of friends move on to new ever more distant and exotic destinations, and they tend to see little

---

24 This is more specific to Madrid, with many bars running ‘inter-cambio’ evenings each night of the week
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or no limitations on their own and others mobility to engage in the ‘cosmos’. Seeing the world as their oyster, they are constantly updating and maintaining their mobility portfolio. These sentiments and the overall perspective of DJs are encapsulated in chapter titles such as ‘Grand Plans’, ‘Flying Solo’, ‘Like a Rolling Stone’, ‘To Boldly Go …’, and ‘Travelling “the only university of life”’, with one autobiography title ‘The Gypsy Queen’, epitomising a DJs’ self-perception. When probed about home, they shrug and doubt if there is such a place.

(laughs) wherever, in anywhere, home; what is the meaning of home, where I feel at home? When I feel I am in peace, I got peace with myself, I feel really well. I got the things no disturb me, like for example here in Manchester when I arrived I felt very good because I got quickly a job, and a stable little life and ok, one, two, three, but now I started to feel like, ugh, I need movement, I need like to see again and start to do other things at another level. (Carmen, 26)

I mean all of these people here /…/from Will downwards they are all in their twenties, like nineteen, twenty, twenty-one, these guys are more my age like twenty-five onwards, err, but yeah we’ve all lived abroad, and all of us have lived abroad, we’ve all straight after uni gone to, as, these guys have too, but I mean like Steve and Sara have, Steve’s been here ten years, she came as an au pair and never left, so but, and these guys as well, Faye lived in Colombia for two years, Molly’s been here for two years, and Luke is going off to Australia next year (Penny, 24)

With wide horizons, DJs are not only familiar with other nationals, but very open and willing to transcend nationality. However, as their networks illustrate, mover DJs have few associations with native non-movers and openly stress the difficulty in meeting and identifying with locals. When probed, they overtly bemoan the lack of openness among locals, not just those in their present context, but those from within their own national boundaries. Instead they celebrate the openness of the other nationals and nationalities in their lives. Similarly, non-mover DJs tend to associate with other nationals separately from their native friends. While both groups know of each other, non-mover DJs have no or little ambition to draw these groups of friends closer together. However, like Miguel this may be due to established attitudes towards the conviviality of their co-nationals.

In the canteen at uni we were always in separate groups, so really it’s from my own experience in Madrid and Spain it’s not very natural to mix groups, especially between Spanish /…/it’s easier for someone from outside who is more exotic to come in /…/but for example with my graduation party I had to exclude some people because I knew that they clash with others/…/and later I have discovered other clashes/…/so these groups are separate because I don’t want to provoke more clashes between for example my intercambio [foreign] friends and my Spanish friends (Miguel, 32)

Difference Junkies project and uphold nationality as a social boundary, so it remains something they can be seen to transcend symbolically by others. Yet this may also involve the reaffirmation of attitudes towards their co-nationals and nationality. Through this they
preserve their distinctiveness, central to their self-perception. In sum, Difference Junkies simultaneously subvert and reconstruct nationality as a social boundary. With continued mobility or fixity they may contest the category nationality, not just the nationalities they currently know and are acquainted with.

**Cosmopolitan Hearths (CHs)**

CHs are movers, whose transnational mobility and subsequent settlement is paramount to their self-perception and awareness. Unlike DJs, and similar to movers with stable horizons, they are aware of and reflect over their struggle to establish themselves professionally and emotionally in their new national context. CHs acknowledge that for professional reasons they may have to move again in the future, however, while potentially mobile they recognise the emotional and psychological limitations of mobility. Their cosmopolitan conviviality in the metropolis is characterised by them having a diverse array of ties and bonds with fellow movers, including compatriots, and native non-movers. They tend to be older, settled or are settling and single.

My experience in Mexico helped me to take the decision to come here, I didn’t expect to live here, you know, I came here just for two months [to learn English], and now I’m one year here, and I never expected to stay here one year, and now I will stay longer, but I would like to go back to Spain [in the future] /..I arrived here in a hostel with my backpack, nothing else, and now, ok, I don’t have much more but I think now I feel comfortable, I feel safe where I live with my [British] housemates /…/ I need to improve my situation here, now I’m living in a small room, and, it’s OK because I pay 200 for this room, I don’t know, probably I move out but I don’t know, it depends on my job because this job where I’m working now, this job has a lot of a big expectations about my position, because they are opening to Spain, and now they say, ‘OK, Spain is a big market so you can do a good job and we have to start to prospect in South America as well’, and then they have great expectation for my position, so, but I would like to work as an engineer, but the job allows me to improve and maybe go to South America, you know, now I have to go to Spain because I have to visit some customers there, and, well Spain is not exciting for me, but South America, but we’ll see, I need to sell. I don’t know so far, until Christmas, in Christmas I will know my future because I have a three month trial (Jesus, 35)

When settled or when safe in the knowledge that they will reside in the city for the foreseeable future due to employment security, CHs tend to develop work ties into bonds. Old colleagues and associates, who may have moved on, remain close. Their professional working environments, from media and the academy to teaching and sales, contain a diverse array of nationalities and are the foundations of their wide horizons.
CHs more often cohabit with non-movers, initially on purpose to develop their local language skills. Outside their multinational work contexts, they do not deliberately seek out fellow movers, but through pursuing their leisure interests in the city they meet a diverse array of people. After a period of settlement, and dependent on their employment\textsuperscript{25}, they are generally comfortable socialising in the local language. However, they also have bonds in their mother tongue, compatriots and movers from English or Spanish speaking countries. They are comfortable introducing fellow movers, including compatriots, to non-movers and vice versa, and therefore their networks in the city become highly interconnected. No one exemplifies this more than Maribel, who when asked if she had helped others settle in Manchester since her arrival three years previously, discusses the case of Raul, a friend she had made through an internet forum for Spanish people living in Manchester.

There was one guy who was going to come here and he just did not really have a clue about anything, and I saw that nobody had replied to his post, so I sent him an email saying ‘OK, I can help you, what do you need or whatever’, so I helped him with everything I could and then the next day he arrived in here, and we met, we didn’t know each other! You know, at all, so we met for a beer and he ended up being a really nice guy, so actually in the first same week we had with my friends a dinner at Billy’s place, like he cooks pizza like, I mean great, it’s even better than the Italian one. So I asked Billy ‘do you mind if I take a new friend to your place, because you know he just got here’, and he said ‘yeah, yeah, yeah’, and this guy Raul just didn’t speak English, I mean he was really bad in English, he could understand English, but speaking, it was just kind of a disaster. But then that day, but he really put an effort you know, he really wanted to speak English, so he tried, and tried and tried and then he just became kind of one of us, my friends just love him, like a month ago, we went to, Ebru, Billy, Rocco, Simon and me, we went to Salamanca, and actually Raul is now living in Pamplona and he came to spend the weekend with us, so, and then there was another girl who was here for two months, who is from Costa Rica but she is doing her PhD in Bilbao… (Maribel, 31)

CHs promote cosmopolitan conviviality, and consequently they develop a wide and stable horizon, with some evolving a sense of belonging to the city. This sense of belonging to the city does not detract from any other sense of belonging, maintaining bonds with friends and family elsewhere. However, CHs are familiar with establishing and re-establishing ‘hearthys’, having at times moved and settled on numerous occasions. Whilst these experiences have taught them adaptation skills, it has also made them aware of the convivial costs of mobility. CHs understand that their own mobility and that of their ties and bonds is somewhat inevitable in their careers. While these bonds are maintained in co-absence, they are missed in co-presence. Logistically, the movement of bonds can disrupt the structure and dynamic of

\textsuperscript{25} Foreign language teaching professionals and others employed for their native language skills tend to have less opportunity to learn and develop local language skills, coupled with the fact that their work colleagues and potential pool of bonds are compatriots or other nationals and not natives.
their network, and psychologically, their sense of belonging to the city. Yet they understand that their own mobility and settlement is fundamental to their convivial stance and sense of self. Therefore subconsciously and consciously they encourage others’ mobility, which ironically undermines the stability of their wide horizon.

The continual shifts in the composition and structure of their convivial and friendship networks, heightens their self-awareness of the importance of personal relationships for their sense of self and belonging. As a result, they appreciate the need to find equilibrium between the ‘cosmos’ and the ‘hearth’, and that personal relationships are the foundation of a cosmopolitan ‘hearth’. Familiar with establishing ‘hearths’ in distinctive places with distinctive others; they learn and appreciate to find commonality between people of different socio-cultural backgrounds. It is in this openness to commonality that they possibly contest nationality not only as a symbolic boundary, but also as a social boundary. Yet some boundaries remain important to one’s sense of self.

M. I do not consider myself as Spanish
N. right, OK
M. If somebody asked me, well if somebody asked me here, I would say Spanish, but if not, I’m Catalan, and that’s why I put it in different because, mmm, I think there is quite a difference between Spanish people and Catalan
N. Yeah, in which way?
M. Yeah, different ways, I don’t know, to do things, I don’t know, I remember working in [the Spanish restaurant] which is very a lot of Spanish people, different ways, I just arrived and I got on with the two guys, and they are from Barcelona, easier than the others, and one guy from Asturias, but always, or here it’s easier to get on, because I guess, a different culture, different language (Marta, 35)

So whereas Difference Junkies project and celebrate national differences, Cosmopolitan Hearths tend to embrace commonality through difference, or difference through commonality as in the case of Marta. However, this is no longer just a product of their biography, but also a convivial strategy with which to approach the future. It is a strategy that recognises that the ‘cosmos’ and the ‘hearth’ are constantly in flux and seldom in equilibrium.

4.5 The Cosmopolitan Play – Act I

Having outlined the contexts where cosmopolitan conviviality occurs, and the cast of actors that engage in this particular production of the cosmopolitan play, I now present the key
substantive findings regarding the transcendence and contestation of nationality as an essentialised identity.

First, the biographical network approach used illustrates that transnational mobility, while influential, is not essential to engage in cosmopolitan conviviality and transcend nationality within the metropolis. Therefore transnational mobility provides opportunities for ‘self’ and ‘other’, movers and non-movers, to evolve attitudes characteristic of a cosmopolitan stance. The findings support criticisms of mistaking mobility for cosmopolitanism, and show that cosmopolitan conviviality is more complex than a simple mover/non-mover distinction. Yet the evidence suggests that mobility with settlement has significant implications for whether people go beyond transcending nationality and reflexively contest it. The findings clearly illustrate that greater propensity to interact with other nationals is mirrored by an increased likelihood to have more socio-culturally diverse bonds. This in turn increases the likelihood that they not only transcend nationality as a symbolic boundary, but contest it as a social boundary. The findings suggest that it is in the familiarity of making the unfamiliar familiar that cosmopolitan attitudes evolve. It is in the nuances of how nationality is contested or reconstructed as an essentialised identity that different actors emerge and can be identified more clearly within the cosmopolitan play.

Here we witness that mobility and settlement without set institutional and temporal parameters, as in the case of movers with stable horizons, encourages reflexivity and self-awareness. Through moving, learning, working and living\(^\text{26}\) in the new socio-cultural context, movers juxtapose their frustrations with their enjoyment, developing biographicity. With settlement, bonds with other nationals, including locals, endure and gain in quality. Through this they acknowledge objective others as subjective others, finding and projecting commonality over, but yet through difference. Hence settlement, or fixity, is key for someone to contest nationality and evolve cosmopolitan characteristics. Inherent to this, is that the initial dizziness and disorientation of a dislocated and bifocal ‘hearth’ diminishes, and possibly with time a cosmopolitan ‘hearth’ evolves and is reflexively managed.

For some, the experience of an extended sojourn abroad triggers a change of convivial perspective, with them embracing more difference into their network. By seeking out cosmopolitan conviviality in the city, they transcend nationality; an experience which they feel enriches their lives. On occasions, they stress that they have always been interested in different languages and cultures, something which distinguishes themselves from their compatriots. They refer to their heterogeneous networks to legitimate their distinctive, somewhat anti-

\(^{26}\) Series of chapter titles used by Mark
national identity and sense of self. Yet ironically, like the young DJs they associate with and plan to emulate, they project and uphold nationality as a social boundary.

For a few young Spanish adults, who return into tightly interconnected friendship networks, extended sojourns help to solidify their national identity. This manifests itself in their affirmation of nationality as a symbolic boundary within their own networks, and their attitudes towards other nationalities. Through maintaining other nationals as objective others, interacting with them predominantly in objective symmetrical positions at work, they preserve a national sense of self based on familiar and durable bonds with co-nationals. However, the socio-cultural heterogeneity of employees and type of workplace is possibly decisive in fostering the transcendence and contestation of nationality. The evidence suggests that a bi-national administrative workplace strengthens nationality as a social boundary, whereas a multi-national service workplace, without one dominant national group, fosters commonality and possibly the contestation of nationality as a social boundary.

Within the cosmopolitan play, different actors find themselves assembled together. Below Max expands on his chapter ‘Cataluña is not Spain’, where during a six month work placement prior to him moving to Madrid and evolving a cosmopolitan ‘hearth’, he confronted and contested a solid national identity.

I think it’s great to have these little sort of independent languages and little nooks, I think it’s great the Welsh speak Welsh, I think it’s part of the colour of our nation, I think it’s a wonderful thing, but it’s just, when you start having a sort of natural disrespect for Spanish people, and you think, ‘well these people don’t really deserve that, you don’t even know them, you know you’re talking about, ok, forty million people in Spain say, out of which you might know twenty, but you hate the rest of them, you’ve never met them’, you know, this sort of mind-set, this sort of, the idea as well ‘ah but you see that our customs are different from theirs’, it’s like, ‘but do you think that the rest of Spain is just homogenous, that you leave Cataluña and suddenly everyone’s the same, and everything’s exactly the same’, yeah, Cataluña’s different to Aragon, but Aragon’s different to Galicia, and Galicia’s different to fucking Andalucia, you know, and London’s different to Newcastle, you know, and my area of London is different to another area of London, and I’m different to my fucking neighbour, you see what I mean, they are just the weirdest group, and you’re like, you know, it’s this sort of undercurrent of racism to it, that I don’t think they realise

(Max, 26)

DJs on the other hand tend to avoid confrontations with native actors, preferring to assemble together. This convivial strategy together with DJs’ mobility portfolio is central to their transcendental persona and self-perception. Yet it is in the confrontations between movers and non-movers that reflexive contestations towards nationality are spawned, and where cosmopolitan attitudes and practices evolve and solidify. Ironically, it is in these same
confrontations, that for others, nationalised attitudes and practices are reaffirmed and preserved.

Many productions of the cosmopolitan play would conclude here. In this study, the complexity of cosmopolitan conviviality is unravelled further in the following chapter. So while it can be concluded that transnational mobility does provide national boundary work opportunities for both movers and non-movers, it remains to be seen if this relates to or is translated into the transcendence and contestation of other social boundaries. The biographical network approach now moves on to explore Convivial Depths, the second axis of cosmopolitan conviviality which refers to people’s interactions across other social boundaries inside and outside their own national boundaries.
5

Convivial Depths

5.1 Introduction

The discussion in this chapter explores if the transcendence and contestation of nationality as a social boundary relates to the transcendence and contestation of other social boundaries (RQ3). Whereas the previous chapter explored convivial horizons, the diversity of conviviality across national boundaries, here the depth of conviviality within and across national boundaries is examined. This distinction is made to deepen cosmopolitan theory, which to date, with its concentration on mobility and the mobile has tended to ignore the diversity of people’s conviviality within national boundaries. Therefore the initial analysis concentrates on the extent to which participants have developed ties and bonds with others of a different social class background, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality (RQ4), and the biographical contexts in which these relationships were initiated and developed.

The analysis follows a similar path to the one in the previous chapter; however, a greater focus is now placed on the biographical distribution and structure of the convivial and friendship networks. The analysis is now complemented with network visualisations to illustrate the extent to which different others in terms of social class, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality are embedded in people’s biographical networks. This is done to shed more light on the relationship between cosmopolitan conviviality and reflexive contestations. The findings deepen the plot in Act II of the Cosmopolitan Play.

5.2 Unearthing Convivial Depths

Whereas cosmopolitan horizons were developed primarily in young adulthood through participants’ study, work, cohabiting and leisure activities at home and abroad, the depth of cosmopolitan conviviality was not restricted to the most recent biographical chapters in people’s lives. Before presenting three convivial depth types that emerge from the data, the homophily of the entire sample’s convivial and friendship networks along the dimensions of social class, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality are discussed.
5.2.1 Relative Measures

Across the sample, participants named fewer people with a different social class background (Q4) than other nationals (Q3), and subsequently identified fewer people with a different ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality. There was some variety with regards to how and why people named others with a different social class background (other SCBs). Whilst some participants, predominantly Spanish, stressed it more as an achieved status based on educational attainment and occupation, others, predominantly British stressed it more as an ascribed status based on schooling and family background. To motivate their choices participants also drew upon alters’ lifestyles and cultural tastes, and use of language and dialect. Thus, without an available authoritative definition of social class, people used their own definitions to name other SCBs, as the following quote illustrates.

…the only part I found difficult was the part on social class, because there are multiple interpretations, not only mine but also if others had to name people of another social class background, so I found that a bit complicated and I was not sure what you really wanted, I chatted with [confidant/flatmate] about this yesterday and he had a completely different idea about it than I had /…/ ok, my definition, for me social class depends on the type of studies you have, the work you currently do and more or less the amount of money you earn, but for [confidant], it's something different, like he said, you might not have any studies but lots of money, or have studied loads and be unemployed (Magda, 31)

However, this study is not particularly concerned with how participants define social class per se, but the extent and quality of interactions participants have with people they see as having a relatively different social class position to them. The identifying of alter (aq&ai) on the sociogram with a different ethnicity, religion, sexuality and of a different age group was unproblematic for participants. Occasionally those identified coincided with names provided under Q5, the friends, colleagues and family they considered different in some way. Here, whilst numerous participants named people they considered different due to their nationality, social class and sexuality, they were less inclined to name people on grounds of their ethnicity and religion, and no one was named on grounds of their age.

The data supports previous research that found homophily in terms of social class to be weaker than ethnicity, religion and age (McPherson et al. 2001). Yet this finding undoubtedly is influenced by the design of the name generator used here. With the homophily measures on each dimension calculated using the convivial and friendship network sizes, the depth measures (social class, ethnicity, religion, age & sexuality) are influenced by the extent to which people named other nationals and people they considered different on grounds of personality or lifestyle. In Table 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 below, the size and homophily measures along
each dimension, together with the socio-cultural heterogeneity of the cases’ convivial networks (\(Cn\)) and friendship networks (\(Fn\)) are collated in their respective horizon. There is little evidence to suggest that convivial depths differ significantly between convivial horizons.

The only significant divergence between the horizons is found along the dimension of ethnicity, where on average cases with wide horizons in Table 5.3 (mean \(Fn = -0.79\)) display significantly less homophily within their friendship networks. There is also some evidence among cases with wide horizons that they are also more likely to identify people of a different religion and age within their convivial and friendship networks.

### Table 5.1 Faint Horizon Depths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>National E-I index</th>
<th>Socio-Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Social Class E-I index</th>
<th>Ethnicity E-I index</th>
<th>Religion E-I index</th>
<th>Age E-I index</th>
<th>Sexuality E-I index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
<td>(Fn)</td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
<td>(Fn)</td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
<td>(Fn)</td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rodyn</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.198</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herman</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.426</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwan</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magda</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.340</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>-0.61</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.2 Stable Horizon Depths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>National E-I index</th>
<th>Socio-Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Social Class E-I index</th>
<th>Ethnicity E-I index</th>
<th>Religion E-I index</th>
<th>Age E-I index</th>
<th>Sexuality E-I index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
<td>(Fn)</td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
<td>(Fn)</td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
<td>(Fn)</td>
<td>(Cn)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>0.408</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>-0.73</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>-0.46</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasper</td>
<td>-0.13</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.45</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.77</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With far fewer alter named or identified along each depth dimension than other nationals, there was significantly less variation between the cases with regards to convivial depth. Hence
the approach used to establish a typology of convivial horizons was inapplicable for convivial depths. In sum, further analysis is necessary to see if the transcendence and contestation of nationality significantly leads to the transcendence and contestation of other social boundaries. To unearth convivial depths further, each dimension is now analysed in turn, starting with social class background.

### Table 5.3 Wide Horizon Depths

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>National E-I index</th>
<th>Socio-Cultural Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Social Class E-I index</th>
<th>Ethnicity E-I index</th>
<th>Religion E-I index</th>
<th>Age E-I index</th>
<th>Sexuality E-I index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cn</td>
<td>Fn</td>
<td>Cn</td>
<td>Fn</td>
<td>Cn</td>
<td>Fn</td>
<td>Cn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayla</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.717</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.642</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacho</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.608</td>
<td>0.674</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribel</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.69</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.636</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.768</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.622</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.701</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.708</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>0.626</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Social Class Background (SCB)

All the participants provided a self-referential SCB of either working (W) or middle (M). Twenty-one of twenty-eight cases named a friend, colleague or family member with a different SCB, of which eighteen named other SCBs within their friendship networks. Across the whole sample’s convivial networks, 13% of alter were of a different social class background, in contrast to 45% with a different nationality. Therefore the networks displayed significantly more homophily in terms of social class than nationality, with means scores across the sample of -0.77 and -0.74 for the convivial and friendship networks respectively.

Whereas just over a third of all alter within the friendship networks were other nationals, only one-tenth were other SCBs, and only in one case did other SCBs dominate the friendship network. However, more interestingly 47% of all other SCBs were embedded within the friendship network, exactly the same percentage as other nationals. Therefore while the networks displayed more homophily in terms of social class than nationality, other SCBs had
the same likelihood of being part of the friendship network as other nationals. Furthermore, other SCBs were more likely to be named as confidants than other nationals.

Whilst family members are not accounted for in the measures in Table 5.1, 5.2 & 5.3 above, very few that were named were seen as having a different social class background. When named, they tended not to be immediate family members, and were peripheral ties in the network. Dylan (W) and Tayla (W) in Manchester were the first in their respective families to attend university. Yet this experience had only increased the social distance between alter in Dylan´s network, and not Tayla´s, who named no other SCBs. However, while others in their networks claimed that they had achieved social mobility due to their educational trajectories, they ardently held onto their British working class backgrounds and identities.

I have a working class background and that’s who I am, I’m not claiming to be something that I am not, although other people say to me you’re definitely middle-class, so I don’t know /…/ I think I relate to more my family and friends, you know what I mean? I’m not, I don’t define myself by the job I do or by my education and that (Tayla, 30)

With far fewer other SCBs named across the sample than other nationals, resulting in less variation between cases in terms of homophily\(^27\), a more subtle approach is necessary to establish a typology of convivial depths. Additionally, unlike convivial horizons, there is no correlation between the convivial and friendship measures, such that there is no evidence to suggest that the propensity to interact with people of other SCBs leads to more bonds with other SCBs.

Structurally, in comparison to other nationals, other SCBs were less connected to each other within the biographical networks. Hence, they were seldom clustered together, such that participants had not been introduced to other SCBs through other SCBs. However, the mean degree or connectivity of other SCBs within the friendship networks (\(F_n\)) was roughly double that of those outside (\(nF_n\)). Therefore the 47% of other SCBs within friendship networks, particularly those people that participants confided in, tended to be well integrated and embedded within participants’ networks and social lives. Yet in summary, participants’ social lives in the main were dominated by people they saw as of a similar social class background.

The positive correlation between the degree of centrality and relational quality for other SCBs, bonds (\(F_n\)) as opposed to ties (\(nF_n\)), also held for those identified with a different ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality.

\(^{27}\)All but four cases are within one standard deviation of the friendship network mean (\(F\) SCB E-I index &gt;-0.43)
Ethnicity

Fifteen of the twenty-eight cases identified alter of a different ethnicity, ten of which identified people in their friendship network. Across the whole sample, just over 5% of all alter within the convivial networks were of another ethnicity. Whilst the networks displayed less homophily in terms of nationality than what could be expected if associates were chosen randomly from either of the metropolitan or national populations\(^{28}\), as outlined in section 3.3.1, the reverse could be argued with regards to ethnicity. Whilst percentages of foreign born residents cannot be equated directly with ethnic heterogeneity, the significant ethnic homophily \((C_H = -0.87 \text{ & } F_H = -0.91)\) witnessed across the networks is far greater than the ethnic heterogeneity of both Spain, the UK, Madrid and Manchester. In network terminology, the figures indicate inbreeding homophily, the greater propensity to interact within one`s own ethnic group than would be randomly expected (McPherson et al. 2001). More importantly, it suggests that strong structural and contextual effects and ethnic boundaries exist and remain strong within cosmopolitan conviviality.

With regards to the ethnic make-up of the sample, all but two participants were Caucasian, with one woman in Manchester of Black Afro-Caribbean heritage\(^{29}\) and Miguel in Madrid of mixed race\(^{30}\). These two participants` convivial and friendship networks were the most ethnically heterogeneous, a finding that supports previous research on the networks of ethnic minorities (Marsden 1987). However, homophily in terms of ethnicity was relatively stable across the sample. Additionally, those identified with a different ethnicity were less likely to be embedded within the friendship network, 37% in comparison to 47% of other SCBs and other nationals. When named in the friendship network, other ethnics were overwhelmingly companions. Only Andres in Manchester and Miguel in Madrid identified a confidant with a different ethnicity, and in both cases they were other nationals. Overall, nine out of ten alter identified with a different ethnicity were other nationals. Hence the ethnic diversity of the sample`s conviviality with co-nationals within their national boundaries was minimal. Instead ethnic depth was inherently linked to their convivial width, which is mirrored in the figures in Table 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3. Here, while cases with faint and stable horizons identified other ethnics within their convivial networks, it tended to be only cases with wide horizons that identified people within their friendship networks. Therefore, national heterophily and socio-cultural

\(^{28}\) This is referred to as baseline homophily – the predicted homophily that would be seen if associates were chosen randomly from the available population – this however biases fixity over mobility

\(^{29}\) E-I Index calculated using Black African and Caribbean alter as in-group (I)

\(^{30}\) E-I Index calculated using Spanish and Puerto Rican alter as in-group (I)
heterogeneity tends to reduce network homophily in terms of ethnicity, particularly with respect to friendship.

