



Max Planck Institute for the Study of
Religious and Ethnic Diversity

Max-Planck-Institut zur Erforschung multireligiöser
und multiethnischer Gesellschaften

MMG Working Paper 13-10 • ISSN 2192-2357

LAAVANYA KATHIRAVELU

Friendship and the urban encounter:
towards a research agenda



Laavanya Kathiravelu
Friendship and the urban encounter: towards a research agenda

MMG Working Paper 13-10

Max-Planck-Institut zur Erforschung multireligiöser und multiethnischer Gesellschaften,
Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity
Göttingen

© 2013 by the author

ISSN 2192-2357 (MMG Working Papers Print)

Working Papers are the work of staff members as well as visitors to the Institute's events. The analyses and opinions presented in the papers do not reflect those of the Institute but are those of the author alone.

Download: www.mmg.mpg.de/workingpapers

MPI zur Erforschung multireligiöser und multiethnischer Gesellschaften
MPI for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, Göttingen
Hermann-Föge-Weg 11, 37073 Göttingen, Germany
Tel.: +49 (551) 4956 - 0
Fax: +49 (551) 4956 - 170

www.mmg.mpg.de

info@mmg.mpg.de

Abstract

The study of diverse and multicultural cities has gained considerable interest, reflecting a growing concern with migrant populations and the implications of ‘strangers’ in crowded urban societies. In this literature, one of the key considerations centers around understanding how ethnically, linguistically and culturally diverse peoples “rub along” and live together in tight and dense metropolises. One strand of this research is interested in the everyday encounter – ranging from the fleeting non-verbal to more sustained engagements over longer periods of time. Despite growing interest in the mundane and quotidian, friendship as a form of social relation and interaction has been largely unexamined.

While research on friendship as a significant social phenomenon has been limited, this paper’s intention is not to urge a general resurgence in the literature. Instead, it posits that friendship ties interrogated in conjunction with understandings of the diverse city, offer innovative ways to understand the urban politics of co-existence. Following Amin’s (2012) recent work, this paper sees friendship networks as social ties that make possible a functioning, yet convivial, society of strangers. Friendships, in this sense, are seen as tangible ways in which the larger “urban unconscious” can be felt, linking the intimate sphere of private lives and relationships with a public urban commons.

Secondly, the paper suggests that friendship can be viewed as a ritualised form of convivial cohabitation in its enactment. This ritual seems to structure the urban environment in ways that the environment itself then seems to be the source of the ritual and associated positive affects. The city is thus seen as a more convivial space because of the ritualised friendships that residents enact in it. In this way, friendship can function simultaneously as the site and enabler of a “plural communal” (Amin 2012: 79), where relations are relatively egalitarian and civil, but also pleasurable.

In doing this, the paper urges that the geographical literature around the politics and spatiality of quotidian encounter should be brought together with more sociological understandings of relationships, networks and ties built on trust, respect and reciprocity. It does so in order to initiate a research agenda around the social and spatial configurations of friendship, which are suggested to have implications for urban dwellers’ experiences of city life, and in opening up potentialities for new ways of living together with diversity. Finally, it is suggested that increased ethnographic attention be paid to already-existing strands of research that could merit from a

greater focus on friendship. In doing so, this paper aims to make contributions to contemporary understandings of everyday encounters in the diverse city, as well as further debates on the potential convivialities of dense urban spaces.

Author

LAAVANYA KATHIRAVELU is currently a Research Fellow at the Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity, working on the GlobalDiversities project, a multi-sited comparative interrogation of urban diversity. Her previous research explored labour migration and city-building processes in the Gulf emirate of Dubai.

kathiravelu@mmg.mpg.de

Contents

Introduction: identifying a gap in the field	7
Defining urban friendship networks: communities of convenience	10
Friendship as public/private mediator	12
Friendship as Ritualized Conviviality	14
Conclusion: strategies for future research.....	16
Bibliography	17

