Interactional Lenses for Contemporary Migration Studies: The Case of the "Cosmopolitan Sociability" Concept*

Maxim L. Ni
Junior Research Fellow, International Research Laboratory "Transnationalism and Migration Studies",
Saint Petersburg State University
Address: Universitetskaya Nab., 13B, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation 199034
E-mail: jintae@mail.ru

Pavel P. Lisitsyn
PhD, Associate Professor, Saint Petersburg State University of Economics
Research Fellow, International Research Laboratory "Transnationalism and Migration Studies",
Saint Petersburg State University
Address: Universitetskaya Nab., 13B, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation 199034
E-mail: fox_sociology@mail.ru

The article attempts to revise the concept of 'cosmopolitan sociability', proposed by Nina Glick-Schiller for the field of migration research, from the interactional perspective. Cosmopolitan sociability characterizes such forms of integration of mobile people that do not refer to ethnicity or the country of origin; instead they are based on openness, free emotional sharing, and general human competencies available to everyone. However, the use of the concept by anthropologists and sociologists seems to neglect specific situational mechanisms of how cosmopolitan sociability is produced and reproduced in everyday interactions. We seek to fill this gap addressing theoretical resources of ethnomethodological membership categorization analysis, as well as interaction ritual theory. We propose to combine these approaches as complementary conceptual frameworks to analyze cosmopolitan sociability practices at the situational level. Ethnomethodological tradition helps to identify mutual definition and accounting of what is happening in specific here-and-now situations. This allows analyzing the stability created within the framework of cosmopolitan interactions, as well as the specific moral order that is reproduced within them. Moreover, ethnomethodological analysis helps to identify contexts where cosmopolitan sociability can or cannot arise. Interaction ritual theory, as developed by Randall Collins, characterizes situational solidarities and group symbols emerging and sustaining in everyday interactions. It is also able to trace the influence of the individuals' past experiences (previous chains of interactions) on their participation in situations of cosmopolitan sociability. The proposed approach is illustrated by the analysis of several examples of labor migrants' interactions in the Federal Migration Service.

Keywords: cosmopolitan sociability, actual cosmopolitanism, migration studies, transnationalism, social interaction, interaction ritual chains, ethnomethodology, membership categorization analysis

At the dawn of sociology in the second half of the 19th century people's lives were generally limited by the rigid borders of national states, and solidarity was perceived as a cohesion within bounded political formations. Hence, the early metaphor of society as a social organism, where the organs are in a functional relationship with each other and support the existence of the whole thing. In turn, it is obvious that the contemporary world is radically different from those realities. Intensification of the capitalist mode of production contributed to the development of transport, communication tools, and most importantly, to a sharp increase of movement of people on a global scale. The massive migration of the population, primarily due to the search for earnings, initiated an extensive research program aimed at critique of traditional sociological thinking.

Ulrich Beck claims that classical sociological thinking is not more than "methodological nationalism" (Beck, 2006). He argues that its optic limits the field of analysis, entailing serious biases. The main shortcoming of thinking within the framework of "sustainable" borders is the inability to explain events that occur across the borders of nation states. As illustration he provides the case of September 11, 2001, global transplantation networks, and mass labor migration that would not be possible in a world of closed social systems. In a similar vein, the classic interpretation of the concept of "society" was criticized by John Urry. In his works the emphasis is on re-writing the social context in terms of the networks and the flows passing through state boundaries (Urry, 2010).

In the field of migration research, this line of criticism is developed in the works of Nina Glick-Schiller, Linda Basch, and Cristina Szanton Blanc (Basch et al., 1995), as well as a number of followers (Faist, 2013). They propose to use the concept of "transnationalism" to indicate the forms of social interaction that occurs beyond borders[1]. Field research demonstrates that many migrant workers do not break ties with their homeland. Moreover, they are also active actors in the political and economic development of their countries and come back regularly, living "between" the two states. Such arguments obviously question traditional discourses on integrating migrants into society.

The most remarkable example of a study based on "transnational approach" is *Transnational Villagers* by Peggy Levitt (2001) that considers in detail the case of the migration from the Dominican village of Miraflores to Boston, Massachusetts. The main argument of the book is that sustainable migration changes social relationships not as much in the host community of migrants as in their homeland. These transformations occur as the result of the "social exchange" between sending and the receiving communities. Ideas, patterns of behavior, and social capital circulating here affect the social context within the sending community. Levitt, in particular, shows how the government of the Dominican Republic changed its legislation, encouraging dual citizenship that provided emigrants the opportunity of political participation of their native country. Moreover, the existence of relatively cheap airfare tariffs allows migrants to exist in two worlds and to compensate their socioeconomic status in their homeland through their earnings from the United States.

---

1. See Ni, 2017. Several arguments of this article are also presented there briefly.

Today the transnational approach to migration is quite conventional in the social sciences. Global movements of people are considered as an important problem. There is a need for more detailed framework analyzing the ways people exist and produce solidarity within transnational spaces. Contemporary researchers are increasingly asking questions about migration without reference to the traditional discourses of integration in terms of cultural assimilation. One of the productive options for answering such demands was the optic of sociological or actual cosmopolitanism. In contrast to the philosophical debate about the construction of a cosmopolitan society developed in normative terms (Nussbaum, 1994), sociologists and anthropologists seek to understand how the logic of everyday cosmopolitanism works (Delanty, 2012). Researchers focus on how everyday discourses and people's practices promote openness to cultural diversity. Studies in line with everyday cosmopolitanism are designed to oppose the conventional optics of migration research focused on the determining role of ethnic and/or national identity in building networks of interaction and closed groups.