However, very few of those identified with a different ethnicity were considered different on grounds of their ethnicity (Q5). To conclude, whilst ethnicity was a symbolic boundary for many with faint and stable horizons, it was not a category used widely by participants to distinguish between people. It is difficult to claim that this illustrates a general contestation of ethnicity as an essentialised identity, or perhaps simply reflects contemporary sentiments around using race/ethnicity as a means of grouping and distinguishing individuals.

**Religion**

Only five participants out of the sample named alter with a different religion, however, this was not seen as significant to their relationship. Instead some cases named people they considered different (Q5) on grounds of religiosity, their practice and adherence to religious beliefs.

Two participants actively practised religion, yet neither identified people of other faiths within their networks. Iwan in Manchester had returned to his faith and the church after university studies, as encapsulated in the chapter title ‘Saved and Amazing’. For a period he was employed by the church, and his convivial and friendship networks were dominated by leaders and members of the congregation, including his wife whom he had met through his faith. Iwan was aware and self-reflexive over the homogeneity and insularity that the focus on his faith had generated, which subsequently had led him to return to his career outside of the church. Hence the strong influence of similar others within his network had led him to select an organisational foci that would induce greater heterogeneity into his network.

I: I’d be reticent to give up my career again [for the church], which, I did that, you know and in terms of like, in terms of my job now and how much I’m earning, and my position, it’s definitely suffered /…/ when I stopped working for the church and went back into working with normal people, I just really, really enjoyed that, just meeting different people and

N: What do you mean normal people?

I: Non, non, Christian people, not of faith, not of faith people, it’s a very small bubble you are in when you work for the church, you know, same people all the time, same type of people constantly

N: But your faith also connects a lot of people from different backgrounds?

I: Yes it does, but when you spend time with people who don’t believe what you believe, there is a certain language that we all speak, Christians, there is a certain way we live, there are things we do, that are not like and you don’t, I wouldn’t have to explain myself to them,
because the thing I’m doing is natural, whereas when I sit and talk to you for example, you know, I’m using language that you’ll understand, I’m maybe toning down some of the more religious stuff, I’m not being so, yeah, I’m being slightly less Christian perhaps, and I’m like that with the guys at work (Iwan, 35)

Overall, religion was not seen as a significant social boundary, and hence homophily in terms of religion appears very strong across the sample. Yet at times religiosity in general (as opposed to a person’s religious affiliation) was used to motivate why people were considered different in some way (Q5). Here, non-religious participants tend to socialise with other non-religious people, and religious people of any faith were considered different. This finding together with the comments made by Iwan, suggest that the church and faith tends to insulate ‘believers’ from ‘non-believers’, which in turn constructs a symbolic and social boundary between people on grounds of religiosity more than religion per se.

**Age**

Thirteen cases identified alter of a different age group, eleven of which also identified these within their friendship networks. Approximately 3% of all alter named within the convivial networks were of other age groups, and all were identified as being older. While many elders were attained from the life-stories earlier chapters (al), 63% were named (aq) and identified as confidants, companions or people who were or had been especially close. This figure would have increased considerably if the biographical network, rather than the convivial network had been used, as parents and grandparents, both alive and deceased were named. The older participants through their lengthier working lives and choice of leisure pursuits tended to associate, confide in, and socialise with more elders than younger participants. In sum, whilst homophily in terms of age was stronger than ethnicity and social class across the sample, elders named were either significant members of their friendship network or people who had been significant in an earlier stage of their lives.

There was no direct correlation between national homophily and homophily in terms of age, with all horizon types as likely to identify elders. However, two-thirds of all elders identified were also other nationals, suggesting that for some, the broadening of their convivial horizons had coincided with the transcendence of age as a symbolic boundary.
Sexuality

Finally, sixteen cases identified alter in their networks with a different sexuality, twelve of which named them within their friendship network. Similar to the figures on age, approximately 3% of total alters were identified as having a different sexuality, 67% of which were named as bonds. Half of all identified as bonds were other nationals, hence for some, the broadening of convivial horizons coincided with transcending sexuality. Additionally, no bonds ($Fn$) were named as people they considered different due to their sexuality (Q5), whereas in one case, ties ($nFn$) were. This would suggest that the transcendence of sexuality at a symbolic level had led to the contestation of sexuality as an essentialised identity for many.

With regards to the sexual orientation of the sample, twenty-five participants were heterosexual, two men were homosexual and one man was bi-sexual. Across the sample, three out of four alter identified with a different sexuality were male, who were also twice as likely as females to be embedded within the friendship network. With regards to the two homosexual men, whilst they both identified heterosexual male friends, colleagues and family, the men within their friendship networks since ‘Coming Out’ tended to be non-heterosexual. Therefore, there is some evidence to suggest that the symbolic boundary of sexuality had strengthened since they ‘came out’. However, in terms of sexuality, their networks displayed no more homophily than the other cases.

Summary

As could be envisaged with the sampling framework and name generator used in this study, homophily was significantly weaker in terms of nationality and social class across the sample than along the other dimensions. However, alters with a different sexuality and/or a different age, when named were more likely to be embedded within the friendship network than those of a different nationality, social class and ethnicity.

Those with faint horizons, whose conviviality is more consigned within national boundaries, did not display greater depth in terms of social class than those with other horizons. Across the sample bonds with co-nationals tended to be within the same social class. The horizons did differ along the dimension of ethnicity. Here, wide horizons, particularly in relation to their friendship networks tended to display less homophily (see Table 5.1, 5.2 & 5.3).

---

31 While sexuality was not a dedicated interview topic, the approach used encouraged participants to discuss past and present relations, through which their sexual orientations were revealed.
32 For these two cases, the E-I index were based on heterosexual men constituting the out-group (E), with heterosexual women included in the in-group (I). Neither of the two cases named non-heterosexual women.
33 This participant had recently self-ascribed his bi-sexuality, so non-heterosexuals constituted the out-group (E).
However, while conviviality across national boundaries induced some ethnic heterogeneity, it was significantly less than could be randomly expected in consideration of the respective populations in either Madrid or Manchester, or Spain and the UK. Hence, ethnicity remains a significant symbolic and social boundary within cosmopolitan conviviality.

Only five participants identified alters with a different religion, and when identified, it was not considered significant for the relationship. More often, participants instead named people they considered different on the grounds of their religiosity, their adherence to and practice of a religious faith. Therefore, religion acted as a symbolic boundary, more between those who practiced it and those who did not, than between faiths per se.

After religion, homophily in terms of age and sexuality were by far the strongest. Yet, while participants interacted less with people of different ages and sexualities, two thirds of alters identified were embedded within the friendship network. Additionally, like bonds along the other depth dimensions, they tended to be better connected within the biographical networks, and not peripheral figures within participants’ lives. With regards to the alter participants named as people they consider different in some way to themselves (Q5), not one was named on the grounds of ethnicity or age. While one participant named peripheral network ties on grounds of sexuality, not one of the twelve cases that identified bonds (Fi6) with a different sexuality named them as people they considered different. This subtle finding supports the validity and reliability of the name generator design, based on the theoretical underpinnings of social interaction positions and the distinction between subjective bonds and objective ties.

Overall, there is sufficient evidence to suggest that interacting with other nationals provides boundary work opportunities for participants in terms of social class, ethnicity, age and sexuality (RQ3). However, the measures alone disguise the biographical contexts of cosmopolitan conviviality and its evolution. I now turn to the organisational foci that structure the patterning of association with objectively dissimilar others over time to reveal three convivial depth types.

5.3 Convivial Depths

The depth of participants’ conviviality was uncovered by comparing the biographical distribution of objective others within their networks. Through distinguishing which relationships were established during childhood (C), adolescence (A), further studies and

34 These alter were not included in the out-group (E) when calculating homophily along this dimension
travels (S), and adult working life (W1 & W2), three broad types of depths emerge; these are shallow, national, and international. These are now presented in relation to how participants not only transcend but contest social boundaries beyond the one of nationality. Here, the distribution of alter with different social class backgrounds are analysed in conjunction with those of a different ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality; now collated together under the label of other depths.

5.3.1 Shallow Depths

In total, nine cases (six non-movers and three movers) are representative of this depth that are characterised by a superficial depth in terms of social class and shallow in terms of other depths. In Table 5.4 the biographical distribution of alter with a different SCB and other depths are presented together with the corresponding homophily measures. In addition, the extent to which other SCBs are co-nationals against other nationals is calculated and presented under the column NAT SCB. Within this depth other SCBs, when named, are predominantly co-nationals (Cn NAT SCB E-I Index ≤ -0.2).

Table 5.4 Biographical Distribution & Homophily of Shallow Depth Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE (class)</th>
<th>Biography (Cn/Fn)</th>
<th>SCB E-I index</th>
<th>NAT SCB E-I index</th>
<th>Biography (Cn/Fn)</th>
<th>Other Depth E-I index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different SCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethnicity,Religion, Age &amp; Sexuality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C    A    S    W1    W2</td>
<td>Cn     Fn</td>
<td>Cn     Fn</td>
<td>E-I index</td>
<td>C    A    S    W1    W2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad(m)</td>
<td>1/1*</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwan(m)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>-0.74</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magda(m)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny(m)</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian(m)</td>
<td>3 2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alice(m)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria(m)</td>
<td>2 1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roan(m)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis(w)</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>-0.99</td>
<td>-0.51</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 1/1 means that this other SCB is within the friendship network, single figures without / means that they are ties and hence only within the convivial network.

** Bold signifies other nationals, so that 1-1 means one other national and one own national with a different SCB.

*** Two other nationals and one own national identified with other depths embedded within the friendship network.

---

35 With an age span of 12 years between the youngest case (23) and the oldest case (35), the working life of those aged 29 or over was divided over two working life periods (W1 & W2)
When named, other SCBs are superficial ties, either loosely connected remnants from school and university or work colleagues on the peripheries of their networks. While other SCBs and other depths named prior to their working lives tend to be co-nationals, other nationals that had entered their adult working lives had induced some convivial depth in terms of age, ethnicity and sexuality. The few alter identified as confidants were elders. Whilst five cases claimed to superficially know people with a different SCB, they did not consider them to be friends, colleagues or family members, and therefore they were not named.

Whilst Brad’s two companions, one with a different SCB and one with a different sexuality, were well embedded within his biographical network, his overall convivial depth remained shallow. In terms of gender, Brad’s network was one of the least homophilous networks \( (Cn=0 & Fn=-0.08) \) across the whole sample, with girls dominating his network during childhood and adolescence. The one male friend from this period was three years older than Brad, had lived in the same village, and helped him when ‘Coming Out’ as gay towards the end of secondary school.

During university and since living in Manchester Brad had developed a large friendship network of predominantly heterosexual women and non-heterosexual men. Brad was shocked to realise that he could only identify one heterosexual man in his entire convivial network. Yet prior to leaving the UK for his Erasmus studies he had developed contacts in Spain through a social networking site specifically for gay men. Therefore, whilst sexuality in terms of his interaction with other men was a significant symbolic boundary, Brad’s sexuality and convivial practices had enabled him to transcend nationality with Spanish non-movers during his extended sojourn abroad.

In Spain I didn’t do a great deal, because I was supposed to be at university, but I chose to skive all the time and hang around with these two, but I learnt so much Spanish and everyone was really jealous of me because all the Erasmus people you know hang around together and end up speaking English the whole time, and they don’t make much progress in their language, while I was like, as, I spoke, I mean my Spanish is a bit guttural really to be honest, it’s more like just the Spanish of, like chatting amongst mates sort of thing (Brad, 28)

However, since returning from his studies abroad Brad named no further other nationals, thus he had not yet had the opportunity to reciprocate the hospitality that he had benefited from in Spain. Neither had it promoted a greater willingness for Brad to interact with dissimilar others. Robert on the other hand, who like Brad had a very large friendship network, had deepened as well as broadened his conviviality since living in Manchester during W2. Whilst Robert identified companions with a different ethnicity and sexuality, he considered all his friends,
colleagues and family to be of a similar social class background, and neither did he consider anyone to be significantly different (Q5). With regards to social class, Robert comments

"It doesn’t exist I suppose in the ways that it used, and I suppose the people that I hang out with they’re of a similar mind set to me, so, they might, I suppose they’d have conventionally sort of middle-class ideas and ideals and things and that’s why I didn’t stick anyone in there (Robert, 31)

Through not perceiving any particularised differences, it could be argued that Robert had transcended social boundaries. Yet this was not complemented with any reflexive contestation of his convivial boundaries. Iwan on the other hand did not initially provide a self-identified social class on the questionnaire, when probed why he replied

"I didn’t answer that because, I kind of took exception to the question really, but I was trying to work out why, what’s my problem with that question, but when it came to answering [Q4], I guess, rather than specify myself, it was easier to say who’s not like me, than it was to say, although I could answer what class I really am, but I’m not sure I like answering it because I think I join in with something that I don’t agree with, which is distinction by class (Iwan, 35)

Iwan contests the notion of class as an organisational structure and categorisation. His quote I would argue illustrates that while he may question social class as a fixed precursor of an absolute location or social identity, he acknowledges that his own social position is understood in relation to others. Likewise Adrian named no other SCBs prior to or since living in Madrid and did not perceive social class as a boundary to social interaction. However, since living outside the UK, class had diminished in relative significance.

"… class isn’t really an issue for me, and when it comes to, well the foreign people I know, I know them as foreign language speakers of English, so my class accent understanding of the French, German, Italian and Spaniards is not great, I could be speaking to a lord or a pauper and I wouldn’t know the difference, and as far as British people I don’t really care, it doesn’t make any difference to me, I suppose if I had to choose between talking to the posh and to the salt of the earth, I’d probably pick the salt of the earth because posh accents annoy me, but the people don’t (Adrian, 35)

Therefore, while all the five British cases within this depth professed that social class was no longer the social boundary to interaction that it may have been in the past, the relationships they had with people of other social positions remained superficial. With regards the Spanish cases within this depth, social class was not seen as something pertinent within their everyday lives. However, while they all had acquaintances of a lower or higher social status than themselves, they were not friends, colleagues or family.
To conclude, within this type there is superficial evidence of social distance within their cosmopolitan conviviality and friendship networks. The shallow depth they have in terms of ethnicity and sexuality evolved either during university studies and/or their current leisure pursuits, whereas elders tended to be close work colleagues or old family friends.

Prior to moving on to the next depth, Iwan’s biographical network is presented in Box 5.1 below to exemplify a shallow convivial depth network. Here we clearly see that other SCBs and other depths are peripheral figures, names that would not have been elicited if the nationality and social class question had not been used in the name generator.

---

**Box 5.1 Iwan’s Biographical Network – Untitled**

As in the Biographical Sociogram Interview, the network is presented in the same temporal format. The inner circle represents ego, and each concentric and chronological autobiographical chapter title/ring has a corresponding life stage abbreviation (C, A, S, W1, & W2). The same colour scheme as used in the interview is applied, where red nodes are other nationals and blue nodes are co-nationals. To display convivial depth, green nodes represent

---

36 Participant did not provide an autobiographical title prior to or on completion of the interview
other SCBs and mustard nodes other depths. Bonds \((F_i)\) are distinguished from ties \((nF_i)\) with a grey shadow, whereas those with a purple shadow are alter that were attained through the telling of the life story \((a_i)\). The node size represents degree centrality, the connectedness of each alter within the network, with the largest nodes being those more central. Alter names have been removed here for purposes of aesthetic clarity and anonymity. The ties that exist between alter are either strong (bold lines) or weak (dashed lines).

The large interconnected cluster to the top of the diagram is Iwan`s associates from church. This includes his wife, not surprisingly, the most connected bond and the only person from the church connected to his family in the centre. Iwan`s family constitute the only people from his childhood. The dominance and dense structure of church members within the network reflects the insularity that Iwan commented on and somewhat lamented in section 5.2.1.

Ties outside of church; old school friends during adolescence, friends from further studies, and new colleagues from working life remain peripheral figures providing some superficial depth. Not surprisingly, other depths tend also to come through his faith, here ethnicity, with many other nationals of West African nationality within the congregation. Here, he also names one working class British man he has helped, but he is only named more in response to the question and does not consider him a bond. In sum, Iwan`s bonds are predominantly co-nationals of a similar social class and ethnic background.

5.3.2 National Depths

Eight cases (five non-movers and three movers) are representative of depths that are originally founded within their own national context. Here we clearly witness that the transcendence of social class within the networks is predominantly with co-nationals as seen below in Table 5.5 \((F_n\text{ National SCB E-I index } \leq 0)\). However, for some cases, their convivial depth has evolved further through developing bonds with other nationals of a different social class, ethnicity, age and sexuality (as in Table 5.4, other nationals are signified by figures in bold). On average they display greater depth across the dimension of social class than the other two depths, particularly in relation to their friendship networks.

---

\(^{37}\) To enable comparison between cases, the sizes of the nodes/alter are determined by using intervals of the standard deviation \((\sigma)\) from the mean degree centrality score of the network. Thus the smallest nodes are over one \(\sigma\) below the average degree and the largest are either one or two \(\sigma\) above the average degree.
Within this depth, not only do participants confide in and regularly enjoy socialising and travelling with people they consider to be of a different social class background, they tend also to be durable and confiding relationships. The longevity of these bonds not only improves the quality and strength of the said relationships, but also deepens their overall convivial depth. As could be expected, other SCB bonds tend to be more integrated into their networks than other SCB ties. However, other SCBs (Fn & nFn) at times are embedded within the same groups founded in school, university, work or a specific social context. As a result, unlike shallow depths, ties with other SCBs tend to be active and co-present, and hence more connected within the networks.

Table 5.5 Biographical Distribution & Homophily of National Depth Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE (class)</th>
<th>Biography (Cn/Fn)</th>
<th>SCB E-I index</th>
<th>NAT SCB E-I index</th>
<th>Biography (Cn/Fn)</th>
<th>Ethnicity,Religion, Age &amp; Sexuality</th>
<th>Other Depth E-I index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different SCB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan (w)</td>
<td>C 2 A 9/3 S 2</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>-0.88</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn (m)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>6/3</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.56 -1 -1</td>
<td>-0.88 -0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura (m)</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-0.57 -1 -1</td>
<td>-0.87 -0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernan (m)</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>-0.60 -1 -1</td>
<td>-0.62 -0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nacho (m)</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>-0.69 -1 -1</td>
<td>-1 -1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasper (m)</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>3/1</td>
<td>-0.63</td>
<td>-0.67 0 -0.33</td>
<td>-0.81 -0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie (m)</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td>2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.40 0.20 -0.33</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max (m)</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.90</td>
<td>-0.90 0 0</td>
<td>3/2 -0.86 -0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>-0.49</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| As highlighted under Social Class Background in section 5.2.1, for some British cases, the familiarity of interacting across a broader social distance due to their educational trajectories, had made them aware of and reflexive about their own social class backgrounds. Dylan, 23 who had the most heterophilous convivial and friendship network in terms of SCB across the sample, discussed his working class background in relation to friends from ´the posh end of the estate´ during secondary school (A) and his group of ´uni mates´ in London (S).

D: They are from middle class backgrounds, they are all from middle class backgrounds but I just figured upbringing, I thought, you know what I mean, rather than the way the person is, because [other SCB companion] isn’t, in no way like does she seem or act like upper middle class or middle class whatever, no one ever does, everyone can be down to earth…

N. But you never felt out of place there? (At University in London)
D: No, as soon as I went down to, I moved away from Manchester because if anything I felt out of place up here if I tell you the truth, I’ve always felt out of place up here, right, and I moved down there and first thing I did when I got down there was keep my door open, constantly, made sure I went to the pub and met a load of people, started off with [other SCB confidant] and then met all these people (points to sociogram)

After a recent break-up, Dylan had returned to Manchester and his family home. His reference to feeling out ‘of place up here’, relates to him being teased and picked on for being the academically smart and conscientious kid ‘on his street´ on ‘the rough end of the estate’. Yet through introducing his oldest confidant from the street to his network in London, Dylan’s geographical mobility had deepened the convivial depth of others. Hence, his contestation of social class and social boundaries generally, stating that everyone can connect irrespective of their background is rooted in his educational trajectory and convivial practices.

Max’s convivial depth is founded on the maintenance of a childhood friendship with Jason, ‘a bit of a hell raiser´ and someone he strongly identifies as working class in relation to his own ‘lower middle-class´ upbringing in London. With a pending visit from this confidant together with another childhood confidant, Max reflects over his cosmopolitan conviviality.

It’s funny, I’ve got Sam and Jason coming next week, and they’re the best of mates, they live together and you know we’ve all known each other since we were four, but they are so different, it’s unbelievable, you know that you tend to find with your older friends because you met them in a period of time, now you tend to be drawn to people who are like you, but of course you are not like you were when you, so I was drawn to people who I was like when I was three, it doesn’t necessarily mean we are going to be similar now, but they are still your best mates, and sometimes it’s, I just find that is a lot more colourful…yeah, so I don’t know how I’m going to entertain them at the same time, they have completely different tastes (Max, 26)

While Hernan within this depth is not comfortable mixing friends from different life stages and contexts, Nacho like Max and other cases in this depth are. However, this mixing is often limited due to the geographical distribution of relations. Whilst at times a potential headache, this mixing provides more colour and depth to conviviality. For as Max points out, friendships founded and maintained since childhood and adolescence, archetypal bonds, are not necessarily and no longer the sort of people he is drawn to or has the opportunity to meet.

In sum, the educational and geographical trajectories of those with national depths, in contrast to that of their friends maintained from childhood and adolescence induces cultural heterogeneity, social distance and hence convivial depth. However, unlike those with shallow depths, this qualitative depth is founded on the continual development and maintenance of
these relationships so that they remain as prominent bonds within their networks, further exemplified by Laura in Box 5.2.

**Box 5.2 Laura’s Biographical Network - `People Lost and Found´**

In Laura’s network we witness the maintenance of bonds with different others over time. Laura has known Steve, her partner of five years and most central figure in her network since partaking together in summer theatre camps during their adolescence. He like his parents is named as working class in relation to Laura’s middle-class background. Within the chapter ‘Hating PE and Loving Britpop’ is a non-heterosexual male companion, who she knows and remains in contact with through her sister. Similar to Iwan’s network before, only family members and friends of her parents remain from childhood.

Prior to moving ‘Into the Sunshine’ of Madrid one year ago, through her work in the UK she developed two female bonds with distinctive social class backgrounds. Through a recent group travel around southern Spain organised by Laura, this dyad is now connected to the outer cluster of new companions named ‘Madrid Fun’. Within this group is Rich, a Brit who she identifies as working class, but who is not named as a companion because he is more a friend
of Steve’s. However, as mentioned in section 4.4.2, the process of drawing circles closer together has proven a source of frustration for Laura, illustrated by her annoyance that her confidant and best friend from university has not yet committed to visit her in Madrid.

Generally, it is not possible to categorically claim that durable relationships with different others within this depth type is clear evidence of boundary transcendence. This I argue is due to these relationships often being founded in propinquity, and more importantly at a time prior to the ontogenetic development “toward the association of homogeneous members from heterogeneous groups.” (Simmel 1964:128) In other words, at the time of relational formation no social/symbolic boundary was seen to exist or existed between the co-actors, even if now in retrospect, objective differences can be identified. From playing together as children, in the case of Max and Jason, or playing theatre at summer camp in the case of Laura and Steve, their collective awareness of social class as a social boundary in terms of their social interactions would have been limited and/or not relevant to their shared activities at the time.

I met a whole load of other people who were just really, really good fun and great compared to the people at my school who I just thought were really quite boring, and I guess they were a mixture between kind of like working class and lower middle class but definitely much more rough and ready /…/ very different upbringings to mine and just a bit more rough around the edges really, which I liked /…/ not posh kids by any means, well the thing was not for posh kids, it wasn’t particularly expensive /…/ although the people who were there were very different from the rest of their people in their school because of their personalities and not necessarily because of their backgrounds (Laura, 31)

Likewise, sexuality does not become cognisant until people are self-aware of the pervasive heteronormativity within their convivial lives, which entails more negotiation for those that come to deviate from this in their sexual orientations.

Ah, well, love is a little difficult, mmm, (pause) how do I tell you (in low voice) well, I am gay and I more or less decided this in the third year at uni, well, when I was in Mallorca the summer before actually /…/ at the beginning of the second year, around that time nothing was concrete, I didn’t have things very clear, you know, but of course for a few years I had my doubts, but during the summer in Mallorca was when I decided and got things more clear /…/ ok there was a lot of time going back and forth in my head, but when I returned for my third year I was able to say from then on, well I could say ‘I’m gay’ /…/ No, I had not spoken to my friends about this before because I did not have it fixed in my head and it’s not something you chat about casually, and because I’d always had doubts, you know I’d been with girls, anyway I told them and they accepted, so when I accepted it I told everyone, because, you know, I’d thought about it but still not sure so I decided I’d wait until I’d been with a guy to make sure, and in Mallorca...(Hernan, 27)
Thus when interpreting biographical networks, some caution should be heeded in directly translating objective attributes recognised in the present as boundaries transcended in the past. People are moving targets in both space and time. This raises some theoretical implications and highlights the strengths of Eriksson’s (2007) interactional framework. Eriksson argues that the value of interaction [friendship], it’s meaning making quality, occurs most often within subjective symmetrical positions than objective symmetrical positions. Whereas in adulthood we may transform ties with colleagues for example into bonds that transcend the workplace, the original context of formation. The maintenance of childhood and adolescent friendships into adulthood involves the incorporation of objective attributes into the subjective relationship. As Laura, Hernan and others with national depths demonstrate, relational continuity, over and above propinquity is dependent on co-actors recognising, negotiating and accepting objective identifications (social class, ethnicity, sexuality, religion, and so forth) over time into the existing relationship. It is within this co-activity, the ability to incorporate objective elements yet maintain interacting predominantly within subjective symmetrical positions that I argue strengthens the quality of the friendship. It is in this co-activity, while to a large degree circumstantial, that national depths differ from shallow depths. For while people may recall significant others from their past which they may recognise as objectively different in the present, some fade into peripheral ties while others remain central bonds. As Laura’s autobiographical title suggests, which is inspired by the significant amount of people she recalls through her narrative, while some people get lost on the way, others are found.