Introduction: identifying a gap in the field

Migration, diversity, and, despite reports of its demise, multiculturalism, still dominate much debate in the social sciences as well as amongst policy makers in a range of countries and contexts (Vertovec 2007; Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010; Martineau 2012). These preoccupations point to an ongoing examination and keen reflexivity over understanding how diverse people live together in relative harmony, despite differences. Within this complex and varied research landscape, much attention has been paid to how heterogeneous individuals interact in urban areas, conceptualised as the primary geographical zone of everyday diversity. This research ranges from studies of fleeting encounters in public spaces, to more sustained interactions in schools, housing estates and workplaces (Amin 2002; Wise and Velayutham 2009). Within this spectrum of analysis, however, the study of friendship as a form of social interaction has been largely neglected. The circumstances, conditions and barriers under which friendships are formed, encouraged, sustained and dismantled have not been sufficiently studied. In the everyday enactments of friendships, the affective registers, 'atmospheres' and emotions that surround them have also not received adequate attention (see Bunnell, Yea et al. 2012; Cronin 2013). In encouraging further research along these lines, this paper suggests, following the work of Ash Amin (2012) and Nigel Thrift (2005), that the examination of friendship networks between different as well as similar urban residents provides insights not just into the everyday functioning of cities, but also indicates an already-existing convivial urban commons. In other words, friendship relations are part of an expansive public sphere that is cooperatively built. Friendship can then work dually – as a lens through which we can understand how diverse cities work, but also as an example of a site for plural and pleasurable interactions. I do not provide any original empirical material in the context of this paper, but merely want to suggest a conceptual starting point for further research on friendship within diverse urban contexts.

Much contemporary social science research has perceived friendship as structurally insignificant in the study of the urban. It is seen as a social phenomenon that is situated within the realm of the intimate (Adams and Allan 1998; Pahl 2000; Eve 2002), more relevant to understanding processes of individual identity formation, and thus removed from workings of the larger urban public sphere. Conceived as firmly within the remit of private interpersonal relations, this perspective has not considered friendship as an appropriate lens through which broader outcomes about metropolitan life can be read.

Other research links friendship to the broader literature around social capital in discussing issues of embeddedness, composition and density of social networks depending on individuals' stage in the life course, gender, class position and marriage status, amongst other variables. Much of this work is also interested in migrants' friendships in terms of access to networks in the migration process as well as during settlement in the host country (Feld and Carter 1998; Warr 2005; Ryan, Sales et al. 2008; Windzio 2012)(de Regt 2008; Johnson 2010). This strand of research is useful in describing friendships' utility within certain contexts, and is perhaps the most fertile area from which deeper and more meaningful analyses of urban friendships can be excavated. However, the study of migrant friendship networks is still lacking in terms of interrogating encounters between ethnically and culturally different peoples, including between migrants and native-born, nor does it adequately take into account the role of affect or emotion in such relationships. The field of social capital, while aiming to codify friendships as a type of network, struggles to deal comprehensively with the messiness and dynamism of such quotidian constructions. This paper thus urges for research on friendship to move beyond the conceptualisation in terms of social networks or capital. There is a range of research emerging, which attempts this in relation to the urban condition.

Bunnell et al's (2012) paper is one of several exceptions that acknowledges the phenomena of friendship as having analytical purchase within the study of the urban. It not only traces the long genealogy of friendship as a concept in the social sciences, but provides a thorough review of the literature around this topic. The key contribution of the text is in identifying friendship relations as relevant for geographers in pushing the boundaries of certain areas of inquiry – namely in understandings of affect, childhood and transnationalism. Bunnell et al's work can be classified together with the writing of Amin (2012) and Thrift (2005) as part of a growing body of scholarship that sees friendship's potentiality to generate sustainable social ties within a city of different and diverse peoples. Katie Walsh's (2007) ethnographic analysis on the seeking of friendship by middle-class British migrants in Dubai is another exception. She points out that friendship is an understudied form of intimacy, which sheds light on the more emotional aspects of social life, especially within the context of transnational migration. In a similar vein, Mallory's (2012) work, though interested more specifically in political friendships, is indicative of the shift in seeing the structural significance of friendship for social relations within a larger political sphere. In these works, it is not just friendship that is conceptually foregrounded, but

the affective dimensions emphasized, along with its structural importance beyond understandings of individual social identity.

A number of other texts, while not explicitly drawing out friendship networks as an important aspect of multicultural city living, do allude to their significance within the larger urban. Examples of already existing literature that mentions friendship networks as examples of functioning conviviality in urban areas include descriptions of shopkeepers in Birmingham who rely on friends to run the business when they fall ill (Karner and Parker 2011), domestic workers in Beirut who exchange information surreptitiously through fleeting encounters on balconies (Pande 2012) and middle class Filipinos in Saudi Arabia who sustain friendships with socially isolated domestic workers in the city through the organisation of informal gatherings on weekends and holidays (Johnson 2010). Friendship, however, can also be found in situations of conflict and violence, as work by Jensen (2008) amongst gang members in a South African township demonstrates. These papers point to the existence of friendships in a range of localised encounters, but needs more focused attention and further fleshing out of its importance as a conduit for convivial relations within those situations.