In this article we continue the tradition of actual cosmopolitanism. We analyze one of the key concepts in the cosmopolitan turn, the concept of "cosmopolitan sociability" that was coined by Nina Glick-Schiller, Tsypylma Darieva, and Sandra Gruner-Domic (Glick-Schiller, Darieva, Gruner-Domic, 2011). It was developed to grasp the processes of interactions in transnational environment that can be characterized as cross-cultural or as cross-ethnic, that significantly expands the field of analysis of migration research. In addition, we propose several advances to this conceptual framework using the developments of ethnomethodologists, as well as the "radical micro-sociology" of Randall Collins. These "external" theoretical resources, in our opinion, will significantly expand the opportunities for detailed, empirically verified description of the phenomenon, and will allow constructing causal hypotheses about the stability of spontaneously emerging patterns of cosmopolitan sociability.

Cosmopolitan Sociability as Emerging Sociality

Glick-Schiller and her colleagues seek to re-focus the attention of migrant scholars to the form of interactions and experiences of mobile people that generate solidarity beyond ethnic, national, and other forms of difference characterized by the dichotomy "we/they". The concept of "cosmopolitan sociability" is grounded on George Simmel's interpretation of sociability as a purely social phenomenon (Simmel, 1971). The main property of Simmel's "sociability" is freedom from the pressure of a person's authorities and internal intentions. Sociability is like a game without external interests. Thus, it is free from the external causality, as well as the inner aspirations of the person at the intersection of which fate is formed. Moreover, for Simmel sociability is the opposition to the teleology of real life; however, Glick-Schiller interprets it as one of the common areas of everyday interactions of mobile people. These free interactions unite people in physical space or cyberspace around those interests that are not always purely utilitarian. Cosmopolitan sociability is defined as "forms of competence and communication skills that are based

on the human capacity to create social relations of inclusiveness and openness to the world" (Glick-Schiller, Darieva, Gruner-Domic, 2011: 402).

These forms of interaction do not necessarily exclude ethnic or national dimension, but exist in parallel by inserting an additional variable in the equation of the formation of group solidarity. Thus, the study of Tsypylma Darieva is devoted to the ways in which young ethnic Armenians in America build ties with the "homeland of their ancestors" through participation in projects to preserve the mountain landscape of Armenia. What is interesting to us is that the general interpretation of participation in this project is articulated in a global scale. The activists emphasize that the preservation of the Armenian ecosystem is important for the whole planet. Such motives attract even the attention of people who are not ethnically related to Armenia (Darieva, 2011).

It should also be noted that most cases where cosmopolitan sociability is built demonstrate the formation of closed communities with a rigid border. For instance, in the article "Socialist Cosmopolitanism Meets Global Pentecostalism" Gertrude Hüwelmeier examines the situation of Vietnamese migrants in Germany (Hüwelmeier, 2011). Her study demonstrates historical transformation of the social context of migrants' inclusion. Her informants report that their initial settlement experience in a new location was inclusion into socialist brotherhood, but after the fall of The Berlin Wall the situation changed dramatically. The post-socialist realities of German cities redefined the status of Vietnamese people; they faced stiff racial stigmatization that sharply limited opportunities for building relationships outside their ethnic communities. Finally, in the mid-nineties, the Pentecostal Church, that adopted Vietnamese converts without regard to their class, ethnic, or political affiliation, began its work around the globe. Parishes with overwhelming numbers of ethnic Vietnamese appeared with the central Pentecostal mission in Hanoi. Hüwelmeier emphasizes that religious identity has become a driver for cosmopolitan sociability not in terms of tolerance, but rather through the appeal to a higher order, namely the order of salvation. This kind of "cosmopolitanism with a moral mission" (Van Der Veer, 2002: 167) arises from religious ideology and forms of solidarity, excluding those who are not involved in religious practices. Thus, the identification of cosmopolitan sociability takes us aside from the unequivocal opposition of rootedness and openness. The principle of openness to the world can be incorporated within the quite rigid boundaries of the religious community.

However, cosmopolitan sociability can emerge beyond closed organizational contexts. The construction of the common space of interaction is a creative process that can take place quite spontaneously, starting from some situation in which people find themselves. Nina Glick-Schiller emphasizes the role of human creativity when she defines cosmopolitan sociability as "a set of practices in which people are not passive consumers but are active participants in creating common spaces" (Glick-Schiller, Darieva, Gruner-Domic, 2011: 403; Massey 2005; Leitner, Peck, Sheppard, 2007). In this respect, examples of the influence of the context of a multi-ethnic environment on the creation of special forms of communication in workplaces are quite interesting. For instance, the study of Uma Kothari describes how street peddlers in Barcelona form a special type of differentiated

communication (Kothari, 2008). Occupation and migrant status help to create a very unusual type of interaction between them. The emphasis is on ethnic differences, but they are interpreted not in opposition terms, but as exchanging specific professional skills. So, the true experts in sales are the Senegalese, who "really know how to sell" (Kothari, 2008: 508). The neophytes of the "camaraderie on the street" strive to establish contacts with them in every possible way. Kothari points out that cosmopolitan sociability can be interpreted as a phenomenon arising from the context of a particular situation. In this regard, for a full analysis, we need tools that identify relations between the conditions of the situation in which sociability produced, and radically empirical data (naturally occurring conversation, narratives, video recordings, etc.). Understanding the possibility of actual everyday cosmopolitanism, in our opinion, requires the development of theoretical and methodological toolkit of researchers.