To conclude, it is not longevity in the sense of time that generates relational quality and national depths, but the boundary work accomplished in maintaining friendships. More importantly, for some, the consequences of evolving convivial depth within national boundaries can generate a more open convivial stance, ‘everyone can be down to earth’. Furthermore this outlook generates cosmopolitan conviviality and ‘boundary work’ opportunities for others, as they not only draw their outer concentric circles towards the centre, but they pull their inner circles outwards. Whilst this may prove frustrating and challenging at times, it provides diversity to their life, and it is within these particular networks that social boundaries are transcended and ultimately contested.

5.3.3 International Depths

The remaining eleven cases (eight movers and three non-movers) are representative of a depth where the transcendence of social class and other depths is through transnational mobility and settlement. Whilst this was evident among some cases with national depths, international
depths are dependent primarily on their conviviality beyond national boundaries, hence they have horizons that are either stable or wide.

Two groups emerge with respect to whom and where they transcend other social boundaries. In the first group, The Mobile Self (see Table 5.6), all bar one are movers where their transcendence of social class and other social boundaries is predominantly with other nationals during settlement or travel abroad \((F_n \text{ National SCB E-I index } \geq 0)\). Here their transcendence of nationality coincides with other social boundaries. The second group, The Mobile Other (see Table 5.7) is an array of cases that have transcended social boundaries with predominantly other nationals in their own native context and/or with co-nationals during extended sojourns or settlement abroad \((F_n \text{ National SCB E-I index } \leq 0.2)\). Here the transcendence of other social boundaries is related to other people’s mobility and settlement. The findings here affirm the notion that transnational mobility provides boundary work opportunities for both movers and non-movers alike (RQ2 & RQ3). However on average both groups have more homophily in terms of social class than national depth cases, but significantly less than shallow depth cases.

Common to both groups is the lack of convivial depth prior to further studies and working life. With convivial depth inherently linked to convivial width, the longevity and strength of these relationships are arguably not as profound as those with national depths. However, due to propinquity and co-presence, these relationships tend to be relatively well embedded within their convivial and friendship networks, as in the case of Marta’s network in Box 5.3.

**Box 5.3 Marta’s Biographical Network – Untitled**

All of Marta’s convivial depth coincides with her convivial width, in that all her alters with a different SCB, ethnicity, sexuality and religion within her network are other nationals met since moving to Manchester over a decade ago. During a visit to the city to see her cousin, who was working in Manchester at the time, Marta was persuaded to return and avoid the unstable career entry and trajectory of a public worker teacher in Cataluña. Through her cousin she met her first friends in the city, the majority of who remain significant people in her life. It is within this group that she first engaged regularly with people of another nationality and ethnicity. She names two British male companions with distinctive social class backgrounds, one longstanding from the initial group, Dave, and one recent, Josh, a former student of hers.
Josh because he has his own business, and, yes, I would like say he comes from a very, yes, upper-class, the way that he behaves, I would say a bit posh /…/ Dave is different in the way of talking, he is very Manc, yes, he is very working-class (Marta, 35)

Additionally, through her work as a Spanish teacher at various institutions across the city, she has colleagues of a different ethnicity and sexuality. However, the only confidant she names in Manchester is Bea, a Spanish work colleague. Bea is named as another national as Marta sees herself, her family and friends in Spain as Catalan.

Following her cousin, Marta has enabled and encouraged both her younger brother and half-sister to come and live with her in Manchester to pursue studies, learn English, work and experience living abroad. However, while both have now returned to Cataluña, her half-sister will return to Manchester to start a Master’s Degree. After such a lengthy period of settlement in Manchester, with friends and family from home visiting, and staying, and through Marta taking friends to Cataluña, her network is highly connected. As a result, she has succeeded in drawing her concentric circles closer together, in turn facilitating cosmopolitan conviviality for others. I now return to elaborate on the two groups, The Mobile Self which Marta is an example of, and The Mobile Other.
Group 1 - The Mobile Self

For members of this group, apart from older family friends or former work colleagues named during the life story (ai), and friends of a different sexuality from university (aq), their depths are predominantly through the evolution of their stable or wide horizons in Madrid and Manchester. Here, other nationals embody other depths, predominantly along the dimensions of ethnicity and sexuality. Thus their depth is significantly linked to the socio-cultural heterogeneity of their networks.

Table 5.6 Biographical Distribution & Homophily of International Depth Cases – Group 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Biography ((Cn/Fn))</th>
<th>SCB E-I index</th>
<th>NAT SCB E-I index</th>
<th>Other Depth E-I index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marta (m)</td>
<td>1/1 1/1</td>
<td>-0.76 -0.43</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>3/3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribel (m)</td>
<td>4/2</td>
<td>-0.67 -0.69</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark (w)</td>
<td>11/2 2</td>
<td>-0.37 -0.73</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola (m)</td>
<td>2/2</td>
<td>-0.89 -0.86</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>1/1 1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias (w)</td>
<td>1/1 1/2 1/1 1/2</td>
<td>-0.69 -0.64</td>
<td>0.20 0.20</td>
<td>1/1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus (m)</td>
<td>1/1 1/3</td>
<td>-0.65 -0.80</td>
<td>0.33 0</td>
<td>3/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres (w)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.88 -1</td>
<td>1 n/a</td>
<td>1 4/3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For many movers, the socio-cultural diversity of the local population in Madrid and Manchester was the attraction and reason for their continued settlement in the metropolis. For some cases, other depths evolved through their association with fellow movers not particularly through their association with natives.

well I have not looked for it, no, it just happens, but I suppose I am, I like it, I enjoy meeting people from everywhere if I can, and mmm, I don’t think it’s a conscious decision /…/ I suppose I find, I have more in common than to, with, I don’t know other people. I don’t know, I’ve never thought about that actually, I mean it’s part of the, the, it just a, you happen to meet British people because, because it’s Britain. But at the same time because it is Britain and as Manchester is very multicultural, you got all these other people living here and you got the chance to hanging out with them and learn from other countries like, you got, you will always have time to meet more British people, you know what I mean or more Spanish people in my case, that’s what I think, it’s easy to find, but it’s not like that I’ve got anything personal/…/ It’s not something that I look for or whatever, it not about the tick, it doesn’t make a difference, you meet someone and that’s it…

(Andres, 32)
With ethnicity, age and sexuality transcended in coaction with fellow movers, Andres’ convivial depth as well as his width evolved through association based on the similarity of being a foreigner. And while Andres named British people with a different social class background, like those with shallow depths, they were periphery figures in his network.

Similarly Lola, 23 the only non-mover in this group, named only fellow international students from her exchange studies in the UK, entitled ‘Erasmus: the best year of my life’. The two companions she named with a different social class background were both South American friends from this period. However, she was unaware of their relatively privileged backgrounds well until after her studies in the UK when she visited them and saw their grandiose family homes. I argue that these cases illustrate that while the transcendence of nationality coincides with the crossing of other social boundaries, for some it is through the shared association of being foreigners in the new socio-cultural context. Here, a contextualised homophily is strongly witnessed, as the foreign identification brings previously dissimilar others together.

However, for others like Mark, interaction with his Spanish wife’s existing network of family and friends in Madrid facilitated a more native ‘Learning’ of his new socio-cultural context. Over time and increasing familiarity with his surroundings and his new friends and colleagues, Mark was able to recognise cultural depths.

Raquel’s friends made me feel incredibly welcome, they always, at the beginning they only spoke English with me, because I couldn’t and I didn’t speak any Spanish and that made me feel very welcome, it made me enjoy going out and made not ‘not’ want to go out. Even though it was very tiring… (Mark, 30)

…we had a lot of financial problems, so I perceive people who come from where they have, where they are better off as higher social background purely because of the culture that I was brought up in. So for me, yeah, these people I perceive them as having higher social background than I do purely because of that, not that I can confirm that or that’s its true. (Mark, 30)

In the case of the Spanish movers in Manchester with international depths, prior to living in the UK, like other Spanish movers they had seldom considered social class as a means of social interpretation and categorisation. However, after a period of settlement in Manchester they had familiarised themselves and adopted a British, if somewhat mutated, sentiment towards social class. Like Marta, they could identify Brits they believed epitomised a working or an upper class identity.

However, they did not see social class as a significant boundary for their own interactions, and more interestingly, like Marta they tended to interact across a broader social spectrum within their new national boundaries than the British non-movers in Manchester. The findings from
movers in both settings suggest that as a foreign national, one becomes classless, and as a result the interactional constraints of the social structure are diminished. However, this does not account for why some movers develop international depths and others do not and therefore have shallow depths.

Here, two interrelated factors prove decisive. Firstly, movers’ occupational and housing trajectories in the new cultural context, and secondly, the extent to which they befriend and maintain friendships with native non-movers. First, movers with international depths had more varied occupational and housing trajectories, which had brought them into contact with a greater array of actors in terms of social class and ethnicity. This was particularly apparent among the Spanish in Manchester. For example, Andres had initially cleaned offices in the evening whilst he studied English during the day, before going on to university studies in the city and ultimately working as an IT technician during ‘Life at the Office’. Whereas Marta through waiting on tables, her numerous teaching roles and renting a room out in her flat, had evolved bonds across social boundaries. These experiences are inherently linked to their survival stories in a foreign context and in a second language, which provide a sense of accomplishment. This was particularly evident in the life-story of Matias, who after ‘The England Years Part 1: surviving working part-time and earning the minimum wage’ in restaurant kitchens had gone ‘Back to Madrid’. However, ‘shitty jobs but a great atmosphere’ in Madrid encouraged him and his Spanish partner to return to Manchester to take up secure professional positions that enabled them to start ‘The England Years Part 2: family life’.

The initial relatively weak labour market position of movers within this depth type in both settings was linked to their limited second language skills on arrival. Improving their second language skills was paramount for their labour market opportunities and advancement. Here, native friends prove to be indirectly influential. The initial hospitality extended by natives to movers accelerates their familiarisation with the new socio-cultural context and their language development. It is within this growing familiarity and learning of the cultural and linguistic nuances of the new social context, coupled to their trajectory and exposure to a broader spectrum of actors, that their horizons are broadened and cultural depths are identified.

As opposed to movers with shallow depths, this groups’ settlement in Madrid and Manchester has been less settled, exposing them to more social diversity. While nationality disguises class, enabling movers to progress socially and interact quite freely across the new social structure, educational/occupational backgrounds and language skills on arrival remain decisive in shaping both their working trajectories and networks in the new context. Here initial contacts with natives accelerate movers’ familiarisation, which inevitably enables them to identify
greater depth in terms of the social structure and hence social class. However, even if social diversity encourages a growing awareness and knowledge of the new socio-cultural context, and a source of reflection over one’s own social class background, it does not necessarily signal the transcendence or contestation of social class.

**Group 2 - The Mobile Other**

The degree of depth within this group is similar to that of the first, but the dynamic within this group has some distinct nuances. First, the socio-cultural heterogeneity of Carmen’s and Tayla’s conviviality during their working lives within their native context included bonds with clearly distinctive socio-economic, ethnic and religious backgrounds. Whilst they recognised and identified objective differences within certain relationships, these remain impertinent to the maintenance of these said friendships. Similarly, they both had an inclusive convivial outlook that facilitated further cosmopolitan conviviality for others.

**Table 5.7 Biographical Distribution Homophily of International Depth Cases – Group 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Biography (Cn/Fn)</th>
<th>SCB E-I index</th>
<th>NAT SCB E-I index</th>
<th>Biography (Cn/Fn)</th>
<th>Other Depth E-I index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carmen (w)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-3/2.3</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>-0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn Fn</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.56 -0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel (w)</td>
<td>-0.64</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn Fn</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.50 -0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire (m)</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn Fn</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4/4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.80 -0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayla (w)</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2/2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cn Fn</td>
<td>-0.35</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>-0.75</td>
<td>-0.71</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mobility and subsequent cosmopolitan conviviality of Miguel and Claire based around their studies abroad and leisure activities had facilitated the development of bonds with other SCBs of their own nationality. The interview exchange with Claire below epitomises how social class is understood and performed in relation to others. During the interview in the English Pub where she had met the British [SCB1 & SCB2] and Spanish [SCB3] companions with a different social class background, she is probed further

N. different class in which sense, [SCB1 and SCB2]

C. SCB1 is very working class (whispers as SCB1 is well known in the Pub)

N. Ok and [SCB2]?
C. [SCB2], mmm, middle

N. Ok and you consider yourself?

C. middle

N. Ok, but you said [SCB2] is slightly different to you

C. you're right I did, no, that's because more because of his background rather than where he is now

N. right, ok, and his background is?

C. It's working

N. Ok and [SCB3]?

C. just the same as the others (pause) but you know when you think about it, you think, oh yeah I suppose so, but you know they're friends so I don't think of them any differently

It could be argued that Claire transcends social class as the objective class identifications of mobile others had receded in the face of friendship (RQ4). Her familiarity with both socio-cultural contexts enabled her to identify people of both nationalities with a different social class background. Yet class was not necessarily a significant boundary in the pub context.

   just to come down here, you know, I could walk in and there are plenty of people to come and say hello to, Stephen goes away for work a lot, he goes away for the football a lot, so, I'm happy coming down if there's a match or just coming down for a drink knowing that I'll have someone here (Claire, 34)

Inherently a context of subjective symmetrical interaction, the pub is a place where one escapes the organisational foci and instrumental roles of working life. For Claire and for others it had also facilitated the transcendence of other social boundaries.

Whereas Claire’s network of friends in Madrid were highly connected and centred on life at the pub, Miguel’s friends in Madrid, like Andres’ network in Manchester, were divided into groups on grounds of native/non-native. Miguel’s hospitality to other nationals had in no doubt assisted in their familiarisation to the city and Spain, with many now settled in Madrid and an active social group in his network. Within this group were others like Miguel of a mixed ethnic and socio-cultural background, a similarity which he recognised was the initial mode of connection.

   Even if I’m a mix of distinctive races and cultures, I’ve never really identified myself with either of them, it happens a lot that if I start talking with someone Latino for example, they don’t see me as Latino, and it’s very typical that when I start a conversation with someone Spanish, simply because of my appearance, neither do they consider me Spanish until I’ve spoken to them for a while (Miguel, 32)
Miguel’s experiences illustrate that ethnicity is omnipresent, simply because it is some cases more apparent within social interaction, than say social class and sexuality. However, with the bonds he had maintained since adolescence, ethnicity had been clearly transcended.

In sum, international depths demonstrate the need for, yet complexity of a two dimensional and contextual analysis of cosmopolitan conviviality. These depths illustrate that the ‘cosmos’ provides opportunities for movers and non-movers to transcend and contest social boundaries such as social class, ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality. However, this transcendence is not separate from nationality, but occurs within it, whereby nationality tends to trump other dimensions. In essence, the homogenising effect of nationality facilitates the association of heterogeneous members within national groupings.

Therefore after closer investigation of the biographical distribution of different others, I argue that international depths are more shallow and wide in character than national depths. Yet unlike shallow depths, international depths have demonstrated an openness to develop bonds across the fault lines of class, age, ethnicity and sexuality. For movers this is often a consequence of their weakened labour and housing market position on arrival, more than any conscious willingness to interact with dissimilar others. However, through their migrant trajectories which retrospectively become part of a survival narrative, movers iterate that they have become more open to others generally. This self-acclaimed openness, however, is not automatically accompanied by reflections over the circumstances that have enabled its evolution. Hence, at times they tend to attribute this openness to their inherent personality rather than the environmental conditions of their conviviality.

Overall, looking across the three depth types, there is no doubt that mobility and the attainment of settlement demands biographicity, ‘to associate oneself afresh’ (Alheit 1992:206). With familiarisation, be that with homogenous members from heterogeneous groups within national boundaries (national depths), or heterogeneous members from national groupings (international depths), people gain a greater awareness of their own objective identifications. It is within this greater self-awareness that reflexive contestations of essentialised identities emerge. However, for some, this entails the construction of new symbolic and social boundaries.

5.4 Convivial Boundaries

It has been illustrated under convivial horizons and depths how ‘the elimination of social boundaries [potentially] begins with the deconstruction of symbolic ones’ (Lamont & Aksartova 2002:12). In other words, how engaging with objectively different others had or not
led to the reflexive contestation of essentialised identities. Yet at times within this process symbolic boundaries are constructed, which in turn may ‘translate into [new] social boundaries’ (ibid.). For purposes of clarity and continuity I refer to these as convivial boundaries.

While many participants named people they considered different on grounds of personality, lifestyle and cultural tastes, they tended to be ties and not bonds. Hence there is some evidence to suggest a significant degree of value homophily across the sample in terms of friendship. However the most apparent convivial boundary, as indicated in some of the networks and the narratives, distinguishes between movers and non-movers in terms of their openness and willingness to difference, the convivial boundary of faux-cosmopolitanism.

5.4.1 faux-Cosmopolitanism

This convivial boundary is witnessed in the dynamic between network composition and structure, and for some, in the articulation and construction of difference based on the openness to difference that transpires from transnational mobility. It is a boundary that mirrors Ossewaard’s (2007) society of strangers, where the non-native cosmopolitans and native locals alike become strangers to others and themselves. As such, and in contrast to the approach taken in this study, it represents a closed and exclusive form of cosmopolitanism, a faux-Cosmopolitanism, one that equates mobility directly with cosmopolitanism. Yet it is not exclusive to movers’ networks and narratives, as some non-movers who have been on extended sojourns abroad also identify with and equate mobility directly with a greater personal openness to others and difference per se.

The convivial boundary manifests itself through different means and to different degrees. In its mildest form, it is just a symbolic boundary within people’s networks, where people choose to maintain social distance between their mover friends and non-mover friends. In its strongest form it transpires as a social boundary within people’s narratives, which at times arises in their reasons for naming people they consider different. Here they name alter due to their more closed, less adventurous and nationalistic personalities, which is linked to their more sedentary life-paths. What appear to be decisive factors in shaping whether it remains a symbolic boundary or transpires into a social boundary, are the circumstances behind mobile experiences, those of their own and those of others. In Tayla’s network value homophily prevails, where irrespective of social status she identifies with others in terms of their shared open-mindedness and free spirited outlook on life, which she links to mobility.
But do you know why though, like the people that I’ve met from abroad, tend to be, these people, they all tend to be kind of like open-minded and like free spirited people who just want to have fun and they don’t worry about things, and I’m that kind of person you know what I mean, like, I don’t want to, yeah, you got to worry about things in life and everything else but at the same time, like for example, Anna, she came from like some slum in Brazil and she’s here, and like the way she got here and how she is living her life now it’s just kind of, you know, I really like that kind of attitude and that kind of spirit, well it’s like I don’t care what is going on, I want to do this so I’m going to do it, because life is too short you know what I mean, and I’d say that is what most of these people all have in common (Tayla, 30)

Similarly, Andres’ main intention to move to the UK was to learn English in order to forge a career in filmmaking. With little money and no contacts in the UK, he chose Manchester simply because of the free language classes he had found on the internet offered in the city.

I came here, I wasn’t supposed to feel comfortable anyway, it was a bit of a fight and it was an adventure, you know, it was, you were out in the woods, whatever, you are not supposed to be comfortable, you are just fighting to, you know survive and that was part of the fun/…/ I’ve got the feeling that people here, just for the simple fact for being, not from here, not British people, that could be, people who are not in their own country, they are more open. The very fact of travelling somewhere and seeing other cultures, seeing other people from other places and such just has to open you, open you a bit, and I suppose I find those people more understanding through no fault of their own, these people who stay there are the same people, I suppose whereas I feel it’s easier to change and become something different when you have seen a bit (Andres, 32)

Through their shared experience and circumstances, and ‘no fault [or choice] of their own’, Andres tends to confide in and socialise with fellow non-natives in Manchester. This convivial boundary was less prevalent among other movers. First, those like Mark and Ria, who were married with a native partner, had incorporated elements of their partners’ network with new non-native friends, including compatriots into their own network. Second, those like Jesus and Maribel who had deliberately chosen to co-habit and/or take employment working with natives had a more interconnected network of natives and non-natives within their new socio-cultural context.

With difference and mobility central to their self-perception, not surprisingly, faux-cosmopolitanism manifested itself the strongest within difference junkies’ networks and narratives. Here, their socio-cultural heterogeneous networks are central to their presentation of self as mobile ‘vanguards’ of a cosmopolitan age. However, with shallow depths, or depths entirely evolved through other nationals, they are faux-vanguards of a mobile ideal. Penny distinguishes between one of her oldest school friends (ai) and a new friend Noemi, a former
peripheral classmate, on grounds of their shared openness to difference as a result of their transnational mobility.

…I’ve known her what nineteen twenty years almost, yeah, twenty years, a long time but, last time, she came to see me here she was pretty heavy going coz she was like ‘oh we do it like this, this is disgusting food, we don’t do it this way in France and bah, bah, bah’ and she is just so, because she is from such a small town and travelled so little she, I don’t know, she isn’t as open minded about stuff and she expects things to be her way and if they are not her way, then they are wrong/

…whereas Noemi has actually, that’s why she and I get on because she’s travelled huge amounts, because she’s lived in Sofia, Budapest, and Madrid actually so we got on because we are so different to the rest of our old classmates (Penny, 24)

After one year in Madrid working as an English teacher and in an expat bar, and with no Spanish friends, she expresses the difficulty of meeting Spaniards in contrast to Italians during her year’s studies in Rome - ‘They are not as welcoming as the Italians, the Italians are so lively and so much fun and willing to include you in their social circles and the Spanish are very difficult in that sense’. Yet in her chapter ‘Rome’, only fellow movers remain from this period of cosmopolitan conviviality, highlighting some disparity between her life as told and her life as lived. With reference to the people Penny considered different, international travel and mobility as an esteemed venture and convivial boundary is reaffirmed.

she had no interest in working any further, for A-levels or going to university, she was from, not that, none of this is a bad thing, it’s just different, she was from a mixed race background, working class, lived in a council house/…/I couldn’t understand that the only thing she was interested in was going shopping and going out and getting pissed and, that’s all she, and boys, but she didn’t have any dreams or any ambitions, she didn’t want to travel, she, well she travelled once to Malaga but I don’t really consider that, I don’t know, I, very judgmental of me, but we are just very different/…/these guys would never have the life that I have, neither would Tess, I mean she thinks, these guys think what I do is mad but incredible, and Jane, I mean Jane has, she studied Italian at university and she lived in France and Italy but she is very happy being in Britain and is very much a English girl (Penny, 24)

With its translation into a social boundary, ‘openness’ becomes an implicit means of self-reference, a means of identifying oneself and others. Yet with little sense of irony or self-distance from its construction it represents a strong form of faux-Cosmopolitanism.

5.5 The Cosmopolitan Play – Act II

Building upon the array of actors introduced in Act I, with respect to the transcendence and contestation of nationality, the plot now thickens to incorporate convivial depths and convivial boundaries.
First, it has been established that participants with wide horizons (nationally heterophilious and socio-culturally heterogeneous networks) are more likely to transcend ethnic boundaries, so that the transcendence of nationality can lead to the transcendence of ethnicity. However, ethnicity remains a strong symbolic boundary across the entire cast of actors. Among all the dimensions, people of a different ethnicity were less likely to be embedded within the friendship network. In contrast, while far fewer alter of a different age and sexuality were named, when identified, they tended to be significant and central figures within participants’ lives and networks. Third, religiosity rather than faith was seen as a more significant symbolic boundary. Finally, ethnicity, age and sexuality together with social class were transcended by many not separate of nationality, but occurred within it. Hence indirectly or coincidentally the transcendence of nationality had led to the transcendence of other social boundaries (RQ3).

For three non-movers, the cultural and socially diverse populations within metropolises like Manchester, Madrid and other cities in which they had lived facilitated the possible transcendence of social boundaries such as ethnicity, religion, age and sexuality within their convivial lives. However, as in the case of Tayla and Miguel, non-movers with international depths, these social boundaries were primarily transcended through their relationships with other nationals. Hence the transnational mobility and migration of others had provided opportunities for native selves to perform ‘boundary work’ and reflexively contest essentialised identities (RQ2).

For movers, continued settlement and familiarisation within their new social context enabled them to identify other nationals that they believed came from different social class backgrounds. Yet social class was not seen as pertinent to their relationships, with their national identifications disguising social class within the social interaction position. For the British in Spain, it was the recognition of other nationals coming from either less or more privileged backgrounds than themselves, which had generated a degree of class consciousness, if nothing else. For the Spanish in Britain, their recognition of British nationals with a different social class background was again dependent upon their length of settlement and familiarisation with latent social class boundaries within British society. Thus, they identified people they believed epitomised a working or upper class identity. For movers generally, in Madrid or Manchester, the nature of their circumstances on arrival was decisive in whether or not they developed bonds with others they perceived of a different social class, and of a different ethnicity and sexuality. This is evidenced by the difference between those who evolve international depths, and those who evolve shallow depths.
Finally, one group of actors in the first instance had evolved their convivial depth within their own national boundaries. Here, their boundary work achievement to maintain and incorporate relationships from childhood and adolescence across divergent educational and geographical trajectories had generated social distance and convivial depth, providing more variety to their lives. In a similar scenario to movers with stable or wide horizons, actors with national and international depths stand at the crossroads of social boundaries and have the potential to facilitate further cosmopolitan conviviality and ‘boundary work’ for others.

As witnessed in the networks of Laura (national) and Marta (international), this had entailed mixing relations spanning life chapters and social boundaries with each other. This convivial mixing, while at times a potential headache it provides, in the words of Max, for a more colourful conviviality. However, it is also dependent upon a degree of settlement and the commitment of bonds to visit. Yet through this practice, be it within one’s own national boundaries as in the case of Dylan, or within and across national boundaries as in the case of Max, they act as cosmopolitan translators. In terms of the Stoic’s cosmopolitan ideal discussed in Chapter 2, they both draw in and draw out the concentric circles surrounding them. It is in this drawing together of their concentric circles that essentialised identities are potentially contested and social boundaries are deconstructed, and reflect the evolution of a cosmopolitan stance. Here, by taking a relational or interactionist approach, the study makes a significant contribution to understand how the elimination of social boundaries begins with the deconstruction of symbolic ones (Lamont & Aksartova 2002:12). This may be subtly recognised in the comment made by Dylan that ‘everyone can be down to earth’ or in Carmen’s final chapter title ‘Be all Human’.