Research on homosociality [see for example (Osella and Osella 2000; Khalaf 2010)] – particularly the tight social bonds between working class men can also be seen as a fruitful space through which we can understand friendship networks. Here is another area of research that can benefit from closer analysis of how friendship provides necessary practical and emotional support networks to marginalised urban residents. My own work around informal solidarities and rotating credit unions of working class migrant men in Dubai provides evidence of this (Kathiravelu 2012). More than just utilitarian, these relationships between low wage migrant men also serve affective and psychological needs of nurture and support in urban environments that are often alienating and extremely exploitative.

It is within these contexts, of already existing research on the social networks of friendship that this paper urges researchers to consider, through empirical investigation, the implications of friendship more carefully. Although the research highlighted above is indicative of increased attention to friendship as a social phenomenon, this paper urges that a more sustained and directed engagement with the networks of urban friendship is necessary in order to unpack the possibilities it offers in understanding how urban conviviality exists. In that vein, this paper also urges the bringing together of two discipline-delineated literatures – the first which is interested in the

material spaces and spatialities¹ of everyday interaction (Huang and Douglass 2009), together with research that focuses on the intersections of race and class (DeFina and Hannon 2009; Deener 2010; Britton 2011) in considering the propensity for convivial social relations. Friendship should be understood as a socio-spatial phenomenon and requires taking into account both the ways in which urban space directs and shapes possibilities of certain affiliations, as well as how deeply embedded power structures and historical cleavages presuppose or make difficult connections. Understanding friendships within the context of urban encounter is about relationships enacted in a particular time-space.

Defining urban friendship networks: communities of convenience

How can we define friendship? Is friendship substantively different to other forms of social ties or social capital? Are we needlessly creating a new term where ones like “community”, “networks” and “affiliations” already serve the same ends? This paper argues that friendship does have conceptual validity and use as a unique idea, for two interrelated reasons, discussed in the following sections of this paper. However, first, I attempt to come to a working definition of friendship that is appropriate to our study of urban encounters.

There have been various definitions of friendship, ranging from the more normative and idealistic Aristotelian conceptions to ones that conceive of friendship relations as not necessarily egalitarian nor completely voluntary (Feld and Carter 1998; Pahl 2000; Adams and Ueno 2007). The use of the term friend is also one that varies with context; some using it only to refer to intimates, while others characterise acquaintances and “mates” as friends. Within the context of understanding friendship’s relevance in urban encounter, I suggest that a broader and more inclusive definition of friendship may be more appropriate, starting from informants’ characterisations, although these are often complex and layered. A more embracive conception of friendship also allows for the intricacies of the concept from non-Anglophone contexts to be explored, where, for instance, where kinship may not be mutually exclusive from friend relations (Pelican 2012). Here, we are interested in the performance, the *doing* of friendship – at the moment of enactment. And so I propose a notion of friendship that emerges from the encounter.

1 Spatialities here can be seen as differentiated from space in referring to lived space; how space is experienced and encountered.

I thus move away from more utopian and idealistic conceptions of friendship, and attempt to conceptualise friendship as it actually exists – as not necessarily egalitarian or uncorrupted. Within the purposes of a discussion around interpersonal urban relations, friendship can then be seen as an expression of community, but also one that ebbs and flows depending on the context; a community of convenience. The understanding of friendship as “communities of convenience” is a practical one, where the utility of the relationship is a significant component of the friendship. This instrumental aspect of friendship is typically foregrounded in contexts of economic hardship and resource scarcity, for example in poor Black neighbourhoods in the United States (Adams and Allan 1998: 9), or in Soviet Russia, where well-placed friends were a means to get to items otherwise unavailable (Pahl 2000). In speaking about the utility of friendships though, I wish to avoid delving into discussions of bridging and bonding capital, for this is not the intention of this paper. However, acknowledging an instrumental component in definitions of friendship allows the incorporation of more working class notions of friendship or “mateship”. Scholars such as Allan (1998) have pointed out how conceptions of friendship in particular regions and linguistic contexts are more sympathetic to middle class notions of sociality, which emphasize the significance of the relationship over the activities that friends may meet over. Similar working-class affiliations are activity-based with relationships not taken out of the sphere within which they were initially formed. This “foci” or sphere of friendship formation and enactment is important (Feld and Carter 1998), especially in understandings the relationship within the context of urban encounters.