It is necessary to take a step towards the unbundling of the conventional dictionary of migration researchers. Here we adhere to the approach of Rogers Brubaker who criticizes the notion of "group", "ethnicity", and "nation" (Brubaker, 2002: 166). According to his idea, a group, whether ethnic, religious, or professional, exists only in specific contexts. Therefore, an analytical tool is necessary for a situational analysis that is radically empirical and does not refer to pre-defined concepts. If we initially aimed at researching ethnic groups, our analysis will show us ethnicity as something integral which relates individuals to a particular group once and for all. The analytics of cosmopolitan sociability assumes completely different perspective in which group identifications can be shifted, giving the room for openness of actors. In his criticism of "methodological groupism", Brubaker points out the need to address the resources of situational approaches, in particularly, the use of the ethnomethodologists" developments (Brubaker, Loveman, Stamatov, 2004: 35), as well as the core aspects of Goffman's frame analysis (Brubaker, 2000: 3). These theoretical resources help to understand the mechanisms of the "embodiment" of ethnicity as an objectively perceived phenomenon. We agree with this approach, but apart from researching the procedures for implementation of cosmopolitan sociability, we are interested in the question of why actual cosmopolitanism takes place in organized communities in some cases, but not in others. In this regard, we complement ethnomethodology with Randall Collins' theory of interaction ritual chains.

Everyday Cosmopolitanism as Accountable Order

Let us begin with ethnomethodological developments for the study of cosmopolitan sociability. Ethnomethodology is not a theory in a strict sense, but rather a research direction that study practices through which ordinary people create an adequate or recognizable order of interaction in the ordinary situations of their lives. The basic theoretical intuition here is that any interaction take place in an ordered form, and, most importantly, this orderliness can be explained without external theoretical constructions such as ethnicity, social structure, or class. A detailed description of the ways of how this order is produced is the main goal of ethnomethodology. Thus, the task of an ethnomethodolo-

gist is radically different from traditional approaches of sociologists. Instead of looking at empirical data for the indicators of some theoretical concept, the focus is redirected to the ways by which people produce the phenomenon of interaction under natural conditions. [2] In turn, interaction always occurs in a certain context, that has a definite effect on the acting. This statement seems like a sociological truism, [3] however ethnomethodology defines context not through abstract structures "above us", but in purely phenomenal terms of the observed resources. [4] Hence, the concept of "indexicality" is required to explain the phenomena of order. Any actions of the person are connected with those details that are given to him/her in direct observation. It means that production of social reality can be traced without appealing to the transcendental sphere of meaning. The account of empirically understood "indexicality" determines the understanding of human interactions as artful productions of an accountable reality (Hilbert, 1992: 30). In other words, the model of the actor in ethnomethodology includes the property of human creativity, thereby releasing it from the model of "cultural dope" determined by the external social structures.

These characteristics of ethnomethodological approach surprisingly resonate with the definition of cosmopolitan sociability provided by Glick-Schiller. Both approaches emphasize that the emergence of sociality occurs in situational context, and behavior of actors is not completely predetermined by social structures. Let us recall that the definition of cosmopolitan sociability point to the competencies of people based on the human ability to create social relationships of inclusion and openness to the world. It is also a set of practices through which people create a common space. Researcher can be asked the question of how and on what basis it is possible to produce accountability between people who are differentiated and put into rigid opposition by conventional sociological optics. This, in fact, is an ethnomethodological question that requires a new description of everyday cosmopolitan situations, taking into account the thematization of traditional categories of migration studies. Following the ethnomethodological intuition, we can ask ourselves about the situations in which self-identification as a member of ethnic group shifts to a more general or multi-layered category, such as "Pentecostal Christian" or "Senegalese expert in trade". Moreover, we are able to inquire in which cases such everyday work of categories produces common spaces, and in which cases it creates an excuse for antagonism.

Within the ethnomethodological tradition, there is a sub-discipline that specializes in researching of how people categorize the participants. This is the Membership Categorization Analysis (MCA), an approach developed by Harvey Sacks (Sacks, 1972; Lepper,

---

2. Here we mean the setting for switching from sociological use of concepts as the resources for the description to making these concepts a topic for empirical investigation (Zimmerman, Pollner, 1970).

3. For conventional sociology, it is obvious that the interaction is embedded in a macrostructural or institutional order (Rawls, 1989).

4. It should be noted that ethnomethodology does not deny the existence of macrostructures, but their role is reduced to selection, accounting, explanation and justification of the recurring ways of ordering interactions occurring in local contexts. Similarly, despite the title of the article, attribution of ethnomethodology to the directions of micro-analysis is debatable (Hilbert, 1990; Korbut, 2014).

2000: 6). MCA focuses on identification of patterns by which participants in natural interactions classify themselves and others. The sets of categories that are associated with one class are designated as the Membership Categorization Device (MCD). For example, the categories "mother", "father", "daughter", and "son" in modern societies are connected in the MCD "family". MCDs compete with each other in conversation. Brubaker emphasizes the productivity of using the MCA to identify ways in which ethnicity is realized as the form of a cognitive scheme (Brubaker, 2004: 16). The same way of thinking, in our opinion, can be applied to the methods of achieving cosmopolitan sociability, considering it as a mutual categorization of participants in interaction within the MCD that does not directly refer to ethnicity.