However, at times and in contrast to cosmopolitan translators, for some, the co-evolution of their convivial horizons and depths involves the construction of convivial boundaries. One such boundary is faux-Cosmopolitanism, one that equates mobility with cosmopolitanism, and excludes natives and non-movers. It manifests itself in its strongest form in a couple of cases as a presentation of self that is open and hospitable in contrast to closed, unwelcoming and immobile locals. While transcending nationality, they homogenise natives as immobile locals who have ventured little from ‘home’. In essence, they reconstruct the local/cosmopolitan dichotomy, and as result, fit into Ossewaard’s (2007) ‘society of strangers’ theorem.

While the corrosion of knowledge of acquaintance enables cosmopolitans to move successfully through social disorganization and insecurity, their ‘built-in identity crisis’ (Berger et al. 1974:92) enables them to move onwards and accelerates mobility – not only physical, but also social, mental and ethnic mobility. (Ossewaarde 2007:373s)
Yet, by reifying the x axis, they are un-reflexive about their own greater opportunities to engage in mobile practices, and as such are faux-vanguards of an elite form of cosmopolitanism.

That brings us to the end of Act II, which has demonstrated that a two dimensional analysis of cosmopolitan conviviality uncovers mechanisms and contradictions that a one dimensional analysis could not possibly find. In the next chapter, Convivial Paths, the third axis of cosmopolitan conviviality brings to the fore the stories behind the evolution of certain convivial horizons and depths as people make their way from ‘home’ to ‘world’ (Tuan 1996).
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Convivial Paths

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter the biographical and third axis of cosmopolitan conviviality is explored. The discussion focuses on situating the evolution of participants’ convivial horizons and depths within the broader context of their life-paths and stories thereof. Convivial path refers to the contextual details of conviviality during the life path and the consequences this has on the biographical composition, distribution and structure of the network. With temporality introduced to the cosmopolitan debate, participants’ convivial paths from ‘home’ to the ‘world’ are exposed for analysis (Tuan 1996).

The discussion initially centres on the biographical events that potentially promote people to or prevent them from engaging with difference in their lives (RQ5), which consequently influences the convivial horizons, depths and stances they evolve. It has been established in Chapters 4 and 5 that for some, interacting with objectively different others over time led to the reflexive contestation of essentialised identities, while for others it had not. It was established that geographical mobility, not only transnational, but also that within one’s own national borders, and consequent settlement, alongside social mobility can induce cosmopolitan conviviality and reflexive contestations. However, the evidence shows that boundary transcendence alone is insufficient to evolve a cosmopolitan stance, and that it simultaneously may involve the construction of convivial boundaries such as faux-cosmopolitanism.

Therefore, it remains to be explored under which circumstances people construct their life-paths. Or in terms of the biographical network approach, how events and sentiments attached to the initial concentric circles of ‘home’; family, neighbours, peers and so influence people’s conviviality when entering into the wider circles of further studies and working life, when convivial horizons and depths diverge. Under the heading Tracing Convivial Paths distinctive themes that emerged in participants’ life-story narratives illustrate that the ‘world’ is met and interpreted through ‘home’. The findings are discussed in Act III of the Cosmopolitan Play.
6.2 Tracing Convivial Paths

While each participant’s life-path and biographical network is distinctive, some general themes across the sample emerged. Here, the local, the national and the transnational intersect in people’s lives, the negotiation and articulation of which differs in terms of participants’ nationality, gender, ethnicity and life stage. It is within these negotiations, and the subsequent life decisions made that act as decisive factors and where certain chapters act as turning points in the evolution of participants’ convivial paths and hence cosmopolitan conviviality.

Three tiers emerge in relation to participants’ life-paths from ‘home’ to the ‘world’ (Tuan 1996). The first overarching tier relates to the broader national socio-cultural context of ‘home’, the cultural norms surrounding the life-course in Spain and the UK. The second nested tier relates to participant’s family structure and organisation, negotiated and articulated through the first tier. The third tier relates to the wider convivial experiences and sentiments associated with ‘home’ during childhood and adolescence, again articulated in connection to and through the previous two tiers. The three tiers are presented in order.

6.2.1 The Spanish Tether and Anchor Britannia

The form and content of participants’ relationships with their parents, specifically in relation to the self-determination of their own life-paths post adolescence differed significantly between Spanish and British respondents, in particular for women. Here, the life-paths and stories of the Spanish reflect a tether which tends to curtail convivial exploration, while those of the British reflect an anchor that tends to promote convivial exploration. However, while negotiating contrasting socio-cultural logics throughout their life-paths, resulting in distinctive convivial paths, overall the British were no more likely than the Spanish to evolve broader convivial horizons or more profound convivial depths. I now unpack the Spanish and British cases separately before substantive comparisons are made.

Five of the seven Spanish women felt or had felt at some juncture in their biographies a struggle in order to self-determine their life choices in the face of overbearing and overprotective parents. The desire to fulfil their aspirations of work and travel had involved constant renegotiation to gain more slack from a matriarchal tether. This was evidenced at times by a strained and stage managed relationship with their parents, a key reoccurring thread throughout their narratives. On numerous occasions, these Spanish women had deliberately withheld information or reformulated stories to their parents in order to gain approval on life decisions that entailed greater distance between the parties geographically, within and beyond national boundaries, and consequently emotionally.
I applied for a summer fellowship in Madrid to go to a lab, and I got it, actually when I told my mother I applied, I didn’t tell my mum that I was going to apply, I told her when I already applied and she didn’t think, ‘oh, come on, it’s a national competition’, it’s was for pharmacists, biologists, medics, medical doctors and vets, and studies, and students of all of that, so my mother didn’t think that I was going to get it, and I got it, so I had to go to Madrid for the summer (Maribel, 31)

For some, the pursuit of independence still entailed an emotional cost. Reflecting on her first difficult year of music studies in the UK, when she spoke little English, Ria elaborates

I think [this period] had to happen, I’m amazed I survived it in some ways, but I’m also aware that I had a lot of support, not necessarily from my family, I think they were a bit, they didn’t know, my mum was too worried /…/ It was actually brilliant, oh my mum was still worried about when I was coming back, she still is, well she’s a bit better now, it’s been ten years, she might as well, but she used to make absolutely horrible dramas every time I went home and came back here, absolutely awful, still now sometimes, she does, the day before I come back she starts crying and makes me feel, you know, I have so much guilt (Ria, 31)

Similar experiences and sentiments were expressed by Magda and Alicia, both of whom had moved away from their home towns in the north of Spain six and nine years previously to work in the capital.

I remember they had a really tough time letting us go, in Spain it’s called the empty nest syndrome38 /…/ anyway they had a pretty awful time, but at the same time I was made to feel guilty, especially by my mother that we were not there, so that every time she’s on the phone she is either ill or sad or, and she transmits this onto me now, even if it’s not my fault… (Magda, 31)

Only Lola in Madrid, the youngest and unlike the other women, still living at home, confided openly about personal matters with her mother. However, the majority of the Spanish women’s mothers, while identified as important people at the end of the interview, were all added to the sociogram (ai). In contrast, five of the eight Spanish men confided in their mothers and fathers, and while the inherent logic of familial39 belonging was present in their narratives (Van de Velde 2005); unlike for the women, it had been significantly less constraining. The men had been given more slack and distance to roam from the offset, consequently facilitating them greater freedom to explore the ‘cosmos’ – like Hernan’s summers spent in ´Cambridge´, ´Mallorca´ and ´Barcelona´ during his further studies. Yet despite Hernan’s love of metropolises such as London and New York because of their cultural diversity, his conviviality had changed little during his three years in Madrid. Here, he had continued to socialise with university friends that like him had moved to the capital to

---

38 Translation of ‘síndrome del nido vacío’

39 Van de Velde (2005) originally refers to it as a logic of ‘familiar’ belonging, here ‘familial’ is used to more reflect the central presence of the family and the relational dynamics therein within the Spanish narratives
work in Public Relations. Hernan shared a flat with his younger sister, who was at university in Madrid, on the suggestion of their parents. This logic of familial belonging was also evident in the reasons the Spanish gave for naming people they considered different. Here, siblings, cousins and childhood friends who had followed more local and settled life-paths were used as a narrative resource to juxtapose their attempts of unleashing a Spanish tether. For some, it was in discussing such alter that *fatuco*-cosmopolitanism appeared, distinguishing people on grounds of their openness to ‘others’ and experiences of travel.

To summarise, for some, and more so for Spanish women, the desire to experience the ‘cosmos’ had come at some negotiation and emotional cost when trying to unleash themselves from an overprotective parental tether. In contrast, but not as striking as the tether in the Spanish narratives, the British elaborated on their parents encouraging them to explore, travel and fulfil their personal aspirations. This culture of exploration was epitomised in stories of travel, of and with their parents, and for some, stories motivated by the unfilled aspirations of their parents.

I’ve been brought up to do what I want basically, my parents will support me whatever I want to do and have sort of given us the guidance you know, go out into the world and experience things, my mum and my auntie Hillarie both did the Ten Pound Pom thing, and neither of them got there because of blokes, and I refuse to be that person, I’m never going to, ever (Katie, 30)

Here, parents and the wider family constitute an anchor that supports their different drifts and desires. For some, their parents’ mobility was a narrative resource to motivate their own mobility, both inside and beyond their own national borders. This was seen as something that was part of their family logic, in a sense, a logic predisposed to cosmopolitan conviviality.

I think mum and dad, particularly dad wanted to live in a country where it was more about, mmm, living, working to live sorry as opposed to live to work, mmm, and they wanted Emily and I to grow up in an environment where they would never have to worry where we were and we could just go out and play in the square and they wouldn’t have to continually keep an eye on us, and we already had the house in France, was our holiday house, so mum, I think mum was a bit more reluctant because she loved her job but anyway they both moved to France and I think they wanted Emily and I to learn another language as well, so we moved to France and my parents still live there, it’s technically home, it’s all I have ever really have really ever known as home (Penny, 24)

Whereas parents were seldom confided in by the Spanish, the British on the whole openly discussed important issues regarding their career and life-path with their parents, often decisions that entailed an increased geographical distance between them. Yet for the British this had not had a detrimental effect on the relationship, remaining emotionally close to their parents. The few British that did not name their parents as confidants were based in
Manchester and were predominantly women. Whilst at times an oversight, the non-naming of parents was for some due to current familial issues and concerns. On the whole, with parents and their own family not seen as an obstacle to be negotiated in the construction of their life-paths, the British participants’ narratives in contrast to the Spanish tended to be more linearly structured, more coherent, and focused on themselves as the sole protagonist.

I acknowledge that broad national differences in the narratives may be due to second language use and proficiency, that of the respondents and my own. However, the narratives in Spanish, and particularly those of the women tended to be the less linear, less structured and at times less coherent. Yet they dedicated more time to discussing other actors in their stories. It is outside the scope of this study to explore this aspect in more detail, but the data supports the idea that life story narratives are embedded in national social-cultural logics.

While the British narratives mirrored a greater personal freedom than the Spanish to construct their life-paths, this was done under variable family logics and financial circumstances. From Penny and Robert who had both attended fee paying schools, and Claire and Katie with fathers that helped finance the purchase of their houses, to the likes of Mark who had stayed at home to work throughout college and university to financially assist his mother. The findings support previous research, that whilst the rhetoric of independence, choice and self-determination is symbolic of young British narratives, their lives as lived differed considerably in terms of the economic, social and cultural resources they could rely on and employ during their biographies (teRiele 2004, Thomson et al. 2002).

Like the Spanish, the vast majority of British identified themselves as coming from middle-class backgrounds. However, the considerable variation in the resources that they could draw upon from their families can be explained with the help of Bottero’s (2004) argument that social class is understood in relation to one’s family relations and one’s associates. Hence, while anchor Britannia may promote cosmopolitan conviviality, the anchor is socially situated, shaping the parameters of that conviviality. In contrast, a familial logic was more decisive in shaping the parameters of cosmopolitan conviviality for the Spanish, diminishing the variation between these cases life-paths. Yet this logic also conceals to some extent inequalities in economic, social and cultural resources that young Spaniards can draw on during their transitions, and arguably are more dependent upon than their British counterparts (Van de Velde 2005, Walther 2006).40

40 With such a small sample it is not possible to relate the variation in life-paths to broader structural socio-economic inequalities in Spain and the UK
C. That year I decided to go to study English, but in A Coruña where I have family living, that way my parents like ‘oh she’s with the family nice’ and that…

N. So you were always kind of negotiating what do I want to do and how do I fit it into my family?

C. Yeah, I always, because you know you are with your family and they pay you, and you, and you don’t have the chance to say I want to work, because in Spain it’s impossible to work with sixteen years old (Carmen, 26)

However, with less familial negotiation, this does not mean that the British experience the transition into working life as less troublesome. Here, and unlike many Spanish, they expect and/or are expected to leave the family home for university, and after concluding their studies they are quickly encouraged to establish a working identity. Therefore anchor Britannia, wherever situated can also generate considerable strain, yet is also likely to encourage some young Brits to take mobility as an alternative route to further their careers and fulfil the expectation of economic independence.

In summary, while the logic of familial belonging was perceived as more of a constraint by Spanish women than men, the logic of individual emancipation was equally experienced by British women and men. The Spanish narratives, irrespective of variable family resources, were more concerned with negotiating greater freedoms from their parents. Whereas the British narratives, irrespective of opportunities that had clearly materialised due to family resources, were more individualised and stressed external factors beyond the family that participants as the main protagonist had overcome. However, with more barriers to negotiate, the acquisition of more personal freedoms was a source of significant reflection for some of the Spanish cases with regards to engaging in cosmopolitan conviviality. Carmen, through working with young people in Malaga and Manchester is able to compare the different logics surrounding youth transitions in Spain and the UK. The greater freedom that British youth have to explore the cosmos she believes results in their earlier maturity,

In Spain, this kind of style we don’t have yet, and your father and your mum have to stay there and support and you have to give explanations, if you fail, you have to say why you fail, and if you extra or plus or maximum, it’s like ‘oh congratulations’, you know what I mean, so it’s totally different and so when I’d been that summer in Coruña studying English, was, was like, living with a Chinese, Italian, German, Martina one of my best friends, Martina, a Holland girl and I. It was the best experience in my life when I was living with them because every day was different (laughing), every day, it’s like the Chinese with different feelings, the Chinese with twenty-eight years, never seen the sea, the Chinese is suddenly is crying and it’s like ‘no, I’m happy’, or like that, or the Chinese smokes marijuana and what happens suddenly /…/ so these kinds of things, made me realise that all these people have been coming from other countries, coming from other places, and I think it’s cultural, I think they have been living like that in their countries, and suddenly coming
to Spain and it’s a shock for them as well, and a shock for me (laughing) /…/ it was a month and after that, (sighs) I come back to Castile de Leon and living the same (Carmen, 26)

The national socio-cultural norms surrounding the life-path in Spain and the UK, as embodied in family relations, were influential in shaping the parameters and social conditions of participants’ convivial paths and the articulation thereof (the life as told). However, with regards to the how these contrasting logics shape cosmopolitan conviviality and the subsequent evolution of certain convivial horizons and depths (the life as lived) further analysis of the narratives and the networks is required.

Therefore I turn to the second conceptual pair which relates to biographical experiences that cut across nationality and gender, and which provide more of an indication to how convivial paths shape certain types of convivial horizons and depths.

6.2.2 Socialised Diplomacy and Settled States

The structure and organisation of participants’ families during their upbringing had a significant influence on their lives as lived and on their lives as told. For purposes of clarity, I elaborate first on cases that experienced difference and uncertainty at home due to family disjuncture or tension, the negotiation of which I term socialised diplomacy. Thereafter I discuss cases that grew up in more stable and settled families, where, for some these settled states had shielded them from difference and uncertainty.

It was clear in the initial stages of some participants’ life stories that they had contended with strained and at times turbulent parental relationships and/or parental divorce in their childhood and adolescence, while for others it came later in discussion. For example with Lola, her family situation arose accidently when the discussion moved onto her return to Madrid and her parental home in the chapter ‘Post Erasmus Period and Graduation’.

N. has there been any change in your relationship with your parents or your brother?

L. the relationship between my parents kind of split up, it’s kind of a strange thing, OK, they live together, but they don’t live as a couple anymore, they get on well, but, I don’t know, it was progressively from I don’t know since I was in high school until the second year of university it was clear that they were not good together, like, I don’t know, they just don’t have common things to do, for example my mum loves going to the countryside of having walks for three of five days and my father likes staying in at home /…/ when she was younger, she did a lot of things and I don’t know she was more like a mad hatter\textsuperscript{41} (laughter), and that’s why maybe I don’t mind telling her more things than my father, I have a good relationship with my father but not in that sense, like I wouldn’t tell him for example ‘you remember that time’ /…/ a reason coz they didn’t

\textsuperscript{41} Translation of ‘cabraloca’
separate physically, because my mum was thinking about going to another house to live, it was because, well firstly of money, we don’t have that amount of money that we can just hire another flat, because it’s quite expensive in Madrid, and also because of my brother, coz he’s now nineteen, ok, he now has a reasonable age but when they were thinking about that he was still in the transition of going on to the high school, a problematic age and my mum wanted to be with him all of the time, so they thought it was the best for both of us, it hasn’t been like a secret at all, but I, I don’t know, maybe I think it was coz we were realising of it progressively

N. OK, so there was never a conversation?

L. Once, it was a conversation that my mum had with us coz she got angry with my father and it was like ‘I’m thinking of getting the divorce’ and I was like ‘What!’ (Lola, 23)

Lola, like others who had experienced and were still negotiating disjointed family states tended to be more thoughtful of the circumstances and more forgiving in the frailties of their parents and others. The experience of living with or between feuding or separated parents, and dealing with the convivial consequences of this had socialised them to be more diplomatic in their convivial stance. Like Lola in the passage above and Max in the passage below, they display socialised diplomacy, able to relay and reflect on circumstances that politely respect the position of all the parties concerned.

So mum moved up the road, she didn’t move away to god knows where /…/ you know they ended up being a lot better parents as divorced people than they were as a couple I would say, for me it worked out well, for my mum it did not work out very well and she got quite depressed, mmm, although the whole custody issue was taken care of quite amicably, I think she found it difficult for me to be away sort of half of the time, because I spent half between the two and I think she suffered a bit for that and I probably was a bit too young, well either too young or too insensitive to sort of really perceive that properly until I was older, mmm, which I didn’t really feel any guilt about at the time but then later I sort of felt I probably could have been a bit nicer to her about that, because I didn’t really, because when you are a kid it’s all about you isn’t it, and you tend not to notice that people around you are also hurting (Max, 26)

The divorce of parents in childhood was encapsulated in the chapter titles of three cases, from simply ‘The Divorce of My Parents’ by Marta, to ‘Nobody said it was Easy’ by Nacho and ‘That’s Bullshit’ by Max, referring to an expression he recalls his mother using in one of countless arguments she had with his father in their small London flat prior to their eventual divorce when Max was eight. In a further six cases, participants elaborated on unsettled or turbulent relationships between their parents, which in some cases had culminated in separation and divorce when participants were in their teens. Overall, the experience of living with feuding parents, and/or constantly negotiating two separate family units post-separation had influenced their primary socialisation and their convivial stance. They generally were more
accepting of uncertainty, and at times showed an attraction to unfamiliarity, so that they could practice their diplomacy.

The convivial consequence of divorce was mirrored in their networks, with two separate family groups identified around each parent, with now weak ties between them. Here, one parent tended to be more acquainted with people in the network, and were more likely to be a confidant or especially close. This was the case for Marta, who while somewhat freed from a weakened familial tether, had found socialised diplomacy at times problematic and suffocating, which in retrospect was why she ventured further away from ‘home’. In doing so she had evolved a wide convivial horizon and an international depth (see Box 5.3).

I remember, I didn’t like to live in Barcelona, I don’t know why, maybe because it was the period of time I just studied there and you have to live with your parents, and my step-mother at the same time, it was not very easy, so when I moved here it was like great because I could work, I could study and it was like a freedom, independency, you could do anything and you were responsible for yourself, yeah, I liked that, yes, I don’t know, I think here it’s easy, I would say to breathe. In Spain it’s, I don’t know, I didn’t like it, maybe because it was that period of time, 23 I think, or 24, mmm, and of course I think I’ve changed, yes, I don’t know, more, here you have more opportunity to meet people, different people, like, completely different cultures, yeah, in Spain its more homogeneous, everybody is more or less the same, everyone looks the same… (Marta, 35)

Here, like fellow Spanish movers with international depths, Marta referred to cosmopolitan conviviality as a justification for her decision to follow her cousin to Manchester. I argue socialised diplomacy, together with the weakening of a familial logic for the Spanish, had predisposed these cases to be open, willing and less restricted to explore and engage with difference. Thus their family disjuncture had not only equipped them cognitively to evolve a greater sensibility towards others, but had also eased the circumstances through which it could materialise.

However, the majority of the sample had experienced more stable childhoods and adolescences, with many going on to transcend social boundaries. Therefore whilst parental divorce and subsequent socialised diplomacy may promote an openness and at times a willingness to engage with difference, a stable family life during childhood and adolescence does not necessarily deter it. I now turn my attention to a group of cases that come from settled family states.

On the whole, and in contrast to most cases with socialised diplomacy, the narrative emphasis was on issues within latter stages of their life story, with life up until then, including further studies, elaborated on briefly as a trouble free and happy period of their lives. For some cases,
a memorably fun and contented childhood and adolescence was juxtaposed to more trying and unsettled chapters in early adulthood, linked to problems with establishing themselves in the labour market and the dissolution of intimate relationships, as encapsulated in juxtaposed chapter titles. I return to Claire’s English pub and Magda’s flat in Madrid to illustrate two settled states.

For Claire, ‘The Good Life’ throughout her childhood and up until university studies is followed by her need to find a job in ‘Time to Grow Up?’. Thereafter ‘When’s the best time to move on?’ relates to what, now looking back, she sees as the inevitable dissolution of a seven year co-habiting relationship that spanned most of her twenties. ‘Back to Square One’ is when she eventually moved on, culminating in her selling her house and returning to live with her parents. After one year living at home, ‘Love lost on the Doorstep’ is when Claire reunites through a mutual school friend with her high school sweetheart, who after numerous years working in Latin America is now a corporate executive and fluent in Spanish, and whom she followed to Madrid. The last four years in Madrid she argues has increased her self-confidence to engage with difference. However, Claire’s final chapter title ‘What Now?’ relates to her growing doubts about if, and when, this particular love story and fateful moment will have the happy ending she desires.

C. I’d love to be settled down, and get married, kids, and you know going back

N. and do that here [in Madrid] as well?

C. Yeah, oh yeah, yeah but I would have liked for it to have happened already and going back to this Facebook thing again, you see all the people that I knew and they’re on their second or third [baby] or like Angela she’s on her third

N. Half their photo albums with babies

C. Yeah, yeah, I’m thinking, not fair, it should be my time

With her life-path not taking the trajectory she had particularly envisaged, the title of Claire’s autobiography ‘It’s not what they said on the Tin’ captures coherently the provisional nature of her life story. Yet, and in contrast to cases with a socialised diplomacy, Claire’s life story title is founded on the proviso of a settled state. Like others, and similar to Matias’ desire to return to Spain since the birth of his son (see section 4.4.2), Claire would like to replicate her own settled family state in Madrid.

Magda likewise, apart from briefly in her chapters ‘My Sick Grandma’ and ‘My Adolescent Sister’, recollected on a trouble free and enjoyable upbringing in Northern Spain. After finding ‘Love’ with a fellow medic student at her hometown university, her following chapters
entail ‘The Effort’, ‘The Independence’ and ‘The Patience’ during an elongated and at times tiring transition to ‘Working Life’ as a Doctor in ‘Madrid’. Yet now after six years living apart from her boyfriend, who, like her mother, she talks with daily and meets at least once a month, they together currently prioritise travelling and ‘Meeting the World’. While the narrative structure of their life stories is similar, Claire’s and Magda’s different career choices and relationship experiences have shaped distinctive convivial horizons and depths. In respect to their convivial paths, up and until further studies, there is little diversity within their networks. Yet with Claire following her rekindled love to Madrid, she has broadened her convivial horizon (stable), simultaneously deepening her depth (international), more than Magda (faint & shallow). However, more secure in her career, and in the future of her relationship, Magda is provisionally more secure than Claire in her life path that is moving naturally from ‘home’ to ‘world’ (Tuan 1996).

Notably, a similar narrative structure was prevalent among other cases from settled states and of a similar age and life stage. However, they diverged like the examples above between faint and stable horizons, and not wide horizons. They tended also to be in committed and/or conjugal relationships, unlike those with wide horizons. I turn to this latter group in the third tier. Therefore, while opportunities through studies, work, associates and chance encounters had resulted in mobility and the greater transcendence and contestation of social boundaries, like others, generally, the replication of a settled state was their achieved or desired destination.

Still, while this desire for replicating a settled state appears linked with partnership and one’s life stage, it does not fully account for why some participants with stable or wide horizons had narratives that were more fluid with a provisional approach towards the future. Hence, whilst they came from settled family states, this was not juxtaposed to more problematic adulthoods, and its replication in adulthood was not of the first priority. Their outlook was closer to socialised diplomacy, in that they were more familiar with and accepting of uncertainty in adulthood. This brings us to the third conceptual pair, which relates to participants’ experiences and sentiments surrounding the wider contexts of ‘home’.

6.2.3 The Misfits and the Conformists

Among some of the cases, we find a shared and common reflection within their life story of never particularly fitting in among their peers at school, or, due to family mobility never staying long enough at one school to maintain friendships. While the outcome of these experiences in terms of their cosmopolitan conviviality and outlook are similar, the dynamics within their convivial paths differ. First, I outline these two groups of misfits before
unpacking a group referred to as the conformists, some of which, while having had settled states and secure employment trajectories, had willingly transcended social boundaries.

Five of the six British women and Dylan, narrated in their life stories a sense of being out of place, of not fitting in at school, their neighbourhood or provincial town during their childhood and adolescence. For some, this also involved them having been bullied, verbally and for Dylan, physically. These sentiments were captured in chapter titles that ranged from the indicative ‘When will it end? – The early school years’ and ‘Tears’ to the less apparent ‘Hating PE and loving Britpop’ and ‘Quite Contrary’.