The analysis of Membership Categorization Devices is achieved through applying a number of principles and rules for the application of categories in a naturally occurring talk. First, categories are linked through the registration of category bounded activities, actions that common sense considers functional within the MCD. Sacks illustrate this rule by analyzing a simple statement: "X cried. Y picked it up" (Leaper, 2000: 14). Common sense tells us that instead of the unknowns, we must substitute the categories "mother" and "child", but how do we come to this conclusion? Sacks draws our attention to the fact that, for an adequate interpretation, we use those resources that are already embedded in the texture of the observed situation on the one hand, and are part of a common culture, on the other. The sequence "cried" and "picked it up" is associated with categories, allowing us to make judgments about the identification of participants. These marks are called "category bounded activities", they denote a set of specific actions that are attributed to category carriers. The term "standardized relational pair" consists of reciprocal categories that axiomatically assume mutual obligations with respect to each other. So, in the described example, the mother–baby pair is fixed and correlates with the obligations of care, and is expressed in empirically fixed actions. Further, consistency rule states that if at least one individual was categorized and a category from a specific MCD was used, then other members of the same group will be categorized from the same MCD. Economy rule is closely linked with consistency rule, since one category suffices for one participant in the interaction. The case of categorization is offset when a new category from a new MCD is applied to an individual, and is thus associated with the observed change in the context of the conversation. In the duplicative organization feature, when persons are categorized within the framework of a single MCD, its actual or potential members are considered as a unit rather than as separate individuals. If a rule of duplicative organization is applied to a certain number of people, they are considered not separately, but together. For example, instead of individual husbands and wives, the pairs are considered as families. Finally, rule of pragmatic relevance claims that if participants in interaction are allocated as the actual relational pairs, the non-observance of pair positions is observable. If the actual pair is not available, its counterpart can be selected by a sequential selection from the MCD.

It is worth to make an important point here. Sacks' original approach implies that categories and their meaning are re-usable objects distributed in the cultural space. Thus,

culture is taken for granted. In contrast, an interpretation of the recent work in line with the MCA offers more situational approach. Thus, Stephen Hester and Peter Eglin propose a distinction between the decontextualized culture model and the ethnomethodological model of culture-in-action (Hester, Elgin, 1997: 12). The first corresponds to the embeddedness of categories, predicates, and MCDs in a rigid cultural context. In the second case, both the use and recognizability of categories rely on contextual resources of interactional situation. Identifying the situation is based not on categorically bounded activity in pointing to the relevant categories, but rather on sequential identification of a specific local context where will be appropriate to place certain objects in a certain category unit. Accountability of categories depends on contextual resources available within the situation (Hester, Elgin, 1997: 29). Thus, the production of categorization becomes situational and local.

The application of MCA to the studies characterized in the first part of the article can significantly expand understanding of everyday cosmopolitanism for several reasons. First, MCA focuses on analysis of naturally produced conversations that avoids distortions arising in the interview. Secondly, MCA, as one of the subfields of ethnomethodology, initially problematizes the role of theoretically developed concepts for describing the nature of groups. Thirdly, this approach allows us to correlate the work of group categories and the contexts where they are used by participants themselves that will help to outline the position of cosmopolitan sociability in the structure of the everyday life of mobile people. We can not only understand the contexts in which ethnic, national, or class identities are treated in conversation, but also to study how it is intertwined with more general membership devices by its orientation on local details. Thus, retrospectively applying MCA procedures to the empirical material collected by Uma Kothari (Kothari, 2008), we could conclude that the Senegalese ethnic labeling is closely related to the categorically bounded activity of more general categorization device of "peddler". The categorically bounded activity of the seller is "selling", someone does it better, and someone does not. Based on the distributed scheme within the local culture, the Senegalese are categorized as "the inborn sellers", and finding this category within the "peddlers" categorization mechanism unites them and helps to establish close contacts. Thus, ethnic identification within this machinery of categories becomes not a barrier, but a bridge for the formation of cosmopolitan sociability.

However, in spite of its merits, the ethnomethodological approach has one serious drawback. The description of the accountability order does not imply an explanation of its preservation. It is produced here and now, and it is fundamentally impossible to build bridges between discrete situations. Thus, the important question of how cosmopolitan sociability becomes the foundation for the formation of solidarity beyond a particular moment remains behind the brackets of ethnomethodology.

Interaction Rituals Chains and Maintenance of Cosmopolitan Community

In order to fill the gaps in the explanation of everyday cosmopolitanism, we need theoretical resource that works with more familiar, classical questions of sociology regarding the nature of groups. A detailed analysis of the interaction *per se* does not help to comprehend production of stable cohesion. As A. Filippov points out, "the ability to induce a solidary action in an undetermined but limited set of individuals as a subset of a larger set does not say anything about their solidarity inside the smaller, or about solidarity within a larger set. The production of a coherent "we" of a solidary group needs other means and involves restrictions" (Filippov, 2011: 30). In our opinion, a productive supplement here is the interaction ritual theory of Randall Collins that which emphasizes the role of rituals in uniting the group (Collins, 1983, 2004).

Collins treats solidarity as a sense of belonging to a group, and the size of group is not limited (Collins, 2004: 49). A group can be defined as a conversation between two people, a class in school, or even a global intellectual community. The sense of belonging to a group is formed through interaction rituals that consist of several components. First, participants in the ritual must be in common physical space. Secondly, there must be a common object on which attention is focused. It can be something external to people or actually people themselves. For example, Irving Goffman, whose work Collins is largely based on, demonstrates that the exchange of courtesies in greeting focuses the actors' attention on themselves (Turner, Stets, Jan, 2006: 136). From here, we come to the next point of the ritual — generating awareness of group boundaries. Finally, the fourth component is shared emotional mood of those who are involved in the ritual.

In a successful interaction ritual, common emotional focus and mutual concentration on the object are mutually reinforcing. There is rhythmic coordination of bodily movements and synchronization of voices in conversation[5] (Collins, 2004: 48). The synchronization of rhythms enhances the sense of reciprocity and the commonality of experience. The actors intensify their participation in the interaction. This leads to the intensification of general emotional background, leading to the effect that Emile Durkheim called "collective effervescence" (Durkheim, 1965), and thus solidarity is achieved between the participants. A successful ritual promotes the emergence of group symbols that have the properties of sacral objects. This sacralization can carry both positive and negative tone. There are standards of group morality in relation to the emerging symbols, their violation causes a collective disapproval.

Moreover, interaction rituals generate emotional energy (EE) that is distributed among participants. In terms of outsider observer, EE can be described as willingness to join interaction. In case of EE increase, the individual shows enthusiasm and confidence. If the individual is passive, we can notice the lowering of EE. An important aspect here is

---

5. Rhythmic synchronization is an object of study for neuroscience-oriented sociologists and psychologists. Its presence in a naturally flowing conversation at the level of synchronization of the participants' voice modulations was recorded and statistically validated in studies of Stanford Gregory (Gregory, 1983; Gregory, Webster, 1996).

the distinction between short-term and long-term emotions (Collins, 2004). Short-term emotions are directly related to the situation and change the emotional energy locally. At the same time, situationally generated emotions can be translated into long-term emotions. Participants can use their accumulated cultural capital (a collection of previously accumulated symbols) in current situation and thereby contribute to creation of group solidarity. Thus, separate ritual interactions are linked and go beyond their borders.

Participants can combine their stock of symbols and emotional energy and enter into cooperation that results in creating solidarity. Thus, interaction rituals are connected (chain) with each other. Individuals tend to build their chains of interaction rituals in a way to maximize the level of EE and carry as-little-as-possible costs (Collins, 1993: 206). The category of "emotional energy" allows Collins to go beyond the field of closed situational analysis. The amount of EE is not constant; it needs to be replenished in the process of new rituals, which prompts the individual to search for and select "markets for ritual interaction" (Collins, 1993: 208). The available pool of EE is invested in rituals that can be replicated in future. The more the investment is, the greater the profit will be, and thus, any person is treated as an EE-seeker.

We can see that Collins' theory have not so many similarities with ethnomethodology and Membership Categorization Analysis. As the main argument for compatibility of these approaches, we turn to Richard Hilbert's article "Ethnomethodology and Micro-Macro Order" (Hilbert, 1990). The main idea or the "radical thesis" of the article is that ethnomethodology and interaction ritual theory have one common feature, that is, an indifference to the distinction of micro-macro levels. Hilbert suggests to look at phenomena of the constitutive ordering of everyday life through the prism of interaction rituals. As an example, he considers natural conversation ordering. Hilbert proposes to add the content of conversation to the analytics of conversation structure. In this case, the content of the conversation (including the categories) becomes a Durkheimian sacred object (Hilbert, 1990: 803). The task of the ethnomethodological description, then, is to describe methods of assembling a sacred object by using situational resources. At the same time, mutual understanding that is reached within the situation is reified. These reified entities are linked by means of engagement and redefining in the new interactions. Hilbert argues that "linkage from event to event is biographical, temporal and sequential and ought not to be confused with a "micro-macro link" (Hilbert, 1992: 805). The interaction level produces both what is called "microstructures" and what is conceptualized as "macrostructures".

With theoretical framework of interaction ritual chains we are able to provide a causal explanation for the emergence of stable forms of solidarity based on cosmopolitan sociability and associated with emotional dimension. Moreover, we can explain how cases of cosmopolitan sociability are formed within institutional frameworks of sustainable organizations, as well as in spontaneous forms. For example, interpretation of daily cosmopolitanism of the Pentecostal sect studied by Gerturda Hüwelmeier is associated not only with the historical context of political change in the country, but also with the local practices of interactions characterized by getting emotional feedback from collective re-

ligious rituals and community activities. When we apply MCA, we can describe schemes that produce openness and inattention to ethnicity or any other form of differentiation of migrant / non-migrant type. However, the interaction ritual theory toolkit allows revealing to what extent the group assigned to a single membership categorization device is united. Researcher's attention will focus not only on narratives of informants, but also on empirically observable manifestations of emotions. In addition, we are able to make some predictions about transforming spontaneous, everyday cosmopolitanism into additional long-term forms of relationships.

Spontaneous Cosmopolitan Sociability at the Federal Migration Service

Let us now illustrate the applicability of the proposed conceptual framework with an example. We base our analysis on data collected during the observations of interactions at one of the branches of the Federal Migration Service (FMS) of Saint Petersburg. The main purpose of visiting this location was to collect information by a questionnaire survey about language competency of labor migrants arriving in the Russian Federation, as well as on problems that migrants encounter during their stay in the country. Unfortunately, the use of a voice or video recording devices met a sharp disapproval from both the administration and the respondents. Because of this, the observations of migrant interactions were conducted in form of spontaneous autoethnography. The main way of recording data was field notes and diary. This, of course, does not allow conducting a comprehensive study. The analysis we attempt to make is rather a pilot sketch that requires further work in the field. Nevertheless, we hope to present an interesting case for analysis.

Visiting FMS is a prerequisite for obtaining the documents for a work permit (patent) in the Russian Federation for foreign citizens. The period of validity of the patent is limited to one year, and in addition, if migrant fails to submit documents for patent registration within 30 days from the time of arrival, sanctions are imposed in the form of fine or restriction to leave the country and re-enter. The period of 30 days is perceived by most of migrants as a very short period of time since during this time, it is necessary to find an apartment, to get a job, and only then to be allowed to apply for patent. As a result, the territory of FMS is always crowded, despite the efforts of the administration to manage the problem.

It is necessary to describe the physical space of FMS as the site where the interactions unfold. It can be divided into two parts, inner and outer ones. The inner part is the first floor of the building where a number of offices and consultation windows are situated, as well as three halls. In the first hall, there are several benches, a large information monitor, and a toilet, as well as several offices, the purpose of which remained unknown to us. From this room, there is a pass to the next one where there is an office for the employees with two windows, and six rows of welded iron chairs to accommodate about thirty-six people. The employees behind the windows accept documents for the registration of patents, verify their authenticity, and check the presence of the applicant's information in the

database. The number of people in this room varies depending on the time; since the hall is open until 4 p.m., it is already quite empty by 5. From here, people move to the next room where they need to get a patent from one of the windows. This space looks just like the waiting room of a suburban station. There are seven windows for issuing papers, as well as several rows of seats that are always occupied.