K. It was a hideous time, not, certainly not the most favourite time of my life

N. But you were OK when you came home from school?

K. I was quite a solitary child, I did, you know we did used to go out and play out on the street with our friends, but, mmm, but I practiced the piano probably six hours a day and read lots of books, so that’s kind of what I did when I was a kid, I preferred the company of adults, I didn’t like children of my own age because they weren’t very nice, mmm, and they were some really nasty girls in my school and of course with it being a really small town, you went through your school life with them, and it wasn’t until the age of sixteen that I moved schools and I moved county, mmm, and you know, I got the bus to school instead of walking up the hill sort of thing, and that was a lot better, I joined a youth theatre at the age of fifteen from the other high school, mmm, became a lot more confident and when I was sixteen I transferred on the basis that their drama department was much better /…/ I know nobody from school, not one person (Katie, 30)

Similarly Lola in Madrid recollects a difficult period when starting high school after her family moved to a new neighbourhood on the outskirts of the city.

L. I don’t know if it was by chance or not but I had a lot of problematic people in my class, so I was a little bit bullied, I don’t know how to say it

N. Bullied

L. Yes bullied

N. Any reason why?

L. Maybe because I was weak, like,

N. You were an easy target?

L. Exactly, yes, because I didn’t defend myself, I was a bit shy, I was the new one and I didn’t have friends and most of them knew each other from the other school, so I was an easy target, like you say, but in the, I was at a point a little bit depressed even, like I didn’t want to go to school, I was having a bad time at the beginning until I got a couple of friends who supported me…(Lola, 23)
While bullying had left a significant mark on misfits’ convivial paths, it had a varied impact on their convivial stances. Whereas for Katie and Penny it had resulted in a hospitable but simultaneously cautious convivial stance, others had a less cautious stance as exemplified by Dylan when starting university (see section 5.3.2) and Lola when commenting on the resolution of the bullying towards the end of her first year at high school, “At the end you have to handle it, sooner or later, you have to react, at the beginning I didn’t”.

Not surprisingly, leaving home or school for university studies came as a welcome opportunity to discover one’s self and hopefully meet more like minded people. Yet while the likes of Dylan and Lola found themselves at university, adding convivial depth in the process, Laura’s expectations of the British university experience were not fulfilled.

It was so mainstream, it was as mainstream as my school I felt, and the people who weren’t mainstream were hippies, and posh hippies and I’ve never had, I really don’t, I like, that’s why I struggled with the class thing because, I’m not posh in the sense of posh, posh, I’ve just, I’m just privileged, but you know white people with dreadlocks and kind of, you know, I couldn’t, I couldn’t get in with them, I couldn’t feel comfortable with them /…/ I think I wanted to get away, maybe I should have gone to London or Cambridge, I didn’t want to go to Cambridge because it was full of posh kids, and I wanted to go somewhere that was northern and proper, but in the end it was full of really posh people who wanted to go somewhere northern and proper (laughter), so that was that…(Laura, 31)42

Three Spanish women Ria, Carmen, and Maribel in Manchester recollected feelings of wanting to see more of life than was on offer in their small provincial towns in Spain. In retrospect they believed that they were destined to leave. Yet, here, their narrative is framed around negotiating the Spanish tether. Carmen for example, who was persuaded by her parents to choose a ‘productive degree’ at a university in the nearest city where her older sister was living, reflects over a period she titles ‘Living in the city BUT under control’

So I finished in three years, I finished because it’s like my parents wanted that, I’ve done it, so it’s like I got a degree, so with that it’s something, and with that as well I can work and my parents are happy and ‘my daughter is degree in labour law’, so it’s something, and then it’s like, ok, I will do it, but now I realise like I not been myself in those three years, I’d not been myself, I always wanted to do things I got here (points to sociogram) but I could not find out (Carmen, 26)

Therefore, whilst British and Spanish cases expressed similar sentiments about not fitting in, they were articulated and given meaning through a particular socio-cultural logic. Ironically, a contradiction arises here between the logic of individual emancipation and the logic of familial belonging. Through negotiating a tangible opposition, in reference to their parents and their

42 It should here be noted, that my own British accent is northern, and Laura asked me where I originated from
mobility, which encouraged self-awareness, these Spanish misfits were more reflexive over the logic of familial belonging. Whereas the British misfits, without a clear and tangible opposition, were less reflexive with regards the logic of individual emancipation.

However, while the life as told is provisional\textsuperscript{43}, we find commonality in terms of the life as lived within misfits’ networks. Their shared sense of not fitting in is evidenced in the lack of confidants, companions or especially close people from chapters pertaining to their childhood, adolescence and for some, further studies. Fortunately, for some, alternative avenues of sociality based on their interests outside of school and their neighbourhood had provided sanctuaries during their adolescence. For Katie and Laura, this was drama and theatre, whereas for Ria and Maribel, it had been music school. In these contexts they had established and maintained durable bonds (as exemplified by Laura in Box 5.2). Generally, misfits have top-heavy friendship networks, where bonds established during working life complement the few bonds prior to and including further studies. As a result their educational and occupational trajectories and workplaces inside and/or outside their national boundaries tend to determine their convivial horizons and depths.

A similar biographical distribution is witnessed in the friendship networks of Adrian and Nacho but for a different reason. Here, frequent mobility and family relocation due to their father’s and step-father’s careers respectively, epitomised in Adrian’s ‘Keep on Moving’ and Nacho’s ‘Express Adaptation’, had prevented them from maintaining school friends from childhood and adolescence. Adrian and Nacho, increasingly and constantly aware that they could or would be moving on sooner rather than later, and hence abandoning friends, adapted their behaviour accordingly. However, as Adrian had two younger brothers to share the ordeal of moving with, both of which he named as confidants, the experience of mobility was more disheartening for Nacho.

When you get older, you start liking going out and you realise you like this and then you have to move, and it’s like oh shit, I don’t want to go somewhere else now, I’ve got my friends, they’re cool, you meet girls, you got a girlfriend, you are only fourteen, it’s nothing, but you think it’s the most important thing in the world (Nacho, 25)

Their oldest bonds, apart from family, were established in the latter stages of their secondary schooling, at an age when they started socialising outside of school. Now becoming more independent of their parents, they could maintain interaction in co-absence through

\textsuperscript{43} Again, it should be noted that their accounts were constructed in a specific socio-cultural context, with a British interviewer, and in English. Therefore the British cases could assume a cultural similarity with their interviewer, whereas the Spanish cases could not to the same degree. The Spanish were made aware, when necessary that I could converse in Spanish and had previously resided in Spain.
telephone, internet and travel. Hence, they again felt safe to invest time in establishing friendships. It is these bonds that Adrian now refers to as his ‘direct friends’ and Nacho as his ‘true friends’. Whilst other participants had relocated during their schooling, the consequences were less obvious than they had been for these two particular misfits.

While the first group of misfits felt that they never particularly fitted in at school, their home neighbourhood or town, and were destined to leave, Adrian and Nacho were denied the opportunity to completely fit in, aware that they were always destined to leave. Hence from an early age, misfits were either familiar with being unfamiliar, or familiar with unfamiliarity. While having distinctive convivial paths, they all share the experience of regularly being posited as the ‘other’ in social interaction throughout their childhood and adolescence.

Within this tier differences in the convivial paths of participants and their siblings also emerge. Hence while family logics and structures are shared, some participants elaborated on the dissimilar convivial paths of their siblings. For Adrian, his younger brother had more longstanding friendships from adolescence due to the family settling earlier in his education. Similarly, Maribel named her sister as someone she considered different because of her more stable life-path, and while both had been misfits in school, her sister had returned home after further studies and established stable friendships. Penny, who moved to France at the age of five with her family, had struggled throughout her schooling to fit in. Tired of the ‘Tears’, at thirteen, her parents found her a boarding school in England to attend. Whereas her younger sister by two years had stayed in France throughout her schooling, who according to Penny was more popular due to her sporting prowess, and the greater encouragement of sports than art and literature in the village school. What these few examples illustrate is that the complementarity of the biographical and network approach portrays a more nuanced picture of the dynamics behind people’s convivial paths that shape convivial horizons and depths.

These misfit experiences, along with for some, the dissolution of romantic relationships in later life, had made them sensitive to other misfits, loners, jilted partners or people outside of their familiar context. This materialised through providing hospitality to other contextual misfits. However, unlike Katie’s case as discussed in section 4.4.2, spontaneous hospitality did not always crystalize into durable friendships within their networks, as in the case of Penny.

(pointing to the sociogram) he, actually it’s funny I went to go and see him in Malaysia, and it actually drove him mad, he was, he made a very amusing comment when I was out there, an observation when I was out there, apparently I pick up all the strays, I'll will just talk to anyone and make friends with anyone. I was standing and waiting for him in Kuala Lumpur, it was late and I ended up talking to this girl and going off somewhere and I was like ‘why doesn’t she come with us’ and
he was like ‘Penny you’re here to see me!’ he doesn’t like picking up people. I wanted to stay in a hostel when we went somewhere and he was like ‘No we’ll stay in a hotel’, but in a hostel we’ll meet people and we can go travelling with people and have new experiences and I’m open to that. (Penny, 24)

However, while these misfits were prone to be inclusive in their convivial stance, evolving broader horizons and deeper depths, there were at times, as discussed in Chapter 5, convivial boundaries to this inclusivity. Hospitality towards outsiders was found to varying degrees across the sample, but for misfits, it was linked to their earlier experiences of not fitting in, or of continually trying to fit in.

Other participants like Brad and Robert had also provided hospitality to socio-cultural outsiders, and similar to the misfits had a relatively provisional outlook towards their future. However, the dynamic behind their hospitality was based on their more secure and linear trajectory throughout schooling into employment. They are conformists, in the sense that unlike misfits, they had not felt out of place during their childhood and adolescence. Conformists generally have a more even biographical distribution of bonds, with their current conviviality spread across different groups from distinctive biographical eras and contexts. For some non-mover conformists, a high level of propinquity, with the majority of their network contained within the same geographical region enables and generates greater connectivity. The cohesive structure of Brad’s and Robert’s network for example is mirrored by a coherent life story narrative, with chapters seamlessly overlapping into each other. Furthermore, through them achieving a smooth transition from education into their chosen careers, coupled with recent house purchases, they fulfil and conform and hence do not contest the logic of individual emancipation. Hence, while attracted by the notion of transnational mobility, they reflect more over what they would have to sacrifice to experience this, and instead prioritise experiencing the ‘cosmos’ like Magda and her partner through travel.

In sum, while misfits and conformists have diverging convivial paths and narrative structures, some share a flexible and provisional stance towards future plans. Whether this was starting a family with their partners, as in the case of Adrian and Ria, their careers for Laura and Brad, or future mobility plans for Katie, they were contingent on what they accepted as fluctuating circumstances, many of which were considered outside of their own control.

A. In general the moving around, I don’t really have a negative memories of any of that, I’ve never had

---

44 Unless already discussed during the interview, interviewees were asked under final questions if they had welcomed or helped alter on their sociogram integrate into the city (i.e. provided hospitality). While some had, others discussed instances concerning people not on their sociogram to answer the question
N. Would you do that if you had children yourself?

A. Because this is all confidential, my girlfriend’s cousin, she has two cousins living in Madrid, one of them we have recently discovered is three months pregnant, which by all accounts is great news, my girlfriend’s always had the position that she is not really interested in kids, she claims, though she coos like a pigeon when she sees a baby in public

N. Your girlfriend is Italian?

A. Yes, and she, like within two days of us hearing this news when she first found out I thought someone had died in the family because

N. She was upset?

A. Not upset, but like we use Skype to talk with our families and she was talking with her mum, and she found out via her mum but all of this was in Italian, and my Italian is worse than my Spanish, so, err, I just got this weird body language, I was like, something bad has happened, turns out not, but she was preoccupied about this for a few days and then spontaneously said she wants to have children now, more recently she has changed her mind again, but I think basically what she says here is pretty much irrelevant. I know she likes the concept but she also has problems with concept, and so she flip-flops, but she is very jealous of her cousin in a way (Adrian, 35)

However, irrespective of relational status, sexuality or age, some misfits’ and conformists’ future plans were primarily concerned with fulfilling personal ambitions, and while they may have come from settled states, as yet, it was not their prime concern in life to return there. The findings from this chapter are now summarised and placed in relation to previous research on young adults’ transitions and narratives in the third act of the cosmopolitan play.

6.3 The Cosmopolitan Play – Act III

It has been illustrated that socio-cultural norms surrounding family life in Spain and the UK, together with family structures and relationships were influential in shaping participants’ life-paths, the articulation thereof, and their opportunities to develop cosmopolitan conviviality. Second, socialised diplomacy as a result of parental conflict and divorce, had conditioned some to accept and engage with difference and uncertainty, and for some, eased the conditions through which they could engage with the cosmos. While for others from settled states, cosmopolitan conviviality was more by accident either through their career choices or romantic encounters, with some of these wanting to return to a settled family state.

It was also shown that feeling out of place, of not fitting in among peers at school and in the local neighbourhood had not only encouraged mobility, but also empathy for, and hospitality towards dissimilar others in later life. Similarly, family mobility and subsequently always being the new kid in school meant some could identify more easily with unfamiliar others. Misfits’
experiences had proved to be an ordeal at times, reflected in their top-heavy friendship networks. However, some conformists, like misfits and those with a socialised diplomacy, had a more contingent and provisional approach towards the future. These three interconnected tiers shaped participant’s convivial paths. In the next chapter it is shown how convivial paths interplay with convivial horizons and depths to evolve distinctive convivial spheres.

However, prior to this, I briefly discuss the findings on convivial paths in relation to previous research on young adults’ transitions and narratives. First, in relation to the study of narrative forms, the three tiers emerge in distinctive ways and combinations. Yet what is quite common across the sample is the use of interactional moments, be they moments of crisis, struggle, discovery, or simply the rekindling of an old love, to entitle chapters in their lives. Here, the BSI procedure allowed participants to structure their story and their presentation of ‘self’ prior to the interview with the use of chapter titles that encapsulated either ‘fateful’ (Giddens 1991:113) or ‘critical’ (Thomson et al. 2002:351) moments in their lives. Yet the initial open structure of the interview enabled participants to go beyond an objective presentation of self, and I, armed with the life as lived on the sociogram in the final part of the interview could probe and explore further these and other turning points in their stories in relation to their convivial paths. Through this probing, some moments were reemphasised and took on more narrative significance, while others were re-evaluated and diminished in significance, providing participants with opportunities for further self-reflection and contestation. It was in these moments of affirming and contesting the significance of events within their life story, that participants’ convivial stance emerged more clearly. In essence, the BSI was able to uncover the analytical space between the life as lived and the life as told, to see how significant ‘fateful’ and ‘critical’ moments are within the larger project of self (Holland & Thomson 2009).

Second, the life story narratives in major part support Van de Velde’s (2005) typifications of British and Spanish youth transitions, the distinction between the logic of individual emancipation and the logic of a ‘familiar’ belonging, and the socio-structural regimes in which they are negotiated (Walther 2006). Yet the narratives and the networks illustrate that under certain circumstances, these logics, whilst rigid, are questioned and challenged, and mutated through mobility. This was evident among numerous Spanish women’s narratives, and to a lesser extent, a few Spanish men’s. Here, among the Spanish movers we find cases that resemble what Holdsworth (2005) has termed ‘rule breakers’, young Spanish adults who forge convivial paths that involve the creation and maintenance of geographical and emotional distance from their parents. However, while some loosen themselves from the Spanish tether, their British counterparts struggle to question the self-evident logic of individual emancipation
within anchor Britannia. Here, mobility and subsequent settlement coupled with a conjugal relationship with another national appears pivotal to the development of a more reflexive stance towards these contrasting logics and intercultural sociality in general. As exemplified by Ria in Manchester, and Adrian and Mark in Madrid, who through living with foreign partners for an extensive period of time, had negotiated contrasting cultural and linguistic repertoires. In her chapter ‘Meeting Phil’, Ria looks back on the beginning of her relationship with her British husband.

R. I didn’t know where that was going to go, and now I realise we that had to go through lots of barriers, you know, language barriers, and

N. So your English at this time was getting OK?

R. It was getting better, yeah, good enough to meet somebody in England and start a relationship with, but there was a lot of cultural things you know, now I realise that we had, when we started going out and after the honeymoon period was over, I realised we had lots of arguments, little silly arguments and many times I didn’t understand what these arguments were, and now I look back, and I know why, my English was very limited, so if I had to say something, I would normally choose the few words I had and they sometimes can seem really direct, so he would be like ‘What!’ and, you know, and again he’s English you know, and I find, and now even more than ever, the more I’m here, I realise many people, you know to go from here to here, they go through here and through here to get there, they are not necessarily very direct, it’s the politeness, sort of, so with him he had to get over the fact that just because I decided to go straight it’s not because I’m nasty, it’s just has to be because I had no other way to say, and also because why should you go through the Pyrenees and then up into France when you can go straight on the motorway, so, it took a bit of adjusting, let’s put it that way

At the same time, while the British cases were often the sole protagonist in their emancipatory story, they were also more likely to name their parents as confidants, those they were especially close to, and occasionally as companions. The findings support Holdsworth’s (2004:910) argument against assuming that the family, while taking “a greater responsibility for the welfare of family members [juxtaposed to the state] /…/ is somehow more important in the south than the north of Europe.” The importance of the family among the British was evidenced in participants’ use of parents’ experiences to substantiate their own mobility and future aspirations. However, while the Spanish tether and anchor Britannia have contrasting logics, one restraining and the other encouraging individual emancipation and mobility, overall, and as will be demonstrated in the next chapter, the convivial spheres of the British and Spanish cases did not differ significantly. Here, the three tiers and the mechanisms within intersect to expose people to or prevent them from difference, and contribute to shape the stance that they take towards others in the present.
The findings from the biographies studied also add empirical weight to an argument forwarded by Adrian Favell (2008) on contemporary European mobility that those people less prone to take advantage of free mobility inside Europe’s border are middle class young adults whose transitions from education into employment are more secure inside national boundaries. Those young adults that successfully, although often unconsciously, conform to the socio-cultural logic surrounding the life-path within their respective transition regime (Walther 2006, Van de Velde 2005).

With regards to the networks and the distribution of ties and bonds across the biography, we witness different convivial paths in relation to the three tiers presented. As mentioned in Chapter 3, the biographical network approach cannot map participants’ entire personal networks at different stages of life, yet neither does it have any ambition to. Instead it unpacks how personal networks are temporally distributed and constructed, and how narratives are relational. And it is here that clear differences emerge in relation to certain mechanisms during childhood and adolescence around socio-cultural logics pertaining to the life path and issues such as the divorce, feelings of not fitting in among peers and family mobility. The methodological approach developed shows clearly how networks “reflect and go with socialisation” and how “their history and dynamics contribute to their present structure” (Bidart & Lavenu 2005:359). This is now illustrated further and in greater detail in the next chapter, Convivial Spheres, where the three axes of cosmopolitan conviviality intersect to generate four broad but distinctive convivial stances within the cosmopolitan play.
7

Convivial Spheres

7.1 Introduction

In this chapter, the findings along each axis are drawn together to present four distinctive Convivial Spheres. The four spheres emerge from the intersection of convivial horizons, depths and paths. To illustrate each sphere, specific cases are used and compared. It is argued that people’s convivial spheres, like their networks and life-stories are provisional, and hence in constant evolution. However, a biographical network approach increases the exposure on cosmopolitan conviviality, and with this, each case’s movement in time and space is brought into focus. Convivial spheres thus capture the temporal and spatial elements of participants’ convivial stance. The findings are summarised in the Epilogue of the Cosmopolitan Play.

7.2 Four Convivial Spheres

Through the intersection of each axis of cosmopolitan conviviality, x, y and z, four broad yet distinctive convivial spheres emerge: national, metropolitan, trans-national and cosmopolitan. Here, the balance increasingly shifts from convivial stances that are predominantly national to predominantly cosmopolitan. With the second (depths) and third (paths) axes of cosmopolitan conviviality introduced to the cultural cosmopolitan debate, the actors as moving targets in time and space come into greater focus. With this focus, it is possible to locate each case within one of the four broad but distinct spheres. However, as the spheres incorporate the temporal, the framework also allows for some overlap between the spheres. Each sphere is presented and illustrated with two case studies and their respective network visualisations which use the same legend as presented in Box 5.1 in section 5.3.1. The Tables 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4 provide an overview of the cases in each sphere in terms of their respective attributes, conviviality and convivial path.

7.2.1 National Spheres

Five non-movers (three Spanish and two British) are representative of a convivial sphere whereby their sense of self remains predominantly attached to their regional and/or national affiliations and convivial path. They originate from settled states and conform to fulfilling their professional aspirations within their own national and linguistic boundaries, which at
times, has involved some mobility and cosmopolitan conviviality. Here, people of a different nationality, social class background, ethnicity, age and sexuality tend to be peripheral and fading figures named from their past and/or recent associates, some of which have become close companions as seen in their horizons and depths in Table 7.1 below.

**Table 7.1 National Sphere Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES(^{45})</th>
<th>CONVIVIALITY</th>
<th>CONVIVIAL PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alicia</td>
<td>Age 35</td>
<td>Settlement 9 years</td>
<td>Language YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magda</td>
<td>Age 31</td>
<td>Settlement 6 years</td>
<td>Language NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iwan</td>
<td>Age 35</td>
<td>Settlement 9 years</td>
<td>Language NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robyn</td>
<td>Age 33</td>
<td>Settlement 4 years</td>
<td>Language NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hernan</td>
<td>Age 27</td>
<td>Settlement 3 years</td>
<td>Language YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As national spheres, the socio-cultural differences between British and Spanish convivial paths are more evident within this sphere than any of the other three spheres. Here, within their networks, the Spanish tend to have a greater distribution of bonds across their biography, i.e. more evenly spread friendships networks, while the British tend to have top-heavy convivial and friendship networks. Yet, overall, their convivial spheres are stable and well established, often involving a committed or conjugal relationship and/or former partners. Additionally, there is little indication that they will move out of this sphere and develop broader horizons as they are content and settled within it. This also applies to the Spanish cases that could, if so desired, broaden their horizons due to their greater second language skills. Yet it is in the differing socio-cultural logics surrounding the convivial path, particularly for females, coupled with the differing biographical distribution of their friendship networks that the national qualities of their spheres become more evident, as now exemplified by two cases.

**Two Northern Souls**

While both Alicia and Robyn identify strongly with their original home regions in the north of Spain and England respectively, the way they use these identifications differ significantly and

---

\(^{45}\) ‘Settlement’ refers to length of residence in Madrid/Manchester, ‘Language’ refers to fluency or not in a second language and under ‘Relational Status’ PARTNER refers to a committed relationship as opposed to DATING which refers to a new relationship

\(^{46}\) ‘Boundary’ refers to whether they AFFIRM or contest social boundaries within their narratives, or NEITHER. Those who contest social boundaries, either as TRANSLATORs, bridging people across social boundaries, or they construct *faux*-cosmopolitanism in their network (*faux*-SYM) or in their narratives (*faux*-SOCIAL)
reflect contrasting logics surrounding the life-path in each country. Alicia’s idyllic start to her life story, briskly described in ‘Summers with my Grandparents’, ‘High School: new love, new friends’ and ‘A lovely time of my life: university’, including her Erasmus year in Italy (see section 4.4.1), comes to an end on completion of her Master’s degree at her home city university. Here, Alicia reflects on the convivial difficulties she had with the predominantly older colleagues on the Master’s course.

A. and also the people in [home city] generally are not that easy to get on with, very hard, they are very, very closed, therefore in [home city]

N. Yes, is this a reputation for the area or your opinion?

A. No it’s pretty accepted, you know in Spain, yeah, that the people of [home city] and the people of Castile de Leon generally are good loyal friends when one knows them, very noble, but they are not very open when you first meet them. They are not people who are particularly welcoming, there is no, ‘come on let’s take a drink’, nothing, therefore a year that did not give me much /…/
The people are very closed, yes, maybe ‘how are you?’ but nothing more, it’s not easy, I’ve got lots of good friends in [home city] but that’s because I’ve lived there, they are friends of many years, but to arrive there new is difficult, and even more if you arrive in a situation with older people who have a children and are in a totally different stage of life...

In contrast, Robyn recollected school as tiresome, cliquey and restrictive, “I was quite glad when I didn’t have to do it anymore/…/like an hour in school can ruin your life”. Similar to other misfits, Robyn had found refuge in an alternative context during her adolescence, a night club where she tended to socialise with slightly older teens. Though Robyn moved south for further studies, these were in the north of England and unlike Alicia she had a positive opinion on northern conviviality within her national sphere.

I’ve never really particularly gone with things that identify me apart from when I worked in Suffolk for a couple of months, of all the things that identify me, you know, my age, my gender, my sexuality, my ethnicity whatever, it’s like I’m Northern and I only discovered that from being down there, and just people talk differently, like people don’t just have a crack on with you in the pub coz I would go for a pint after work by myself and I could do that here and have a conversation, I think you can do that in the North and end up having a conversation with someone, it’s a lot harder down there

Here, convivial comparisons tend to primarily be with others within their own national boundaries. However, through her work context, Alicia affirms a symbolic boundary between Spanish and Brits based on emotional warmth and openness (see section 4.4.1). Yet like others within this sphere, mobility inside and outside their national boundaries as young adults had provided a source of reflection and self-awareness with regards to who they were and were not. Hence, in national spheres, conviviality is understood more in relation to the
heterogeneity within national boundaries, than particular differences between nationalities. Another common feature within Alicia’s and Robyn’s life-stories is the prominence of and entitling of chapters to a former committed relationship, the residual effects of which were prevalent in their networks, which are visualised in Figure 7.1 and 7.2.

Figure 7.1 Alicia’s Biographical Network – ‘I have it very clear’

‘Ivan’ and ‘Post Ivan: life goes on’ were turning chapters in Alicia’s life, and even though she still has contact with Ivan, he was not initially named. She has recently moved in with her new partner (New bf), who is acquainted with her main group of friends she has maintained from college and university in her ‘Home City’. While she has confidants, like Pilar, and companions in the city from working life, after nine years living in the city, Alicia still does not consider Madrid as ‘home’.

…I don’t like Madrid, no, because I think it is a little dehumanising, you know, everyone running around on their way to work, sleeping on the metro and talking to no one, you end up going out

---

47 Translation of ‘Lo tengo muy claro’
when you are tired, ok, you take a beer then you have to get somewhere else and then get home which is on the other side of town...