The outer part of the FMS building consists of the courtyard with an area about 150 square meters. There is a way to get there from the big hall that issues papers, and this space is also very crowded. The yard is covered with a canopy to protect people from rain and snow, and under the roof, several rows of backless low benches stand perpendicular to the exit/entrance of the building. The distance between the benches is no more than one and a half meters. After every two benches, there is a wall made of iron mesh, and iron wickets are attached to the ends of the walls. There are usually so many people here that the queue goes outside the courtyard to the territories adjacent to the FMS building.

We spent most of the time in the yard where people gathered, and we discovered that their turn to obtain patents or other documents would not come very soon.[6] Our attention was attracted by the repeated complaints connected with the conditions of the long wait for the documents. These complaints manifested in two forms: first, when the researcher came to the point of the questionnaire asking "What situations would you like to avoid in the future that take away much of your time and energy?", and secondly, the topic of complaints spontaneously arose as an excuse to talk to unfamiliar people in the same situation as themselves. Next, we will focus on analysis of these situations.

Since most of the visitors to the FMS were migrants from Central Asia, we invented a special methodology for attracting respondents / informants to collect data for the survey. Most of migrants from Uzbekistan, Kyrgyzstan, and Tajikistan do not know Russian well. We, in turn, had a limited knowledge of Central Asian languages. Thus, during the field work, we adhered to the tactics of the "spontaneous recruitment of translator". If the first respondent spoke Russian, then after the survey, we tried to get in touch with him and ask him to help with translating the questionnaire for his compatriots. Partly because of this, and partly because of the interest in our research, there were several people constantly around the researcher. Even in those moments when no one was interested in taking the survey, we were surrounded by two or three curious people. In this, the questions on those situations that are time-and energy-consuming itself often became an occasion for collective discussions. The respondents complained that the procedure for obtaining documents from the FMS is the most exhausting. Often, instead of a clear answer to the questionnaire question, some of the respondents began long monologues-explanations, and then the rest become involved in the process. For instance, responding to the question, one man from Azerbaijan sharply criticized the authorities of St. Petersburg, and his criticism was supported by "translator" from Uzbekistan, as well as an occasional witness. Here is a reconstruction of the statements based on the diary entries:

---

6. Many people often did not get their turn at all during the day and had to return the next day.

R1: "Did you ask me about most of all time and effort? And what, you do not know? Nobody needs all of your research! You go here, ask questions, and then what? Simple people are suffering! Hard workers!"

Int.: "Yes, but still we are trying to change something. Our research is not just done to be done. They then come to the government's eyes."

R1: "Stop it! You'd better go and ask your *administration* why people on the street are sitting like *cattle*. They have to patch up the roof, do something to reduce the queues. And we're sitting here — there's nowhere to fall crumbs!"

R2: "They all have everything 'bar-bir,' my friend (turns to R1). I have already come here from five in the morning and all wasted, but at work the days are idle. They do not care about us."

R1: "Yes, they don't care! They just fill out the paperwork, and we're here . . . Are you (referring to Int.) saw what was happening this autumn? This roof is all flowing, it's cold . . . You need to throw your papers — it's all useless!"

In the situation it is clear how the discussion of complaints about the work of the FMS is unfolding. A common understanding of the situation is built on the basis of the locally distributed resources of the situation. Waiting in the FMS creates institutional context. The Institution is responsible for issuing documents for registration in the territory of the receiving state and for employment. Consequently, the categories of people here are limited to "hard workers" and "administration". Boredom and the lack of places to sit causes inconvenience. In addition, the behavior of those who are classified as the "administration" demonstrates a clear disregard for the "hard workers". This is indicated not only by the documented reconstruction of the conversation, but also by repeated complaints about the rude attitude of those whom we (the researchers) categorize as "guards", while the informants, following the rule of the duplicative organization, are referred to as the unit of "administration". Focusing on the local context details, the informants refer to themselves as the category of "suffering people". The situation in which we (the researchers) turned to them with the question on "problem situations" also becomes a resource to categorize themselves primarily as "suffering people", and only then as "hard workers". Thus, general understanding of the situation is made with respect to the opposition of the two apparatuses of membership categorization; the "suffering people" and the "administration". Following the rules of economy and duplicative organization, such categories as Uzbek, Tajik, Kyrgyz, Azeri, or builder, roofer, or painter in this context are combined by referring to the category of "sufferers", correlated with the situation of being in the FMS. In addition, through a combination of contextual details and categories, the categorically related activity of "suffering people" arises when one has to wait an extraordinarily long period of time for one's turn and endure an inhuman attitude from the employees of the FMS. The work of MCD[7] "administration" in this regard is ambivalent. In the described fragment, participants demonstrate the application of the rule of pragmatic relevance to

---

7. As previously mentioned, the Membership Categorization Device (MCD) is the set of categories that are associated with one class and categorically-bounded activity.

the category-related activities of administration. It is understood that the duties of the administration are to ". . . to patch up the roof, do something to ensure that there are no queues", but instead it causes people to suffer. Using this thematic vocabulary allows building of communication mode that is open to those who fall under the general category of "suffering people at FMS", regardless of their ethnic or national affiliation. The only criterion for entry is language skills.

The same conclusions are relevant for spontaneously arising communication that we overheard and recorded. Even if ethnicity was somehow referred to in the conversation (most often it was the question "where are you from?") discussing conditions for obtaining patents, ethnic categorization was absorbed by MCD "hard workers". The only difference in the case of spontaneous communication was the greater variability of topics associated with categorically-bounded activities. Typical development of the conversation, which began with the discussion of endless queues and clarification of ethnicity, involved discussion of work. It is interesting that some of the informants with whom we had contacts outside the survey noted that during these spontaneous discussions they had made new colleagues, although not always with their fellow countrymen.

Moreover, we can assume that within the framework of discussions of discontent with the work of the FMS administration solidarity is created based on involuntary participation in interaction rituals. All indicators of the success of the ritual are noticeable: physical co-presence; general focus on the need to obtain patent; group boundary separating those who are categorized in the conversations as "hard workers" from those who are referred to as "administration" or "superiors"; and, finally, shared emotional mood. Despite the fact that the sacred object or symbol generated in this case has a negative tone, it is also capable of creating emotional energy and solidarity. As Collins himself notes, "solidarity presupposes not only positive emotions, it is created by a conflict situation, since solidarity is not opposed to conflict, but to indifference" (Collins, 2006: 128). From this perspective, the ritual unfolds around the pronouncing of the situation, which is a form of passive resistance from below. The participants in the interaction experience emotional upsurge through the articulation of "just anger". The position of weak becomes a source of solidarity beyond ethnic differences.

Why did we not notice the transformation of this kind of everyday cosmopolitanism into a structurally organized community? Collins' theory draws our attention to the temporal structure of migrants' stay on the FMS territory. A person comes here, spending a few days collecting necessary documents. During this s/he accumulates certain dissatisfaction (– EE), and probably enters into interaction rituals where s/he replenishes emotions (+ EE)[8]. However, after collecting documents, s/he hurries to work or home. For a long times/he is free from visiting this place. Those emotions that were produced in successful interaction ritual are not recharged for a long time, so the degree of solidarity remains low. As a result, we can assume with a high degree of certainty that the original cosmopolitan sociability that generates solidarity on the basis of complaint will not take

8. The term (– EE) means the loss of emotional energy, while the term (+ EE) means the growth of emotional energy.

the form of sustainable community. However, the contacts established within the situations of criticism of the FMS administration have the potential to grow into something larger by using those types of categorically-bounded activity that are be relevant for the categorization device of "hard workers". It is possible that the emergence of such forms of everyday cosmopolitanism will generate stable group solidarity.

Conclusion

The phenomenon of cosmopolitanism, as considered through sociological lenses, is of special interest for analytics of the contemporary deterritorialized world where the borders of national states are gradually eroding. Analysis of everyday interactions, where identities lose their primary importance and yield their place to communities of a more general order, opens the possibility to grasp new forms of sociality that arise spontaneously from large-scale global migrations. That is why the research of cosmopolitan sociability as proposed by Nina Glick-Schiller and her colleagues is so important today.

We believe that supplementing studies of everyday cosmopolitanism with the resources of ethnomethodology and interaction ritual theory will significantly expand the understanding of mechanisms of how cosmopolitan sociability emerges and maintains. Application of ethnomethodological membership categorization analysis helps to understand how situational resources allow mobile people to perceive themselves and others in categories more general than ethnic ones. Looking at the situation from the point of interaction rituals theory makes it possible to explain transformation of spontaneous forms of communication into stable groups and to reveal the reasons for non-emergence of institutionalized solidarity.

Our frames do not have an integral character. Our main goal was to draw the attention of migration scholars to research optics of the sociology of everyday life that helps to escape the reduction of methodological nationalism. Our approach allows re-definition the classical notions of group boundaries through the thematization of essential ideas about the forms of identification and the boundaries that they assume. Attention to local contexts of cosmopolitan solidarity, description of the ways in which they are produced in terms of cognitive schemes, and actualization of the role of emotions make it possible to create truly "thick descriptions" grasping the specifics of people's lives in the era of globalization. We hope that the developments presented will find their application in concrete empirical studies, and will be further advanced.

References

Basch L., Glick-Schiller N., Szanton Blanc C. (1994) *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*, New York: Gordon and Breach.

Beck U. (2006) Living in the World Risk Society. *Economy and Society*, vol. 35, no 3, pp. 329–345.

Brubaker R., Cooper F. (2000) Beyond Identity. *Theory and Society*, vol. 29, no 1, pp. 1–47.

Brubaker R. (2002) Ethnicity without Groups. *European Journal of Sociology*, vol. 43, no 2, pp. 163–189.

Brubaker R., Loveman. M., Stamatov P. (2004) Ethnicity as Cognition. *Theory and Society*, vol. 33, no 1, pp. 31–45.

Collins R. (1993) Emotional Energy as the Common Denominator of Rational Action. *Rationality and Society*, vol. 5, no 2, pp. 203–220.

Collins R. (2004) *Interaction Ritual Chains*, Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Collins R. (2006) Moj put' v sociologii [My Path in Sociology]. *Sociological Studies*, no 11, pp. 125–132

Darieva T. (2011) Rethinking Homecoming: Diasporic Cosmopolitanism in Post-Soviet Armenia. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 34, no 3, pp. 490–508.

Delanty G. (ed.) (2012) *Routledge Handbook of Cosmopolitanism Studies*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Durkheim E. (1965) *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, New York: Free Press.

Faist T. (2013) Transnationalism. *Routledge International Handbook on Migration Studies* (eds. S. J. Gold, S. J. Nawyn), Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 449–460.

Filippov A. (2012) Mobil'nost i solidarnost. Stat'ja vtoraja [Mobility and Solidarity. Second Article]. *Russian Sociological Review*, vol. 11, no 1, pp. 19–39.

Glick-Schiller, N., Darieva T., Gruner-Domic S. (2011) Defining Cosmopolitan Sociability in a Transnational Age: An Introduction. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 34, no 3, pp. 399–417.

Gregory S. (1983) A Quantitative Analysis of Temporal Symmetry in Microsocial Relations. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 48, no 1, pp. 129–135.