With her confidant Bea, who also works in Madrid, Alicia travels ‘home’ regularly to visit her parents in the inner ring and to socialise with friends. As yet, she has no fixed plans to return north, but feels that ‘balance has arrived’ again in (W2) after her break up with Ivan and as a result she is ‘very clear’ over who are the important people in her life. Similarly, in ‘Happiness and Contentment’ (W2), post ‘Nick’, Robyn reflects on her changing philosophy on life from one where she sought happiness to one where she now seeks contentment.

**Figure 7.2 Robyn’s Biographical Network - ‘Angel of the North East’**

While both identify with their ‘home’ region, unlike Alicia, Robyn enjoys living in her adopted city of Manchester. Robyn’s conviviality is concentrated within her final two concentric circles in Figure 7.2 pertaining to her working life in the north of England.

Similar to Alicia, Robyn prefers to confide in her sister rather than in her parents and other family members within the inner childhood ring. She maintains close relationships in West Yorkshire from her studies, yet her network unlike Alicia’s is top-heavy, with the majority of
her companions met during her four years in Manchester. Robyn realised post break up with Nick that much of her conviviality had been through him, so to achieve some distance she developed friends at the pub through John (a friend of Nick’s), at work and through the internet. She is now content, but she would like to replicate a settled state with someone. With little contact with old friends from the night club, and with her parents retired and living in France, she tends to only visit the North East around family festivities. Yet in regards to her autobiographical title, she recalls a conversation with someone she met through work.

He said ‘I think it’s a great place to be from’ and I was a bit offended because I’d only just left, but I think I quite agree with him. I like being the different one in a group, like if I was at home, I’d be just the same as anyone else, but here my accent it’s different and it just means that people have conversations with you, it’s an interesting thing in [work], like I’ll say to a group of lads ‘right we about to start’ and you can do anything you want, I would have to work harder if I was at home.

In sum, each case illustrates the contrasting paths and biographical structures of national spheres in Spain and the UK. More importantly they demonstrate that difference is contextual and relational, whereby one can be posited as the ‘other’ in social interaction within national boundaries, and that this can be something one is attracted to and utilises knowingly.

7.2.2 Metropolitan Spheres

Six non-movers and four movers (six British and four Spanish) are representative of a sphere that is founded on cosmopolitan conviviality in the metropolis. They tend to have lived in more than one metropolis, and value spontaneous conviviality; they are able to and enjoy comparing and contrasting cities in terms of cosmopolitan conviviality.

…they were talking about the fact you can’t get cards, greeting cards in Madrid, you can in Barcelona, people go to Barcelona and they change it, because they say ‘oh you can’t buy greeting cards’ and they open up [a shop], people come to Madrid, and they just completely assimilate into the city and then they moan about the fact that they can’t buy greeting cards, but they don’t do anything about it coz they’re so, because they kind of accept the extremeness of Madrid, so I think if you just let yourself go with it, it accepts you, in a way a lot of cities don’t really, it’s not like London where you can just be who you want to be and do what you want to do because they’re are not that many different ways of doing stuff [here], everyone kind of does the same thing no matter what their politics or clothes or wealth is…(Laura, 31)

While they have distinctive convivial paths, the Spanish tend to come from settled states and be conformists, while the Brits tend to be misfits with weak second language skills (see Table 7.2). On average they are younger and have broader horizons than national spheres, which for difference junkies is paramount to their sense of self. Overall, they are socially active and
intentionally seek out cosmopolitan conviviality in the metropolis, and thus tend to have top-heavy convivial networks. Yet the Spanish as conformists, with happy recollections of childhood and adolescence, tend to have maintained more relationships from this period.

**Table 7.2 Metropolitan Sphere Cases**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>CONVIVIALITY</th>
<th>CONVIVIAL PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Settlement</td>
<td>Language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dylan</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>From City</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katie</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayla</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>From City</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lola</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>From City</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miguel</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>From City</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jesus</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Dating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gasper</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While some are cosmopolitan translators, bridging alter across social boundaries and biographical chapters, others tend to construct *faux*-cosmopolitanism in their networks and also in their articulation of difference. This cosmopolitan boundary is either a deliberate convivial strategy or more due to organisational and contextual factors; as in the case of Lola’s students’ residence during her Erasmus studies in the UK. However, while *faux*-vanguards mistake mobility for cosmopolitanism, they all, to varying degrees equate a metropolitan lifestyle with cosmopolitanism. However, and as exemplified by Dylan (see section 4.4.1 and 5.3.2), who by studying and working in London, the metropolis was a rich resource of reflexive contestation along both the x and y axis. The sphere is now exemplified below using two common yet distinct cases, Miguel from Madrid and Tayla from Manchester.

**Two Mixed Souls**

While Miguel reflected on his mixed cultural and ethnic background in relation to his conviviality (see section 5.3.3), Tayla was less reflexive regarding the mixture of logics within her convivial path. Tayla’s misfit struggles against an Afro-Caribbean familial logic, similar to the one experienced by Spanish females, was negotiated and articulated within a British logic of individual emancipation.
…my brother and sisters are alright, it’s more my parents and my extended family kind of, for example when I got my job, my so called middle-class job, and everything else [in London], I think that some people in my family kind of thought ‘oh she thinks she’s better than us’ which is ridiculous, you know what I mean /…/ The point was, I was an adult, I wasn’t living in Manchester so I didn’t feel like I had to constantly be saying what I was doing or where I was going /…/ it’s because like once university finished people kind of assume you are going to come back home and going to be around and do this, that and the other, whereas to me it’s like, well no, obviously I am not going to be here, I’m going to go and live my life now (Tayla, 30)

Tayla identified herself strongly as working class (see section 5.2.1), yet her social mobility through her educational achievements and subsequent career in London had generated some distance between her and her family and childhood friends. Like some Spanish, she named siblings as people she considered different due to their conformist life-paths, one of whom was married and a mother, juxtaposed to her single metropolitan lifestyle. Yet her two sisters and Suzanna, her oldest school friend, remain her oldest and closest confidants in Figure 7.3.

**Figure 7.3 Tayla’s Biographical Network - ‘Inside Out’**
Since recently returning to Manchester, bonds like ‘Mish’, ‘The girls’, ‘The Bahamian Artists’, ‘The Marieds’ and a few former work colleagues are now in co-absence. Yet spontaneous in her conviviality she has already welcomed some ‘New Imports’ to her home city. With her return, she now feels comfortable that she can present herself as she would like to be seen by others, hence her autobiographical title ‘Inside Out’.

Her alter post adolescence tend to be of a different ethnicity/sexuality and nationality, or of a different nationality, but with a similar Afro-Caribbean ethnicity. However, she sees them all as “open-minded and like free spirited people who just want to have fun” and who like herself “don’t worry about things” too much (see section 5.4.1). Tayla’s faux-cosmopolitanism emerged with her reflections on her constructed sociogram, yet with her seeing all her friends as open-minded there is no visual evidence of a cosmopolitan boundary within her biographical network. Whereas in Miguel’s biographical network in Figure 7.4 entitled ‘Intercultural and Interdisciplinary’, his faux-cosmopolitanism is more evident.

**Figure 7.4 Miguel’s Biographical Network - ‘Intercultural and Interdisciplinary’**

---

48 In correspondence prior to the interview Miguel was keen to know more details about the interview, in response I referred to the information sheet and briefly explained the three stage format of the interview.
Here, due to a deliberate convivial strategy to socialise with movers aside from his native school, university and work friends (see section 4.4.3 & 5.3.3), apart from his girlfriend, only weak ties span biographical circles and social boundaries. Hence while Miguel interacts across a wide horizon containing international depths, ironically he does not facilitate further cosmopolitan conviviality within his home metropolis.

While Miguel’s best friends (BF1 & BF2) had met some of his intercambio friends, including his current Spanish girlfriend, he had maintained convivial distance between his friendship groups. Miguel confessed that his girlfriend was attracted to Latinos, yet personally, he felt neither totally Spanish nor Latino. Since his summer in the US, and similar to Tayla, through his conviviality in the metropolis, he had found other mixed souls of a different nationality with whom to socialise, confide in and fit in with.

Miguel and Tayla, like others within this sphere feel at ‘home’ in the metropolis, and are likely to remain for the near future within a metropolitan sphere. However, this does not mean they will remain in the same metropolis, with Penny at interview planning her next move to Istanbul, and Katie her move to Vancouver.

Whether the other three movers will remain within this sphere is less conclusive. First, as Jesus explained in section 4.4.3, his settlement and future in Manchester was contingent on his current job, having stayed longer in the city than he had initially intended. Yet his long term plan was to return to Spain, his more outdoor lifestyle associated with the better weather, and probably a more national convivial sphere. Less likely to stay within a metropolitan sphere are Gasper and Laura, who as evidenced in their reflections in section 4.4.2 in regards to managing co-present and co-absent relations are currently undergoing and negotiating the transition from a metropolitan to a trans-national sphere.

### 7.2.3 Trans-National Spheres

Seven movers and two non-movers (five Spanish and four British) are representative of a sphere which is founded on transnational mobility and consequent settlement. The movers had lived at least three years in either Madrid or Manchester and had transited to a trans-national sphere from a national sphere via a metropolitan sphere. The two non-movers, Brad and Luis, due to their competent second language skills, developed prior to and during their extended sojourns abroad had developed bonds inside and outside their national boundaries with other nationals. Hence, they had evolved trans-national spheres from ‘home’.
Overall, in line with their horizons, they have stable (even if wide) convivial spheres that span at least two nations. While the British movers are convinced they will stay in Spain, Matias is less convinced of a settled British state and wishes to replicate a settled Spanish state for his son (see section 4.4.2). Yet while the logic of familiar belonging had strengthened for Matias with the formation of his own family, the other Spanish movers were less convinced of a return to a ‘home’ where they felt they had not particularly fitted in. Through negotiating cultural differences at some point in their everyday lives, cases within this sphere have transcended and reflexively contested nationality. Hence they demonstrate cosmopolitan traits, however, some show a tendency for faux-cosmopolitanism within their networks. This may be as a result of an unconscious convivial strategy as in the case of Andres and Brad, or in Adrian’s case, due to his English working environment and lack of second language skills, which were closely linked.

Table 7.3 Trans-National Sphere Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>CONVIVIALITY</th>
<th>CONVIVIAL PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Marta</td>
<td>Age 3 years YES Single Stable Shallow faux-SYM Anchor Settled Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Luis</td>
<td>From City YES Single Stable Shallow Translator Weak Tether Settled Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Adrian</td>
<td>3 years NO Partner Stable Shallow Translator Anchor Settled Misfit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Claire</td>
<td>4 years YES Partner Stable International Translator Anchor Settled Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Mark</td>
<td>5 years YES Married + Stable International Translator Anchor Diplomacy Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Ria</td>
<td>6 years YES Married Stable Shallow Translator Strong Tether Settled Misfit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Andres</td>
<td>6 years YES Single Stable International faux-SYM Weak Tether Settled Misfit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matias</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Matias</td>
<td>7 years YES Married + Stable International Translator Weak Tether Settled Conform</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Marta</td>
<td>11 years YES Single Stable International Translator Weak Tether Diplomacy Misfit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Having established durable bonds outside of their own national boundaries, if the movers were to return ‘home’, their spheres would remain trans-national due to their stable horizons, with ties established between alter from different national contexts. However, with movers’ international depths originating from their mobility, it is possible that a return ‘home’ would entail a more shallow convivial depth, similar to that of Brad’s and Luis’. This sphere is exemplified by Mark and Luis, who have similar stances from distinctive experiences.

---

49 MARRIED+ refers to being married and having started a family
Two Romantic Souls

Mark’s and Luis’ trans-national spheres had evolved due to their working environments, and romantic encounters within them. They both discussed, yet to different lengths, their enjoyable childhoods and adolescences in Britain and Spain respectively. So while Luis encapsulated this entire period in ‘The Happy Years Part 1’, Mark elaborated on escapades and companionship with his ‘best mates’ (see Figure 7.5) in ‘Growing’, ‘Smoking and Drinking’ and ‘Nelson-ing’. Nelson refers to the English language school he worked for throughout his teens up until ‘Moving’ to Madrid. It was here that Raquel, a Spanish student, walked into Mark’s life one day in ‘The Meeting’. They overcame their initial shyness and became a couple and started ‘Sharing’ their life together, with Raquel finding work teaching Spanish. This continued until Mark recollects one grey, wet and cold British winter’s evening, when returning home from work, he found Raquel in the dark crying on the bed. Raquel in conversation reflects on this event, Mark’s turning point for them ‘Deciding’ to move to Madrid,

…the really thought that I was like really bad, and it was like, I just, the thing is, I just couldn’t see myself, I mean my aunt, my mum’s sister, she moved to England, she married there, she had twins and then I mean my uncle, he died a couple of years ago, but, the, the point was, I just could see that she was on her own and I just couldn’t see myself like that

With the break-up a few years previous to this evening of Mark’s parents after longstanding financial problems, which had entailed Mark working part-time throughout university to help his mum financially, the rationale for their move to Madrid fitted both a British emancipatory logic and Raquel’s Spanish familial logic.

…at the time we decided I was twenty-four, and it was like well if I don’t do it now, I’m probably never going to do it you know, and there was nothing, there was nothing I could, I couldn’t, I couldn’t go any further at Nelsons, there was no where I was going to make any more money, there was no way else I could get promoted, there was no way we were going to be able to afford a house, and Raquel really missed Madrid. (Mark, 30)

Prior to the move, Mark had lived, worked and studied in the same town his entire life. Therefore since meeting Raquel and living five years in Madrid, Mark had moved from a national to a trans-national sphere, via a brief fun-packed sojourn in a metropolitan sphere (see Mark’s quote in section 5.3.3). Now married and ‘Creating’ a daughter, and with Raquel pregnant again, his final chapter and long-term future involves ‘Nurturing’, and the centrality of his family in his life is mirrored in Figure 7.5. Together, he and Raquel have created a settled family state with the help of Raquel’s family, who own the flat they moved into
on arrival and still live in. Mark defines the move as to Madrid as an emigration, which sheds some light on his comment at the start of the interview.\(^{50}\)

\[\ldots\text{the main thing is that from my point of view is that it feels like a different life... here, but the people that I remember most clearly were from when I was growing up. (Mark, 30)}\]

**Figure 7.5 Mark’s Biographical Network – ‘Big Wide World’**

Luis, now thirty-three, motivated his return to his home town and parental home four years previously after various working sojourns inside and outside of Spain to him missing his ‘people’, a group of bonds from his neighbourhood and school, together with his mum and his sister, the latter who he confides in about most things. The ‘Happy Years Part 1’, growing up with no responsibilities in a working class satellite town in the municipality of Madrid was juxtaposed to ‘Trying to become an adult’, where after various jobs and ‘Still looking for maturity’, he decided to study tourism at the National University of Distance Education\(^{52}\). On

\(^{50}\) Photos of their leaving party from England are pointed out in the living room of their flat, where the interview took place. Here also are a few pictures and pieces of furniture that they had shipped from the UK

\(^{51}\) This is the visualisation of Figure 3.2

\(^{52}\) The Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia (UNED) - Spain’s equivalent the UK’s Open University
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completion after two years of study, aged twenty-three he embarked on ‘The Happy Years Part 2’. Here, through working tourist seasons in France and Mallorca, with brief returns home, he had a lot of fun working, living and socialising with people from many different places – “working but with a feeling of holiday” – improving on and becoming fluent in French in the process.

**Figure 7.6 Luis’ Biographical Network – Untitled**

However, and similar to other male movers within this sphere, when probed on why there are no alter identified from this period he explains that he is not particularly good at maintaining friendships in co-absence. Yet whilst out of sight, former colleagues and friends were not completely out of mind.

…but what I want to say, is that they formed a part of my life, and if later I don’t see them again, you know it’s not because I didn’t want to, I didn’t, but because now my life is here, OK everything was great during that time we had together, but if you don’t have a relation for a while with someone you have shared something very strong during a certain period, well later, it’s not the same /../it’s just part of my life that I enjoyed a lot and I happened to share with them (Luis, 33)
During this period he also met Elisabet, whom he followed to her home city of Barcelona. Yet it was on their break-up a year later that Luis decided to go ‘Back to Basics’ and return home to his ‘people’ (see Figure 7.6). At interview, and now for two years working at a global IT call centre, with many native and foreign employees, he enjoys the cosmopolitan conviviality in Spanish, French and English that his position facilitates and which he is accustomed to. With now new and old friends connected across his convivial path, a secure job, and living with his parents, Luis confesses to now living ‘The Easy Life’. Yet when probed on his next possible chapter title, he comments

L. I don’t know, I would like to meet a woman, to make a life with someone, something more stable

N. Here in Madrid or?

L. Well, to start with yes, but if I had to move, yeah, well fine if I love her, then it wouldn’t be a problem, if possible here yes, but otherwise, not a problem. For example with Elisabet she wanted us to go to Italy together, but I was wary, I couldn’t because I was scared of what could be and I didn’t want to make that compromise, I was scared of being totally dependent on one person and I couldn’t depend totally on one person, and, so anyway, like I said, everything has a purpose, because now, in retrospect, yes, if I look back from the perspective right now, I would say ‘why didn’t I go?’, if I love her and if everything was fine between us

N. You did love her?

L. Yeah, so, if this happens again yes, but if I meet someone in Madrid, then no (Luis, 33)

In contrast to Mark, who missed his ‘best mates’ but had created a settled state, Luis wished for a settled state but had his ‘people’ around him. Yet like others within a trans-national sphere (see Marta’s biographical network in Box 5.3), as cosmopolitan translators, both Mark and Luis had connected people across national boundaries and their convivial paths. In doing so, they had come to realise that difference is more subjective than objective.

…everyone is different, I mean, the one of the things that I’m, from my experience with the language school is and working within [global IT company] is that you really do realise that everyone is different, and everyone has a different perception of the same information, so, to say who is different is very difficult because it is very difficult to point out how, everyone, how people are the same more than anything /…/probably the easier question is who’s similar? (Mark, 30)

When probed on meeting natives, Mark mentioned that he had initially found Spanish people at work quite insular. Yet after recently being promoted to Team Manager, he found his new Iberian team, of which Luis was a member, more convivial than he had expected. Mark was adamant however to accredit the ease with which he related to his team to Raquel, her family and friends, through whom had come his knowledge of Spanish culture.
7.2.4 Cosmopolitan Spheres

Three movers and one non-mover (three Spanish and one British) are representative of a sphere which is founded on the transcendence and reflexive contestation of social boundaries in co-presence and co-absence. What distinguishes these cases from those with a metropolitan and a trans-national sphere is that not only have they moved and settled numerous times within and beyond their own national boundaries, but that they have also performed boundary work outside the confines and contexts of the metropolis.

I think it takes a while to know how to live somewhere new and integrate yourself immediately, it takes practice to do that, and I think my first two goes at it, well I didn’t really do that very well. I made friends at the end of that year in Newcastle, I made some real friends after about 10 months/…/ For me it took me a while to sort of, there is an art to it I think, living away from your sort of, you know comfort zone and your circle of friends, sort of meeting people and making a life for yourself that you enjoy, I think you know, this is the fourth time I’ve done it and I think this time I’ve really to manage to get it. It’s taken me that long to know how to integrate myself and I think now I’d truly say that I’m truly comfortable and I’m truly happy (Max, 26)

While their current conviviality was centred on Madrid or Manchester, they had maintained relations in co-absence with others either of a different nationality, social class background, ethnicity, age and sexuality from the numerous places along their convivial paths.

In my case, I think to go to Malaga, it’s like another country, comparative with the north, it was like another country, because I’d been, I can show you photos where there is only me Spanish and twenty guiries54 around me, and it’s so funny, because all my friends are like ‘look at you, you are the foreigner for us’, and then it’s so nice because you can travel and see your friends and it’s like, phew, and it’s really good relations, no it’s like friends just appear, no, no, no, it’s friends like, we are and then, for example with some of them I’ve been getting a relation, like a relationship, but more than that, so in Malaga started everything more or less (Carmen, 26)

Table 7.4 Cosmopolitan Sphere Cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>CONVIVIALITY</th>
<th>CONVIVIAL PATH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nacho</td>
<td>Age 25</td>
<td>Settlement 3.5 years</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carmen</td>
<td>Age 26</td>
<td>Settlement 2 years</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max</td>
<td>Age 26</td>
<td>Settlement 2 years</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribel</td>
<td>Age 31</td>
<td>Settlement 3 years</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

53 Max’s second go at it was in a town in Cataluña as elaborated on in section 4.5
54 ‘guiry’ - Spanish slang to indicate foreigners or tourists, generally from the north
Their hospitality to others is linked to their experiences of mobility, socialised diplomacy or misfit sensibilities. Unlike trans-nationals, they envisage future mobility, either intentionally to see more of the ‘world’ (DJs), or inevitability due to their careers (CHs). This makes them appreciate and accentuate the value of co-presence, making them highly convivial souls.

While currently leading spontaneous metropolitan lifestyles, they do not conflate the city with cosmopolitanism, having negated strong nationalistic sentiments outside of the metropolis (see Max’s quote in 4.4). Mobility has made them aware of the fragility of relations and the effort necessary to maintain bonds across time and space. Yet while they contest social boundaries, symbolic boundaries remain present in their networks. This is not a conscious decision, like Max’s surprise to recognise that all his alter were Caucasian. Instead it reiterates that educational and occupational trajectories remain decisive in shaping the pool of available ties people encounter. Therefore, while these cases have transcended their own nationality, class, ethnicity and gender within their convivial paths, these same social categories remain decisive in structuring the parameters of their cosmopolitan conviviality.

**Two Convivial Souls**

While having very distinctive circumstances throughout their life-paths, both Nacho’s and Maribel’s convivial spheres clearly indicate that they are willing and open to engage with the ‘other’, having received and provided hospitality within cosmopolitan conviviality. Through these experiences they had come to transcend and reflexively contest essentialised identities.

The consequences of Nacho’s parents’ divorce when he was five years of age, and the numerous relocations during his childhood and adolescence due to his step-father’s job had produced a convivial stance quite distinctive from many of the other Spanish cases.

> Usually when you are a kid, you got your friends and you grow up together, and that’s great right, but I didn’t have that chance, so I had to learn to deal with different people, even different culture because in Alicante it’s not like, it’s quite different because in small towns they speak Catalan, and my family are not Catalan speakers… (Nacho, 25)

While mobility had proved to be an ordeal at times for Nacho, it had exposed him to difference from an early age. Nacho was the only Spanish case not to have siblings. Yet unlike many of his compatriots he confided with his mother and step-father on a broader range of issues, from relationships to travel plans and future aspirations. More similar to the British, Nacho had experienced his family, while disjointed, more as an anchor than a tether. This is also mirrored in the strong logic of individual emancipation within his narrative, as epitomised
in his chapter ‘This cage is too small - May you open the gate?’ which refers to his desire to escape his province during his university studies.

Your friends are the ones you had when you’re fourteen and like, you’re growing slightly different with the things you like, the music you like, things you are interested in are different. You’ve still got a good relationship, and another thing is that you are not linked because of your tastes or something, it’s more like we are friends and we have always been friends, we are always going to be friends /…/ but when you are getting older, you try to find people who are similar or with similar tastes or something/…/and in Alicante, you can meet many people, but in the end it is not a big city/…/so in the end I wanted to get out and then after doing badly in my second year at university, I decided to go, I said mum, I want to go (Nacho, 25)

Like others with a cosmopolitan sphere, he recognises the importance of others within his life-path. Yet contrasting his own experiences to a wider chorus of Spanish from settled states, referred to as ‘the stables’, he reflects on the consequences of his mobile life-path.

…it’s like they’ve got, like ‘the stables’ they have got this great atmosphere to grow up and be happy or whatever, but at the same time, I think when you are more like me, you get new skills, you develop new skills because you have to, so, and that helps when you are definitely older because when you are older then you usually move somewhere else, people, most, well not most but many people they move somewhere else and they don’t know what in involves, so for a few of them it’s not that easy, so there are a few advantages, not many, but a few (Nacho, 25)

Nacho identifies and is attracted to a lifestyle of travel and learning new languages, like that of Sam (see Figure 7.7), an English companion and former housemate. Nacho seeks opportunities to pitch the skills he has acquired throughout his life. At interview, Nacho switches comfortably between Spanish and English, yet insists that his fluency in English\(^{55}\) has come since living in Madrid and not during his previous six month sojourn in London.

There was plenty of people from Pakistan and with Burkas, but I loved the atmosphere because it was completely different to Spain, it was great going to the small grocery shops, and I couldn’t understand their accent, ‘tirty-too’, but my English was terrible and I didn’t understand a thing…

In Madrid, he speaks English every day either with his foreign housemates or the ‘allied forces’, a male group of native English speakers. When probed about the future, he is only sure that his secure well paid IT job\(^{56}\), which was offered to him due to his English skills, would not deter him from leaving to reconnect with the wider ‘cosmos’.

\(^{55}\) Nacho spoke English with more of a British than a Spanish accent
\(^{56}\) Nacho named no current work colleagues among his alter
However, he acknowledges that future plans are contingent on his relationship with Maria, his Polish girlfriend. Nacho mentions that Sam teases him in that he will become a Polish farmer, to which, in the interview, Nacho responds with a wry smile. The significance of his final chapter ‘Like a Rolling Stone’ and the title of his autobiography reflect Nacho’s convivial path, his difference junkie habits, and his musical interests.

Nacho originally moved to Madrid to be with Lucia, a Spanish girl he met in London. They both moved into a large shared flat with Dani in downtown Madrid, who by chance originated from Alicante, a connection that helped them get the room. After his and Lucia’s break up, Nacho remained in the flat with various compositions of flatmates, represented in Figure 7.7 by ‘House 2’ and the current composition ‘House’. Nacho praises Dani’s conviviality, as someone who always made him and others feel welcome and comfortable in the flat, involving them socially and helping them integrate into the city. Nacho has now taken over the mantel.

57 Title of a song by British band Stereophonics
of hospitality in the flat from Dani, who after years of living with movers and encouraged by Nacho and Sam, had decided to follow suit and pursue his career in London.