Gregory S., Webster S. (1996) A Nonverbal Signal in Voices of Interview Partners Effectively Predicts Communication Accommodation and Social Status Perceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 70, no 6, pp. 1231–1240.

Hester S., Eglin P. (eds.) (1997) *Culture in Action: Studies in Membership Categorization Analysis*, Washington: University Press of America.

Hilbert R. (1990) Ethnomethodology and the Micro-Macro Order. *American Sociological Review*, vol. 55, no 6, pp. 794–808.

Hilbert R. (1992) *The Classical Roots of Ethnomethodology: Durkheim, Weber, and Garfinkel*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Hüwelmeier G. (2011) Socialist Cosmopolitanism Meets Global Pentecostalism: Charismatic Christianity Among Vietnamese Migrants in Germany. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 34, no 3, pp. 436–453.

Korbut A. (2014) The Idea of Constitutive Order in Ethnomethodology. *European Journal of Social Theory*, vol. 17, no 4, pp. 479–496.

Kothari U. (2008) Global Peddlers and Local Networks: Migrant Cosmopolitanisms. *Environment and Planning Developments*, vol. 26, no 3, pp. 500–516.

Leaper G. (2000) *Categories in Text and Talk: A Practical Introduction to Categorization Analysis*, London: SAGE.

Leitner H., Peck J., Sheppard E. (eds.) (2007) Contesting Urban Futures: Decentering Neoliberalism. *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers* (eds. H. Leitner, J. Peck, E. Sheppard), New York: Guilford Press, pp. 1–25.

Levitt P. (2001) *The Transnational Villagers*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Massey D. (2005) *For Space*, London: SAGE.

Ni M. (2017). Transnatsionalizm i povsednevnyy kosmopolitizm v optike mikrosotsiologii [Transnationalism and Everyday Cosmopolitanism through the Optics of Microsociology]. *Sovremennye problemy issledovanij transnacionalizma i migracii* [Current Issues in Transnationalism and Migration Studies] (eds. A. Rezaev, P. Kivisto), Saint Petersburg: Skifiya-Print, pp. 101–119.

Nussbaum M. C. (1994) Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism. *Boston Review*, vol. 19, no 5, pp. 3–6.

Rawls A. W. (1989) Language, Self and Social Order: A Reformulation of Goffman and Sacks. *Human Studies*, vol. 12, no 1–2, pp. 147–172.

Sacks H. (1972) An Initial Investigation of the Usability of Conversational Data for Doing Sociology. *Studies in Social Interaction* (ed. D. Sudnow) New York: Free Press, pp. 31–74.

Simmel G. (1971) *On Individuality and Social Forms* (ed. D. Levine), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Turner J. H., Stets, Jan E. (eds.) (2006) *Handbook of the Sociology of Emotions*, New York: Springer.

Van Der Veer P. (2002) *Colonial Cosmopolitanism, Conceiving Cosmopolitanism: Theory, Context and Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Urry J. (2010) Mobile Sociology. *British Journal of Sociology*, vol. 51, no s1, pp. 185–203.

Zimmerman D, Pollner M. (1970) The Everyday World as a Phenomenon. *Understanding Everyday Life: Towards a Reconstruction of Sociological Knowledge* (ed. J. D. Douglas), London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, pp. 80–103.

Перспективы интеракционистского анализа в современных миграционных исследованиях: случай «космополитического общения»

Максим Ни

Младший научный сотрудник Международной лаборатории «Транснационализм и миграционные процессы» Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета

Адрес: Университетская набережная, д. 13Б, Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация 199034

E-mail: jintae@mail.ru

Павел Лисицын
Кандидат социологических наук, доцент кафедры сравнительной социологии факультета социологии Санкт-Петербургского государственного экономического университета
Старший научный сотрудник Международной лаборатории «Транснационализм и миграционные процессы» Санкт-Петербургского государственного университета
Адрес: Университетская набережная, д. 13Б, Санкт-Петербург, Российская Федерация 199034
E-mail: fox_sociology@mail.ru

В статье делается попытка пересмотра концепции космополитического общения (cosmopolitan sociability) с интеракционистских позиций. Термин «космополитическое общение» был предложен Ниной Глик-Шиллер для анализа современных миграционных процессов. Он характеризует формы интеграции мигрантов, которые основаны на открытости и общечеловеческих компетенциях и не предполагают жёсткой связки с этнической принадлежностью или гражданством. Однако концепция космополитического общения не уделяет достаточного внимания тому, как именно возникает и воспроизводится космополитическое общение на уровне конкретных ситуаций повседневного взаимодействия. Мы стремимся заполнить данную лакуну через обращение к этнометодологической традиции анализа категоризации членства, а также к теории ритуалов взаимодействия Рэндалла Коллинза. Этнометодологическая традиция рассматривает взаимное определение того, что происходит в конкретных ситуациях взаимодействия, что дает возможность анализировать устойчивость отношений в рамках космополитических взаимодействий и конкретный моральный порядок, который воспроизводится внутри них. Кроме того, этнометодологический анализ позволяет выявить контексты, в которых космополитическое общение способно/не способно возникнуть. В свою очередь, теория ритуалов взаимодействия рассматривает ситуационные солидарности и групповые символы, возникающие в повседневных взаимодействиях. Она также предоставляет концептуальные ресурсы для анализа влияния прошлого опыта людей (прошлых цепочек ритуалов взаимодействия) на степень их вовлеченности в космополитическое общение. Предложенный подход иллюстрируется на материалах включенного наблюдения за повседневными взаимодействиями трудовых мигрантов в Федеральной миграционной службе.

Ключевые слова: космополитическое общение, повседневный космополитизм, миграционные исследования, транснационализм, социальное взаимодействие, цепочки ритуалов взаимодействия, этнометодология, анализ категоризации членства