Evidence of Nacho’s socialised diplomacy was apparent when he discussed his father, someone he sporadically saw and felt somewhat sorry for. When visiting ‘home’, he tends not to notify his mum if he meets with his father, who he tends often to visit for the sake of his grandma, a woman he respects and enjoys introducing to accompanying friends from Madrid. Hence the numerous weak ties between his grandma and his companions in Figure 7.7. Weak ties also exist between his ‘true friends’ back ‘home’ and the ‘allied forces’. Roberto, a former work colleague in Alicante, and Sam are now close since their joint exploits and travels with Nacho to the 2010 World Cup in South Africa. Yet since Sam, a central companion of Nacho’s, had recently moved on to teach English in South Korea, Nacho’s appetite for a new experience had been wetted, “maybe Poland” he mentions and smiles. In sum, Nacho is a highly convivial soul translating between people with different national and social class backgrounds. But unlike Maribel in Manchester, as yet, he does not identify any social class differences among his foreign friends.

If Nacho was overexposed to difference during his upbringing, the reverse could be said for Maribel. ‘Childhood with Differences’ refers to her strict and disciplined upbringing, where studies and extra-curricular activities were prioritised, playing the piano more than playing with other children in her neighbourhood. An intelligent student, and labelled ‘cerebro’ (the brainy kid) in school, Maribel has little affinity with, and no longstanding friends from ‘home’. She was therefore relieved to leave the family nest and her town for university studies in the city. In the city she joined her cousin and another sibling pair in a ‘House’ (see Figure 7.8) that was owned and run by friends of her parents. Here, she stayed during her entire undergraduate studies.

…there was no way I could convince my parents to leave the house, and, coz again ‘I had to be focused on my studies’ (imitating parental voice) and it was like, they thought it was the best way of, you know, keeping focus and also I was under control, somehow (Maribel, 31)

At university, she rediscovered her faith and became active in the church and in student politics, which she argues transformed her from the shy girl she was at ‘home’ to the person she is today. It is from such activities she established her now oldest friendships with Rocio and Monica (see Figure 7.8), following on from the establishment of ‘Music in [her] life’ and her present identity.
M. …so [at university], just kind of changed me, like it opened me up, I had more freedoms, I could choose how to be and what to do

N. A blank canvas

M. Exactly, for example in my home town, apart from my family, nobody calls me Maribel, everybody knows me as Maria Isabel, because you know when you go to school and they ask for the names, it’s like ‘Maria Isabel’, you know

N. Since University?

M. It was not just from university but from that summer that I went to a music course in Galacia and there was another Maria Isabel as well, so to differentiate, I said well, call me Maribel, my family calls me Maribel, it’s not weird for me, so, and I really liked how it sounded, you know when other people called me Maribel [other than] my family and I just stick to that now

Figure 7.8 Maribel’s Biographical Network - ‘Pathway to Happiness’

Somewhat ironically, Maribel accredits her activity in student politics to the discipline installed in her as a child by her parents. Therefore, while enjoying her new freedoms, it did not come at the expense of her studies with her achieving good grades. This subsequently led onto doctoral studies, and her moving out of the house into a shared flat with fellow research
students. Yet the final year of her PhD thesis was a particularly difficult time as her father became ill and died.

Prior to completing her PhD, she was informed of a post-doctoral research fellow position in Manchester by Anders, an older Swiss academic she had met at a conference. She interviewed and was appointed. However, with her contract nearing completion, and without any clear indication if there will be more work for her on the research project, her final chapter title ‘Where do I go?’ reflects the provisional nature of her life story and the inevitability of mobility in her future.

While not initially having great expectations about Manchester, thanks to Jane her first housemate, and her colleagues, she quickly settled and came to appreciate the city and its leafy suburbs, where she now lives in a large shared house. Yet it is through work, specifically Ebru, and her housemates that she has evolved a cosmopolitan hearth.

And well the happy experience has been like this last year and a half, more or less, because I got really good friends and mmm, yes, I guess, everything is different when you have different people in your life and it’s been like enjoying really, I started to understand a little bit because my father’s death was a little bit hard to deal with but I just tried to, I kind of understood the kind of good part of that bad experience, and it’s like, you know, the most important thing in this life is people and the people you love and you don’t know what is going to happen tomorrow, so just live today as happy as possible and it is what I have been doing. I am really lucky because I got two friends, Zoe and Vale and we used to do everything together like a year and a half ago or so and then Vale left, but from Vale I met Rocco, and Ebru was with me and Billy was with Rocco, and now we are the three of, the four of us, we are, they are like my younger brothers and sisters, so they are my family here.

It this period she entitles ‘Finding the simple happiness’, through which she has come to recognise that a cosmopolitan hearth is also a convivial strategy, a way of coping in the contemporary world. This also becomes clear when I propose that the inevitability of mobility applies to the majority of her network, including her ‘English family’.

M. Yeah, I know, that’s what, yeah, I just thought that, if I have a big reason to stay or I will just look for a place, because they are not, they are an important reason but not a big reason to stay, because it’s what happened with my friends from PhD and stuff, all of them are just spread around the world and that’s what will happen with them as well, it’s like temporal places. The good thing is that I haven’t yet found my place.

N. But you think you will?
M. Yes, I will find it eventually, like a place where I really see like, I see myself living my whole life in there, or maybe not, maybe for a long time.

While having contrasting logics during their upbringings, distinctive educational trajectories, and of different ages and genders, both Nacho and Maribel had evolved cosmopolitan spheres, displaying considerable biographicity in the process. What they both have in common is their continual planning, pursuing and grasping of opportunities to learn and develop, making them both highly active convivial souls.

…I was going to the national meetings in representation of the local one, they knew me at the national level, so they convinced me to get involved at the national level, so I was the spokeswoman of the national federation for a while and I became part of the board for a year as well, so, that’s kind of, but that was really a good time and I learnt a lot, a lot… (Maribel, 31)

Yet through their mobility in childhood and/or adulthood, together with the mobility of bonds, such as Vale for Maribel and Sam for Nacho, they are aware that co-presence is fleeting and a valued resource which must be fully appreciated. This contributes to their convivial activity and misfit sensibilities, which makes them highly welcoming and tolerant to ‘others’ (see Maribel’s quote in section 4.4.3). Hence, their cosmopolitan stance originates from their convivial paths and accentuates with the evolution of their convivial horizons and depths. For Nacho, Maribel, Carmen and Max, a cosmopolitan sphere is now their ‘home’, whatever tomorrow brings or wherever it may be.

7.3 Spheres and Networks

Prior to concluding the chapter with the epilogue of the cosmopolitan play, some brief observations regarding the structure of the biographical networks in each sphere are made. While comparison between cases in terms of network density, the extent to which networks are interconnected, could not be made due to variable network sizes, some differences in network connectivity between spheres emerge.

The average biographical network density across the sample was 0.38⁵⁸. Generally older and with partners, coupled with lengthier periods of settlement in Madrid or Manchester, cases with national and trans-national spheres tend to have more connected networks, with an average density score across each sphere of 0.4 and 0.48 respectively. Trans-national spheres were more connected than any other sphere due to partners being connected to and translating between large sections of the network, and/or weak ties formed between family and friends in Spain and the UK, as in the case of Marta (0.69) who had the most densely

---

⁵⁸ Density is measured by taking the average network matrix score and thus measures here can range from 0 (no connections) to 2 (all strongly connected)
connected network (see Box 5.3). Whereas cases with metropolitan and cosmopolitan spheres, who were generally younger and single, and had less lengthy periods of settlement in Madrid or Manchester, tended to have slightly less connected networks, with an average density score of 0.32 in both spheres. Carmen’s (0.09) network was the least connected across the sample, with her having many geographically dispersed unconnected bonds from her work on numerous European social entrepreneurship collaborations prior to her move to Manchester from Malaga, and the evolution of her cosmopolitan sphere from a metropolitan one.

While trans-national cases had drawn their biographical circles closer together, simultaneously translating across social boundaries, this was due to settlement and the propinquity of alter in Spain and the UK. In essence, they trans-late between two settled national spheres. Whereas the more mobile convivial paths of metropolitan and cosmopolitan cases, coupled with the desire for or inevitability of mobility among bonds, reduces propinquity within their network. Thus they tend to have fewer ties across biographical circles, and less connected networks.

7.4 The Cosmopolitan Play – Epilogue

Through the qualitative intersection of convivial horizons, depths and paths (the three axes of cosmopolitan conviviality) four broad yet distinct convivial spheres emerge. Each sphere recognises the temporality of conviviality, and how this in interaction with the geographical shapes people’s convivial stance in the present. With temporality brought into focus through the introduction of convivial paths, the framework captures the relational dynamics and mechanisms that people negotiate, both out of choice and circumstance, as they evolve their convivial horizons and depths.

The four spheres: national, metropolitan, trans-national and cosmopolitan provide a more nuanced picture of the cosmopolitan play and fill the three gaps in the existing literature that were outlined in Chapter 2. Firstly, the spheres fill in the missing middle space left between elite movers (Kennedy 2004, 2005, Kesselring 2006, Pilcher 2009), and displaced people (Glick Schiller et al. 2011), making visible the numerous and variable consequences of ‘cosmopolitanization’ (Beck 2006), the transformation of the national self under an increasing mixture of the global and the local. Secondly, the introduction of non-movers highlights that while people of different nationalities, genders, ethnicities, and classes draw on variable economic, social and cultural resources during their transitions, shaping the parameters of their cosmopolitan conviviality, this does not necessarily determine the convivial stance they evolve. This is displayed in their contestation or not of the ‘other’ in terms of nationality, social class, ethnicity and so forth. It was shown that the ‘other’ is relative to a person’s social
position (Bottero 2004), the transformation of which demands boundary work or reflexive contestation. Therefore while self-reflexivity “may be conditioned by already-existing delineations” (Adams 2007:147) of gender and class, with cosmopolitan conviviality analysed along two axes, the role of, and the possibility that non-movers may evolve a cosmopolitan stance is recognised. Here, with the unearthing of convivial depths and the tracing of convivial paths, it was found that for the British working class interviewees and for Spanish women, geographical and social mobility inside and outside their national boundaries had generated reflexive contestations.

By filling the second gap in the literature with the introduction of non-movers, the cultural cosmopolitan debate is opened up to something significantly larger than transnational relationships, travel and consumption (Mau et al. 2008, Roudemetof & Haller 2007, Skribis & Woodward 2007). And yet while movers tended on average to evolve broader and deeper convivial spheres, those with transnational and cosmopolitan spheres had done so through their interaction with non-movers. This in turn, provided boundary work opportunities for non-movers, though some non-movers were more open and willing to such opportunities than others. Here, the filling of the third temporality gap, the neglect of conviviality along people’s life-paths from ‘home’, sheds considerable light on the willingness and openness of people to engage with the ‘other’ and the ‘cosmos’.

By tracing convivial paths, it is clearly illustrated that earlier experiences in childhood and adolescence, specifically those coupled with feelings of uncertainty and unfamiliarity, either due to family circumstances or their wider conviviality, enables some to more easily understand and accept the ‘other’. Hence, while people across all spheres are able to identify ‘others’, they are not equally able to identify with them, with some people tending to emphasise the differences and others the commonalities between peoples. It is the significance of these biographical experiences, which shape convivial paths and people’s convivial stance, which accounts for how people of a different nationality, gender, ethnicity, age, class, sexuality can evolve similar convivial spheres.

Furthermore, the four spheres reflect both the significance and the limits of transnational mobility for the evolution of a cosmopolitan stance. Therefore, while we cannot equate or mistake mobility for cosmopolitanism (Glick Schiller et al. 2011), transnational mobility remains a major driving force behind much cosmopolitan conviviality. However, the spheres demonstrate that we cannot directly equate the metropolis with cosmopolitanism (Glick Schiller & Caglar 2009), even if those who have evolved a cosmopolitan stance may now reside there. And while hospitality and openness to ‘others’ of various guises and disguises was
present within each sphere, it was more central to people’s sense of self in the cosmopolitan sphere. Yet while cosmopolitan traits became more central in the fourth sphere, this was not mirrored by any elitist self-referential cosmopolitanism. Instead this was exemplified by a sense that they knew and had found their place in the world, but that they were unsure whether this or not was tied to any particular geographical co-ordinates. By filling the three gaps in the cosmopolitan literature, greater complexity in the cosmopolitan play was captured.

The benefit of the framework developed, is, that with the temporal placed alongside the spatial, it makes more visible what mobility both inside and outside people’s national boundaries equates to. The concept of convivial spheres enables the mapping of people in both time and space, and as a result is not a fixed typology (Thomson & Taylor 2005:337). This movement across and between spheres is captured in people’s life story narratives, as exemplified by Mark’s quote that it feels like a different life in his trans-national sphere compared to his previous one in a national sphere, and Laura’s and Gasper’s reflections on their transition from a metropolitan to a trans-national sphere in terms of the changing structure and sentiments surrounding their conviviality.

Hence, like for Laura and Gasper, there is some overlapping of spheres as people move between them. These transitions between spheres demand biographicity, the ability to relate the social to the self. Hence, and maybe not surprisingly, strong evidence of biographicity is found among cases with a cosmopolitan sphere, those who have made numerous transitions. Their cosmopolitan stance is attained through a convivial path of engaging with unfamiliar others in unfamiliar contexts, through which they enjoy learning and have learnt to find commonality in conviviality. Thus they appreciate and value both the depth as well as the breadth of their convivial sphere, and the convivial path it entailed.

However, biographicity and self-reflexivity as mentioned previously was prevalent to varying degrees across the sample, and like cases with a cosmopolitan sphere, it is reflective of the sphere a person has evolved. Hence cases with national spheres stress events inside national boundaries such as the transition from their ‘home’ town to university and consequently to Madrid or Manchester for work, or, like Iwan the insularity of their convivial sphere. Metropolitan cases on the other hand emphasise adapting to living in different cities inside and outside their national boundaries, coupled to life stage transitions, and at times, discuss and construct differences, between people and places. Finally, trans-national cases reflect over the enjoyment and frustration of cultural differences between Spain and the UK, and how they have learnt to negotiate, accept and welcome them. Thus the framework of convivial
spheres contributes significantly to understanding the conditioning of biographicity and self-reflexivity (Adkins 2002, Adams 2007).

To conclude, convivial spheres capture the three axes of cosmopolitan conviviality, convivial horizons, depths and paths. They illustrate that a second depth axis and a third temporal axis are essential for a fuller sociological understanding of cosmopolitan conviviality. The analytical cosmopolitan play is now complete. The final chapter provides a review of the production, and attempts to answer the question of how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance.
8

The Cosmopolitan Play – A Review

8.1 Introduction

In the preceding analytical chapters a three dimensional view of a cosmopolitan play was constructed culminating in the presentation of four convivial spheres in the previous chapter. Here the findings along each axis, horizons, depths and paths are summarised before the discussion turns to offer an answer to the overarching research question - how may someone evolve a cosmopolitan stance?

The focus then shifts to the wider theoretical and methodological implications of the study and its findings, in relation to the cultural cosmopolitan debate and youth sociology. This leads onto an evaluation of the strengths and limits of applying a biographical network approach as well as suggestions for future empirical research.

8.2 Evolving a Cosmopolitan Stance

The study set out to answer how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance; this overarching research question provided the starting point for a discussion in Chapter 2 on Cosmopolitan Conviviality, the interaction of people with distinctive objective identifications. Here, theoretical, methodological and hence empirical gaps within the existing literature were first highlighted. These gaps centred on three areas: non-elite and non-displaced moves, or a ‘middle-group’ of movers; the interaction between movers and non-movers; and temporality. Therefore, the purpose of the study, apart from answering the overarching research question, was to develop a mid-range relational theoretical framework for the study of cultural cosmopolitanism. The discussion in Chapter 2 generated four sub-research questions around these gaps in the literature. To address these shortcomings, a biographical network approach was developed and presented in Chapter 3, Exploring Conviviality. The summary of the analytical findings is structured around the four sub-research questions before an answer to the overarching research question is offered. The first sub-research question initiated the relational approach of the study.

- Does transnational mobility provide an opportunity for movers and non-movers, self and other in interaction to evolve a cosmopolitan stance?
In Chapter 4, Convivial Horizons, it was clearly illustrated that transnational mobility does provide opportunities to develop cosmopolitan conviviality for both movers and non-movers. Yet it was also shown that this conviviality is more complex than a simple mover/non-mover distinction. The biographical element of the methodological approach highlighted that people are moving targets in time as well as space.

Overall, it was found that mobility and subsequent settlement has significant implications for whether people go beyond transcending nationality to reflexively contest it. It was found that a greater propensity for interacting across national boundaries, inside and outside their own national boundaries, is mirrored by a greater likelihood to have more socio-culturally diverse friendship networks. Here, second language skills were fundamental for shaping the parameters of people’s cosmopolitan conviviality, their ability to engage with the ‘other’ and provide hospitality. Three types of convivial horizons, faint, stable and wide reflected these findings.

For faint horizons, other nationals are peripheral ties in the biographical networks, and at best companions met through studies, work or church. Within stable horizons we start to witness the transcendence and contestation of nationality, with people naming other nationals as confidants as well as companions. Yet co-nationals remain on balance the most significant people in their lives. It is in the third wide horizon that equal or greater emphasis is placed on other nationals within friendship networks. Here we find two ideal type ways of reflecting on this balance. For both difference junkies (DJs) and cosmopolitan hearths (CHs), the transcendence and contestation of nationality has become a central part to their sense of self. However, while DJs are continuously planning their next adventure into the ‘cosmos’, CHs are more wary of the emotional and psychological costs of mobility. In sum, as convivial horizons become broader and other nationals become of greater significance in people’s lives, the greater the likelihood that people reflexively contest nationality as a social boundary, and display hospitality towards the national ‘other’. This leads us to the second sub-research question, which extends the cosmopolitan debate beyond a horizontal national plane.

- Does the transcendence of nationality relate to the contestation and transcendence of other symbolic/social boundaries such as class, ethnicity, religion, sexuality and age among movers and non-movers?

In the exploration of this question in Chapter 5, Convivial Depths, the cases diverge more in terms of their cosmopolitan conviviality. The findings confirm that simply looking at one horizontal axis of cosmopolitan conviviality is insufficient to account for all its complexities.
Here, by looking at both the x and y axis, we find that while some people transcend nationality and contest and transcend other social boundaries, others do not.

First, and as could be envisaged with the name generator used in this study, homophily was weaker in terms of social class across the sample than along any other depth dimension. However, those with faint horizons, whose conviviality is more consigned within national boundaries, did not display greater depth in terms of social class than those with other horizons. Second, it was found that people with wide horizons are more likely to transcend ethnicity. However, ethnicity remains a strong symbolic boundary across all convivial horizons. In contrast to people identified with a different sexuality and age, people with a different social class and ethnicity tended to be less central and significant figures within people’s friendship networks. Very few cases identified people of a different religion; instead people considered religiosity rather than faith per se as more of a significant symbolic boundary.

Yet it was only by exploring the biographical distribution, quality and nationality of alter with a different social class background, ethnicity, religion, sexuality and age within biographical networks that more complexity was captured in three distinctive convivial depths. These were superficial and shallow, national and international. Whereas superficial and shallow depths refute the notion that the transcendence of nationality leads to the transcendence and contestation of other social boundaries, both national and international depths support the notion, but in contrasting ways.

First, in superficial and shallow depths people with a different social class background, ethnicity, sexuality or age were peripheral characters in their networks and lives. What distinguishes international from superficial and shallow depths is that transnational mobility, that of their own and others, had brought them into convivial contexts with other nationals that were also of a different social class, ethnicity, sexuality, religion and age. Hence, indirectly or coincidentally the transcendence of nationality had led to the transcendence of other social boundaries. This convivial depth originated from a broadening of convivial horizons.

Here, the naming of people with a different social class background was related to movers’ knowledge and greater familiarity with their friends and their new national context with settlement. However, the reasons given for naming other people of a different social class background differed between British and Spanish cases. Here, transnational mobility and settlement had induced a certain degree of class consciousness among both British and Spanish movers. However, for movers and non-movers alike, social class was not seen as a
pertinent boundary in interaction between people of a different nationality, or between people of the same nationality outside of their own national boundaries. With nationality disguising social class, some movers interacted across greater social distances. In sum for those with international depths, it could be argued that bonds with people named of a different social class were not symbolic of boundary transcendence, but instead were more symbolic of movers’ growing cultural awareness and knowledge of their new socio-cultural context.

Yet class consciousness was also displayed by cases with national depths, people who in the first instance evolve convivial depth within their own national boundaries. Here, their boundary work achievement to maintain and incorporate relationships from childhood and adolescence across divergent educational and geographical trajectories had generated social distance and convivial depth. Here clearly for a couple of British working class cases, social mobility linked to their educational and occupational trajectories had resulted in them transcending and contesting social class. However, for middle class cases this conviviality was argued not to be symbolic of particularly transcending social class, but instead symbolic of people’s ability to now identify objective differences among bonds maintained from the past. This leads onto the third sub-research question, which introduces relational quality into the cosmopolitan debate.

- Is the cosmopolitan stance associated with the experience and ability to look beyond objective differences in developing bonds of close personal relationships?

The culmination of exploring two axes of cosmopolitan conviviality in Chapters 4 and 5 with a biographical network approach is the finding that the transcendence and subsequent contestation of social boundaries is associated not only with the composition of convivial and friendship networks, but also with the biographical distribution and structure of networks.

It was established that interacting with objectively different others over time had for some led to the reflexive contestation of essentialised identities, while for others it had not. Therefore, while boundary transcendence is associated with evolving a cosmopolitan stance, it alone is insufficient. Here, the biographical distribution and structure of networks prove to be insightful for explaining how cases diverge in terms of the contestation of social boundaries.

First, we find cosmopolitan translators, actors that also connect people across biographical eras and/or social boundaries, often drawing their biographical circles together. In essence, they act as a catalyst for further cosmopolitan conviviality, where essentialised identities are potentially contested and social boundaries are deconstructed. Second and in contrast to translators, we find actors that simultaneously transcend and contest national boundaries, and
construct a cosmopolitan boundary that excludes non-mover ‘others’. Here, actors draw on their own transcendences with objectively different others to distinguish themselves from non-movers. They tend to be DJs with superficial and shallow or international depths. They are indicative of *faux*-cosmopolitanism, the mistaking of mobility with cosmopolitanism.

However, to explore the circumstances behind the evolution of diverging convivial practices and stances, a third axis of analysis was presented around the final sub-research question. This question introduces temporality to the study of cultural cosmopolitanism.

- How are the biographical events that expose people to difference influential in the evolution or not of a cosmopolitan stance?

In Chapter 6, Convivial Paths, it was demonstrated that the way people envisage and articulate their conviviality in the ‘world’ was filtered through their convivial experiences and sentiments surrounding events at ‘home’. Analysis of the life story narratives and chapters produced three interconnected tiers with which the cases could be compared and analysed in relation to their exposure to and relationship with difference and the ‘other’. The first overarching tier concerned the socio-cultural norms surrounding the life-path in Spain and the UK, using the concepts of the Spanish tether and anchor Britannia to illustrate how convivial paths are articulated through a certain national logic. The second tier related to the relationship of people’s parents, whether they had experienced a settled family state throughout their upbringing or socialised diplomacy, a childhood and/or adolescence among feuding and/or separated parents. The third tier concerned people’s diverging experiences and sentiments surrounding their conviviality in school, neighbourhood and town prior to further studies, and whether they had been misfits or conformists. Cases differed in relation to these three tiers, each evolving quite distinctive convivial paths. However, while their life stories were provisional and reflected their current convivial circumstances, certain life-paths, particularly those with socialised diplomacy and/or who had been misfits had involved more exposure to difference and induced more empathy and hospitality towards ‘others’.

Finally, through drawing together the findings from convivial horizons, depths and paths, a three dimensional framework to understand cosmopolitan conviviality was presented in Chapter 7, Convivial Spheres, offering an answer to the overarching research question.

- How as an individual does one become tolerant, hospitable and at ease with the unfamiliar and develop an openness and willingness to engage with the other?
Four broad but distinctive convivial spheres were presented, national, metropolitan, transnational and cosmopolitan. Here, the balance shifts from convivial stances that are predominantly national to predominantly cosmopolitan.

First, while those within a national sphere have moved inside and/or outside their own national boundaries, their sense of self remains predominantly attached to their more settled conforming convivial paths and their regional and/or national affiliations. Second, those within a metropolitan sphere emphasise their diverse and spontaneous conviviality in metropolises inside and outside their own national boundaries, which has facilitated the transcendence and contestation of nationality and other social boundaries. However they tend to equate the metropolis with cosmopolitanism, which for some may also involve excluding others in their own productions of the cosmopolitan play, entitled faux-cosmopolitanism. The effects of transnational mobility and consequent settlement on the evolution of cosmopolitan traits become more clearly apparent in the third trans-national sphere, which houses mainly movers. Here, people have negotiated socio-cultural differences in their everyday convivial lives, embodied in bonds with movers and non-movers across numerous convivial contexts. Settlement and proficient second language skills, coupled with the propinquity of relations in different socio-cultural contexts, enables them to trans-late across national and social boundaries within their convivial paths, providing a further source of contestation. While hospitality is displayed across all convivial spheres, it becomes more evident and key to a person’s sense of self in the fourth cosmopolitan sphere. The cases within this sphere offer a more comprehensive answer to how someone may evolve a cosmopolitan stance.

What distinguishes cosmopolitan sphere cases is that they have moved and settled on numerous occasions inside and outside their own national boundaries and the metropolis. They have a convivial path which has made them familiar with being the ‘other’, socialising them to recognise and empathise with unfamiliar ‘others’. Aware that everyone is different, the emphasis is on commonality rather than difference in their narratives. While these cases do not perceive people in terms of their objective identifications, transcending and contesting social boundaries, their convivial sphere remains shaped by structural parameters. However, their convivial paths have subjected them to sufficient engagement with ‘others’ for them to reflect on the diverging opportunity structures people have to engage in the ‘cosmos’.

Therefore, and similar to trans-nationals, they enjoy acting when it is possible as catalysts of cosmopolitan conviviality. Yet with either the desire for or inevitability of mobility ever present within their convivial sphere, linked to an ethos of learning, they appreciate and value co-presence. Hence, the active and heterogeneous conviviality found within a cosmopolitan
sphere is as much a by-product of convivial paths as it is a convivial stance with which non-
elite mobile people inside and outside their national boundaries may approach life in the
contemporary age.

In sum, stemming from the biographies explored in this research project a cosmopolitan
stance is more likely to evolve in the following circumstances. First and foremost a life path
that has demanded the negotiation of uncertainty and unfamiliarity from an early age due to
either familial break up and/or difficulties of fitting in at school or in their wider social
environment. These experiences both encourage and enable people to leave ‘home’ and
search adventure and forms of identification in the ‘world’. Second, they have educational and
occupational profiles that facilitate mobility and exploration, and make use of the
opportunities that these open for them to both further their careers and their experience of
the ‘cosmos’. However, while for some this mobility and exploration is encouraged by family
and peers, even at times part of their socialisation, for others it demands careful diplomacy so
as not to upset or worry forever concerned parents back ‘home’.

8.3 The Play’s Theoretical and Methodological Contribution

The study clearly illustrates the complexity of the cosmopolitan play and confirms that a one
dimensional view of cosmopolitan conviviality would tend to conceal more than it could
convey. Here, by placing the temporal alongside the spatial in the research design, the study
contributes to the cultural cosmopolitan debate by demonstrating that actors evolve their
convivial behaviours and attitudes in time as well as space. Yet to fully discuss the study’s
theoretical and methodological contribution, I first need to return briefly to the back catalogue
of previous productions of a cosmopolitan play.

The study deliberately avoided adding to what David Harvey (2009) has termed ‘adjectival
cosmopolitanisms’, the growing vernacular in the literature used to portray divergent forms
and contexts of cosmopolitan conviviality. These include ‘rooted’ cosmopolitanism (Appiah
2006, Beck 2006) ‘vernacular’ cosmopolitanism (Werbner 2008), and ‘subaltern’
cosmopolitanism (Jeffrey & McFarlane 2008). At first, while consciously suspicious of
‘adjectival cosmopolitanisms’, believing that they empty cosmopolitanism of its analytical
power rather than enrich it, they collectively reflected a gap in the literature due to the
assumption that cosmopolitanism is only found among mobile people and populations.
Hence, ‘adjectival cosmopolitanisms’ reflect each research production’s particular cast of
mobile actors. And yet while these studies have pushed the explorative domains of
cosmopolitanism beyond mobile elites, their ethnographic directions and casts have produced quite niche plays for niche audiences.

Therefore by casting non-elite movers and non-movers, the intention was to produce a convivial play which would speak to a wider audience. However, the need to find a balance between capturing the complexity of this convivial play and being able to generalize about it called for a purposefully chosen cast of actors under a new methodological direction. Young adult actors from two metropolises in two distinctive countries were cast to make substantive comparisons between how people diverge in their experiences and sentiments surrounding their passage from ‘home’ to ‘world’ (Tuan 1996). While the life stories were highly indicative of participants’ current life stage and the circumstances thereof, patterns emerged that highlight the complexity of cosmopolitan conviviality in the contemporary age. I suggest that people of other backgrounds and life paths will be able to relate to and critique the details and the findings of the study. The ability of this production to generalise beyond young British and Spanish adults is I argue due to its methodological direction.

The biographical network approach acknowledges the significance of the narrative construction of self, a self that is not constructed within a social vacuum, but in relation to others. The approach explores the ambiguous analytical space between the life as lived and the life as told, a space that people grapple with in their everyday interactions. The participants related to and engaged with the common sense design of the study and its thorough implementation, creating a broader and thicker description of cosmopolitan conviviality. And it is the rationale behind the design of a mixed method, the Biographical Sociogram Interview, that a wider academic audience will relate to and value. Yet foremost it is in the complementarity of the biographical and network approach, as illustrated by the substantive findings, that the three gaps in the existing literature were filled. In essence, the theoretical and methodological contributions of the study are two sides of the same coin. I now etch these contributions in greater detail.

**8.3.1 Theoretical Contributions**

For purposes of clarity the study’s theoretical contributions are presented around the three gaps in the cultural cosmopolitan literature that it filled, before moving on to the significance of the findings for the sociology of youth transitions.
Cultural Cosmopolitanism

First, with the casting of a middle group of young adult movers from different national and social class backgrounds, the study was able to find what mobility equates to for a large share of contemporary movers. Within this group, clear differences emerge in how people negotiate mobility and the ´cosmos´ on the one hand and fixity and the ´hearth´ on the other. It was shown that mobility without settlement is unlikely to promote the contestation of nationality, and that in some cases it may affirm nationality as a social boundary. However, those who had settled, and had negotiated the convivial consequences of this, including the loss of established and taken for granted sources and systems of meaning (Sonn 2002) had come to not only transcend nationality but also contest it. Yet while the findings lend support to the critique of equating mobility with cosmopolitanism, they also caution against equating the metropolis with cosmopolitanism (Glick Schiller & Caglar 2009). For while the metropolis is a source of cosmopolitan conviviality, enabling people from different national and cultural backgrounds to transcend particularised differences (Jones 2007), for some movers this becomes a means of differentiation from non-movers. Hence there is greater likelihood for mobility to be equated with cosmopolitanism, or faux-cosmopolitanism in the metropolis. This finding adds minor weight to Ossewaarde´s (2007) ´society of strangers´ theorem since the majority of movers and non-movers in this study had become familiar with each other.

The study showed that those movers most likely to transcend and contest nationality and other social boundaries were those who had moved and settled on numerous occasions both inside and outside their national boundaries, and outside the confines of the metropolis. However, this also demands a level of linguistic ability, which defines the parameters of mover’s conviviality and often their social position on arrival. For those who rely on their native language skills for employment, this can be a convivial blessing and a curse, easing integration initially but limiting opportunities for second language development. Here non-movers were seen to prove influential not only for movers’ language development, but also for the improvement of their social position and their understanding of the new cultural context. Yet for some Spanish movers, the evaluation of their social position and that of their non-mover friends in the UK in relation to an imagined parallel social position in Spain, displaying biographicity, culminated in a desire to or an assertion that they would return ‘home’. The significance of non-movers on the experiences of movers leads us on to the second gap filled by this study, and the broadening of the cosmopolitan debate.

By applying a relational approach the contribution of non-movers to social change, and the significance of cosmopolitan conviviality on non-movers was examined. Here, the
heterogeneity of non-movers’ interactions inside and outside (horizons and depths) their national boundaries shaped distinctive convivial stances. The shaping factors to whether non-movers evolved more cosmopolitan traits differed between the British and the Spanish along lines of mobility, social class and language skills. For some British non-movers, mobility within their national boundaries, and social mobility for working class cases, had provided sources of reflexive contestation and a greater openness and willingness to engage with the ‘other’. Whereas for some Spanish non-movers, who tended not to consider social class as a significant social boundary to interaction, mobility and second language skills were paramount to their wider engagement in cosmopolitan conviviality and subsequent evolution of a less national and more cosmopolitan stance.

By going beyond comparing the subjective attributes of movers and non-movers (Mau et al. 2008, Roudemetof 2005, Roudemetof & Haller 2007, Skrbiš & Woodward 2007), or focusing on particular bounded contexts of cosmopolitan conviviality (Glick Schiller et al. 2011), and instead placing the emphasis on people’s conviviality inside and outside their national boundaries, this study amplified the cultural cosmopolitan debate and its analytical field. By capturing the multitude of contexts and illustrating the mechanisms through which “the elimination of social boundaries begins with the deconstruction of symbolic ones” (Lamont & Aksartova 2002:12) along two axes of conviviality, the role and significance of non-movers within the cosmopolitan play and social change is acknowledged and demonstrated.

However, it was through the introduction of temporality that the major theoretical advances were made to the cosmopolitan perspective. Here in collaboration with the relational approach, the significance of people’s conviviality and the contexts of these in earlier phases of their lives were seen to have a defining effect not only on their willingness to engage in the ‘cosmos’ but their openness to the ‘other’ in numerous guises once there. Through the introduction of convivial paths, thus exploring along three axes of conviviality, cosmopolitanism becomes more than a zero-sum game between the national and the cosmopolitan. Here the cosmopolitan stance is recognised as something which begins to form in the local and the national context, and something which remains articulated through and in reference to it. By analysing the relational biographies of movers and non-movers, the wider contextual layers that surround the evolution of people’s convivial horizons and depths emerged. The concept of convivial spheres captures the evolution of people’s convivial stance, highlighting that the ‘other’ is relative to a person’s social position in time as well as space (see Box 8.1). Hence the openness and a willingness to engage with the ‘other’ is relative to each of the four spheres. However, as more and more ‘others’ in various guises and
Box 8.1 Model of Convivial Sphere Evolution

The model presented below captures the temporal evolution of convivial spheres and stances between one that is predominantly national to one that is predominantly cosmopolitan. The arrow below the figure illustrates the shifting emphasis of understanding and engaging with the `other´ between a local and a cosmopolitan stance. A fifth local convivial sphere is proposed to possibly capture actors not cast in this production but who may yet transcend and contest boundaries within their local or regional spheres. The layout and overlapping of the spheres highlights the possible transitions between them in time and space. The sizes of the four spheres in the figure reflect the distribution of actors in this study housed within each, and the wall thickness represents the strength of these actors´ convivial stances. The thinner walls of the metropolitan sphere represent that for many this is a transitory sphere between a national and a trans-national stance, and possibly a cosmopolitan sphere and stance.
disguises with time are incorporated into a person’s ‘generalised other’ (Mead 1984), the unfamiliar becomes increasingly familiar as symbolic and social boundaries recede.

It is here that the theoretical approach and convivial paths contribute significantly to show this process as relational and one that is imbued with affect. With the unfamiliar becoming increasingly familiar, the convivial joy of meaning making between actors with distinctive cultural, social and ethnic backgrounds as subjects provides both actors with a sense of self in the world (Erikson 2007, Simmel 1964). It is this joy in the interaction value (Erikson 2007) that actors may seek to share by connecting people across social boundaries (horizons and depths) and/or biographical eras (paths). As cosmopolitan translators they act as catalysts of further cosmopolitan conviviality and boundary work.

However, while some actors are transmitters of cosmopolitanism through their cross boundary connections, with their convivial stance initially formed in the local and the national, these non-elite actors through their convivial paths have a foot in numerous camps. Therefore the metropolitan, the trans-national and the cosmopolitan actor is able to criticise, defend and enjoy the national stance through their attachments to different national actors. From the biographies studied in this study, both trans-national and cosmopolitan movers expressed the need sometimes to socialise with compatriots and others in their native tongue and national practices. These findings lend support to the idea of ‘rooted cosmopolitans’ or ‘cosmopolitan patriots’ (Appiah 1997, 2006, Beck 2006), people who establish links with other nationals whilst maintaining strong links with co-nationals, and in doing so, establish multiple attachments. Yet while Appiah (1997:618) suggests that,

> the cosmopolitan patriot can entertain the possibility of a world in which everyone is a rooted cosmopolitan, attached to a home of one’s own, with its own cultural particularities, but taking pleasure from the presence of other, different places that are home to other, different people.

Not everyone identifies with ‘home’, and the mechanisms behind why people may take pleasure from the presence of the ‘other’ may arise from this lack of identification. From the interviews with young non-elite British and Spanish non-movers, it was shown that hospitality towards the ‘other’ was more evident among those who had experienced being the ‘other’ at ‘home’, and as such, were attracted by and empathised more with ‘others’. By using the concept of cosmopolitan conviviality in this study, a more empirically grounded understanding on a wider cast of actors within the cosmopolitan play emerges, and hence ‘adjectival cosmopolitanisms’ are avoided. In essence, by adopting the metaphor of ‘the cosmopolitan play’ and analysing the convivial horizons, depths and paths of actors within it, the four spheres: national, metropolitan, trans-national and cosmopolitan unpack, add depth to and
enlarge the space between the local and the cosmopolitan. Yet by grounding the analysis of cosmopolitanism in people’s conviviality over time, in their relationship towards and with the ‘other’ and not along normative principles of a detachment to place and nation (Roudometof 2005, Roudemetof & Haller 2007, 2010), the evolution, divergence and strengthening of convivial stances is witnessed.

With increasing corporeal mobility (Urry 2000) many people’s cosmopolitan conviviality is no longer limited to their localities. The theoretical framework developed in this study demonstrates that non-elite actors have interdependent influential orientations which evolve distinctive convivial stances across time and space inside and outside their localities in the cosmopolitan play (Merton 1968).

**Sociology of Youth Transitions**

With regards to the field of youth sociology, the findings illustrate that the motives behind and the consequences of transnational mobility in people’s youth transitions differed along lines of nationality and gender. For some Spanish women, the path away from ‘home’ had required constant negotiation and management to gain more slack from concerned parents, a tether which for some still applied considerable emotional strain. The Spanish in Manchester motivated their mobility to the UK primarily by a wish to learn English or pursue their chosen career. However, they had also anticipated and enjoyed the ‘fight and the adventure’ of surviving in the ‘cosmos’. Unlike the Spanish who on the whole articulated struggles in terms of their path away from ‘home’, the British articulated their actions and accomplishments in terms of their path towards the ‘cosmos’. Hence, the British in Madrid motivated their mobility in terms of the ‘cosmos’, that is, the culture and the lifestyle coupled with career opportunities, and/or as a joint venture with their partners. The findings regarding the influence of international study exchange programs such as the Erasmus program on the evolution of European young adults’ convivial stance is less conclusive. Here, a few cases had thereafter strengthened their national stance, while a few had evolved less national spheres. Yet of the four cases housed within a cosmopolitan sphere, none had studied on an international exchange program.

The framework of convivial spheres proves useful for the interpretation of youth transitions. While the significance of informal networks in youth transitions has been previously recognised and elaborated on (Diepstratet et al. 2006, Walther et al. 2005, Heikkinen 2000, MacDonald et al. 2005), a systematic analysis of the composition, distribution and structure of young adults’ networks in relation to their life-paths has received little attention outside of
personal network studies (Bidart & Lavenu 2005, Grosetti 2005). Within this study, convivial spheres shed considerable light on the consequences that both endogenous and exogenous life events have on young adults’ transitions. For instance, it was shown that the Spanish had tended to maintain more friends from prior to working life, linked with contented and settled childhoods and more local university studies, and hence in adulthood, Spanish movers were more drawn back towards a geographical ‘home’ than the British.

Yet national differences diminish as cases move from a national towards a cosmopolitan sphere, and similarities between people emerge as stronger. For example those housed within the cosmopolitan sphere share an active prioritisation of learning and self-development within their life-path, which exposes them to a more diverse array of ‘others’. These actors’ transitions epitomise what Diepstraten and colleagues (2006) term ‘trendsetting learning biographies’, making life-path decisions step by step to maintain an integrated autonomous learning life concept but simultaneously recognise the importance of others within this life project.

Furthermore, the framework clearly showed that while the cosmopolitan actors in this study tended to identify themselves as middle class, and the parameters of young adults cosmopolitan conviviality was related to their relative national, class and gender positions, these attributes across the sample were not decisive in determining people’s convivial stance.

8.3.2 Methodological Contributions

As previously mentioned, the biographical network approach developed explored the analytical space between the life as lived and the life as told, and as such it is greater than the sum of its parts. Here, the biographical method and formal network analysis were meshed together in a qualitatively driven way (Mason 2006) to tackle the research questions posed.

The approach developed contributes both to the theory and practice of investigating social life. Through the ability of the BSI to produce data on the life as lived (construction of sociogram) and the life as told in tandem, the method allowed interviewees to not only enrich their stories, but also with probing, and if willing to capture their own contradictions and dissonance in their narratives (Holland & Thomson 2009). The benefit of this two pronged approach is that it recognises and further enables the act of data production between the interviewer and interviewee. However, this did not and should not translate into a critique of participant’s system of meaning, but simply a means to uncover the underlying origins of these respective systems. With the biographical and the network method meshed together in the BSI, three data sources arise, the life story narrative (A), the construction and narration of
the biographical sociogram (B), and (C), the reflections and links established between (A) and (B) in the final part of the interview. In essence, triangulation occurs within the method with the participant being asked to interpret A in relation to B and vice versa thus producing C. While there may be methodological and logistical arguments for producing A and B at different time points or reversing their order, if A followed B, then A is narrated through B and C does not exist. In sum, C is the added value which makes the biographical network approach greater than the sum of its parts.

Yet A+B and consequently C are also greater than the sum of their parts. As the person’s life story is the initial focus, the social analysis is humanized (Boissevain 1979) as interviewees elaborate on and place content into their autobiographical chapter titles. The questionnaire and semi structuring of the life-story with the autobiography enabled participants to be more comfortable, safe in the knowledge that they had a series of prearranged props with which to construct their stories. This enabled interviewees to relax and for rapport to be developed during A, enriching the discussion and enabling more probing during B and C. Thus with this order the interviewee accepts and understands that he or she is the focus of the research both as subject and as object, and the sociogram is there to complement that focus. Furthermore, the tangibility and manoeuvrability of constructing the biographical sociogram for the participant is also an important element in this interactional process (Emmel 2008). In practice participants were set a social puzzle, and while the rules were outlined, they had to place and link their relations as they best saw fit. Like any puzzle, some people worked it out quicker than others, but all the interviewees enjoyed completing it. During and after the construction of the sociogram, with participants elaborating on the criteria for why or why not they had named people of a different social class, or whom they considered different, and the quality of these relationships, participants’ subjective notions of difference and similarity could be explored and developed further in the final part of the interview. The sociogram enabled the participant to link biographical events with their conviviality, highlighting the temporal ordering and dialectic interplay between network selection and influence. It also enables the interviewer to highlight and probe contradiction and dissonance between A and B, producing C and improving the credibility, authenticity and hence value of the data. In essence the order of the interview procedure was qualitatively designed to make the best use of the biographical method and the network method. This was done by placing people first in order to better understand their social life and the stance with which they had to it (Boissevain 1979).

Biographical network analysis acknowledges the significance of A, B and C as distinctive but interconnected parts of the data, combining quantitative and qualitative methods to move
between each to enhance the comparative interpretations of cases. In this study, the quantitative approach of formal network analysis was used in the initial survey of convivial horizons and the unearthing of convivial depths, a means to focus and direct further qualitative and biographical exploration. This systematic approach enhances comparative case analysis of personal networks and their narratives. But more importantly, with the structuring of the sociogram around the autobiography of the person, the biographical details of the network which are often overlooked in formal (personal) network analysis (Boissevain 1974, McPherson et al. 2001) become part of the analysis. As exemplified in the four analytical chapters of this study, the addition of temporality to the construction and analysis of ego networks provides an additional context through which to interpret individual behaviour and attitudes, and social life in general. The approach illustrated the dialectic interplay between network selection and influence throughout the analysis and its influence on the convivial stance that people evolved. The approach and the findings posit a caution to formal network research to not neglect the influence that the evolution of networks, tied to their relational content and quality, has on shaping personality and network structures.

In conclusion, the biographical network approach was specifically developed to answer the study’s research questions (Sanjek 1974), which required the temporality (A) and the relationality (B) of cosmopolitan conviviality, and the link between (C) to be explored. The study answers both network specific (Crossley 2010, Edwards 2010, Hollstein 2011) and wider (Mason 2006) calls within social science for mixing methods in a theoretically driven way and introduces an approach which opens an analytical space where quantitative and qualitative methods can meet and play.

8.4 Directions for Future Research

The theoretical and methodological approach developed in this study raises questions for future research and the directions thereof. These are sketched out and conclude the thesis.

For purposes of the research questions, the actors in this production of the cosmopolitan play were cast on the criteria that they were acquainted with people of a different nationality. As outlined in Box 8.1, this casting criteria leaves potentially at least one convivial sphere unexamined, a local or regional sphere housing people unacquainted with other nationals. Previous research measuring local versus cosmopolitan attitudes has found that people tend to cluster at either end of a normative local/cosmopolitan continuum (Roudemetof 2005, Roudemetof & Haller 2007, 2010) and that younger and better educated people are more likely to fulfil these norms of cosmopolitanism (Mau et al. 2008, Olofsson & Öhman 2007).
However, this study showed that while nationality, class and gender shaped young university educated adults’ cosmopolitan conviviality, they did not determine the type of convivial stance that these young adults evolved, and that transnational mobility was influential but not decisive.

I suggest that the three dimensional theoretical and methodological framework developed in this study is better equipped to explore the relational and temporal dynamics of a group of people that are often seen as the antithesis of cosmopolitanism. Through recognising that the ‘other’ is a relative social position along two axes, the stratification effects of education and social class inside national boundaries on cosmopolitan conviviality is open for exploration. Therefore the call is that the next production of the cosmopolitan play should include non-university educated young adult non-movers residing inside and outside the metropolis that are both acquainted and unacquainted with other nationals.

However, any such future production would also demand the advancement and refinement of the biographical network approach. One such refinement would be in terms of the name generator employed to reflect the aims of the study and the revised research questions. To date the majority of ego network studies measure and explore networks in terms of social support, which at times assume a certain degree of geographical and temporal propinquity. Yet the biographical dimension illustrates the significance of co-absent and co-present relationships in shaping people’s convivial stance. Therefore the methodological focus on the frequency of tangible social support received may restrict more than encourage exploration into how people’s social behaviours and attitudes evolve, the aim of the network approach.

By shifting the emphasis to explore the quality of interaction people have across the social boundaries of nationality, social class, ethnicity, and so forth over time, and people’s subsequent affirmations and contestations of essentialised identities formed around these boundaries, the significance of bonds in people’s lives take centre stage. So while weak ties may be important for people to get ahead in social position (Granovetter 1973), co-present and co-absent bonds within and across social boundaries and life stages are important for people to understand, accept and include the ‘other’ in their numerous guises and disguises.

If the cosmopolitan perspective is to be a critical perspective it therefore must be open and willing to transcend and contest its own normative foundations. Through the transcendence and contestation of established theoretical and methodological boundaries this study has enlarged and enhanced the perspective in order to better understand the complexity of social life in the contemporary globalised age.
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PARTICIPANT INFORMATION SHEET

Thank you for your interest in my research. Please read the following information sheet fully before deciding to become a research participant in the study.

The Cross-Cultural Interaction of young British and Spanish adults living in Madrid and Manchester

This doctoral research project is interested in your social interaction with others who are culturally and socially different from you in terms of for example nationality, ethnicity or social-class, as well as in how your social interactions have changed over your lifetime.

The first part of the study involves completing a questionnaire which you can find attached as an Excel file. This file contains three sheets, and I would be very grateful if you could complete all three. The first sheet asks you for some personal details (name, age, education, occupation, etc.), the second sheet is on your social world (family, friends, neighbours, colleagues, etc) and the third sheet is on significant life events – You can return this questionnaire to me via email.

Your questionnaire answers will provide the basis for the second part of the study which will consist of a face-to-face interview. This interview will last around 2 hours, during which time we will discuss in-depth the information you have supplied in the questionnaire and also draw a map of your social network. I will supply all the necessary materials to construct the map, but it would be helpful if at least this part of the interview could take place at a kitchen or dining room table. Whilst the interview will be arranged at the most convenient time for you, it would be best if we conducted the interview with as few external disturbances as possible. The most suitable place I suggest therefore is either in your home or alternatively my home, which is located XXXXXXXXXXX.

All the information you provide will be confidential and pseudonyms will be used in the final thesis. Prior to the start of the interview you will be asked to sign a consent form, also attached.

If you decide to take part in my study, I look forward to receiving your completed questionnaire by email with your suggestions for suitable dates for the subsequent interview. If you have any further questions before, during or after the study, please feel free to email me or phone me on XXX XXXXX in Spain or on +XXXXXXXXXXXXX in the UK.

Many Thanks, Neil Armitage
# APPENDIX B – Questionnaire

## Sheet 1

**The Cross-Cultural Interaction of young British and Spanish adults living in Madrid and Manchester**

### Personal Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Education/Highest Qual:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E.g. GCSE, BSc in ....)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age:</th>
<th>College/University/Universities:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality:</th>
<th>Occupation &amp; Workplace:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In Madrid/Manchester since: (dd/mm/yyyy)</th>
<th>Foreign languages spoken and level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E.g. French –fluent Spanish - basic conv.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Now Please Go to Sheet 2**
Please write the names of as many people as you like for the six questions below in the corresponding coloured column to the right, i.e. Column 1 for Question 1

(To assist yourself in this task, you could refer to your contacts in your mobile and email or your friends in facebook)

Please write down the names of people with whom you -

1. *Discuss important personal matters with*
2. *Enjoy socialising or travelling with* (do not repeat names from question 1/column 1)

Please name friends/colleagues/family with a different -

3. *Nationality to you* (you are now allowed to repeat names mentioned before)
4. *Social Class Background to you* (again you are allowed to repeat names mentioned before)

Please name friends/colleagues/family whom -

5. *You consider are different to you in some way* (again you are allowed to repeat names mentioned before)

And Finally,

6. *name anyone who is or has been especially close to you but whom you have not named in columns 1 to 5*

Now Please Go to Sheet 3
If you were to write your autobiography what would be the titles of the book’s chapters?
(Use as many of the lines you wish below to write the chapter titles, you may also provide a title for the book)

Now Please Save the File and Return it to xxxxxxxxx@xxxx.xxx

Thank you very much and I look forward to meeting you soon
APPENDIX C – Interview Guide

Introduction
- Go through Information Sheet/Consent Form
- How did you find the questionnaire? – clear up any issues
- Explain procedure of interview – Life Story/Sociogram/Final Questions

Life Story
- Using the chapter titles given please take me through your life story – using the names you have named where possible – you may add new names not previously mentioned (purple)
- reiterate with skeleton and flesh
- Are there any people from the stages who were important at the time, but you have not included? Why no important people from this stage?

Relationships/Sociogram
- How have you distinguished between the people you have named in Col.1, 2 & 6?
- Please place the names in the circle in which period you met them – placing people who know each close to each other – show how to do the first few
- Groups of people who know each other well (1st person met/same time? etc. – Friends/Colleagues/Family) – social contexts established relationship
- Ties between others – strong (red)/weak (blue)
- Locations of people (mix in/out of city) how do you contact them?
- HAPPY WITH SOCIAL MAP? – would you change anything
- Which of these are Spanish/British? Language used?
- Different Alter? (Nationality, social class, ethnicity, religion, age, sexuality, etc.)

Openness/Hospitality
- Which are the people who you feel have had the most significant impact on your life?
- Beyond those you have just discussed, are there others here you could not imagine not being in your life? And Why?
- Who in your life in Madrid/Manchester made you feel welcome when you arrived?
- Have you welcomed others?
- MOVERS - Have you found it easy or hard to meet Spanish/British people?
- Have you become more open and willing to meet new people or try new things since arriving? Any examples? Why do you think this is?
- On reflection over your life – how do you feel you have changed?
- Where do you feel you belong?
- What are your plans for the future/Where and how do you see your life in the future?

THANKS