Friendship networks then do not have to imply strong ties, but loose and elastic ones, that come into play and stretch or tighten with changes in circumstances, mobility and geographical distance. Friendships range across levels of intimacy, from that of close dyadic relationships that involve similar or shared life experiences and shared geographies, to those that evolve within a short time-space, around a particular activity or area. This mode of friendship, despite the element of utilitarianism, does not see people merely as “infrastructure” (Simone 2004) and thus is not the “tactical cosmopolitanism” (Landau and Freemantle 2009) employed by African migrants, nor the “everyday multiculturalism” (Wise 2007) of suburban Australians, as it involves interpersonal ties that are deeper than mere civility², but also importantly, pleasurable. It is the affective and emotional nature of the relation between

2 Describing a form of civility, Sennett explains it as a mode “in which we feel easy with others physically as well as mentally, because we aren’t forcing ourselves on them” (Sennett 2012: 211).

friends that brings pleasure. This is cognizant with Thrift's "light touch model" (2005) of urban intimacy where urban interactions such as friendship are situated around their pleasure-giving potential. Friendship, in this sense, is generally an enjoyable sociality, except in instances when it turns exploitative, for example in situations of co-ethnic exploitation by friends who act as brokers or agents for potential migrants (Lindquist 2012). Here is where the bond of friendship is tested, and infused with mistrust, although not always broken because of these manipulations.

Friendship then is not just an instrumental network, but it is where interaction is sought not just as a means, but also as a pleasurable end in itself. Communities of convenience – as a way of thinking about existing friendship ties and networks within a city thus conveys both the convivial communitarian aspect, as well as the utilitarian uses to which urban ties lend themselves.

Next, I suggest that interrogating friendship within diverse cities is useful in furthering our understandings of the urban condition in two aspects.

Friendship as public/private mediator

Much literature in urban studies is preoccupied with the transcendence and demarcation of boundaries between private, public and parochial not just in material, but also symbolic and relational spaces (see for example Colomina 1994; Fenton 2005; Low 2006a; Staeheli, Mitchell et al. 2009). Friendship exists across these various spheres; it is a private affiliation but typically seen as shaped by a politics that functions outside of it. Here I also extend that it should be seen simultaneously as a form of public membership; as a way to participate in the public sphere. Not only when friendship is enacted in public space, but also because of its implications for models of an inclusive citizenship and belonging that could transcend the lines of race, class, gender, or phenotype difference (amongst others).

In the writings of Jacques Derrida (2006), for example, friendship is conceptualised in both private and public terms. The public nature of friendships is seen as expressive of the wider political sphere, indicative of a fraternal equality under the law, while it is in private where difference is seen to be negotiated between diverse Others. The friend, in the public model, is a fellow citizen in a democratic republic, while in private, friends are indicators and affirmation of who we are, or not (Pahl 2000). For early theorists such as Mills and Wollstonecraft, friendship is the

way in which citizenship can be performed within a privatized home sphere (Fenton 2005); where larger national solidarities become part of an intimate zone. Although these can be argued to be different modes of friendship, they are built on a basis of trust, respect and reciprocity. In our considerations of friendship within the sphere of urban encounter, it is this mode of bridging of public and private perspectives that makes friendship a useful tool in the study of the urban.

Here, the public/private divide can be taken in two ways. On the one hand, private space can be seen as interior space where affect takes place, within an individual. Alternatively, private space can be interpreted as the physical space of the home (as opposed to an outside public arena). In the context of this discussion of friendship, I draw on both characterizations of private space. Friendship is indicative of affective relations, but also (as pointed out in the previous section), typically understood as performed within the spaces of the home. However, in situating friendship relations within the home, this division is blurred in the sense of the private home-space becoming a zone where public affiliations of citizenship and sociality are enacted. This presents, for example, an interesting prospect for the study of domestic spaces in Singapore, Hong Kong and the Arab Gulf states, where foreign domestic workers live within the spaces of the home, but who are considered neither members of the family, nor complete strangers (Huang, Yeoh et al. 2005). The divides between public and private are blurred, not just within the space of the home, but between relations between people sharing the same intimate space. The pseudo-friendships that service staff perform with customers can also be seen within this context, especially when they take place in a “third space” that elides zones of both work and leisure (McDowell 2005). Friendship is thus an element that when performed within particular spaces, has the propensity to (further) complicate their definition as wholly public or private. But beyond the destabilization of spatial boundaries, friendship is a relation that bears elements of both public and private forms of affinity. Finally, friendship could be a useful frame through which to investigate the possibilities of conviviality amidst the negotiation of difference and hierarchy, as with the case of domestic workers and within workplaces.

In then making the seemingly private spaces of friendship visible, we can examine if they do in fact merely reflect the boundaries and structures of public life in cities, or if they offer examples and possibilities of transcending those divisions, and building alternate solidarities. This does not always require access into everyday and intimate spaces of urban lives, as work by Pande (2012) on “balcony talk” and illegal migrant collectives demonstrates. Often, fleeting friendships are enacted in the

public and parochial spaces of cities like corridors, balconies and sidewalks. Despite the increased use of communicative tools such as email, texts and social networking technologies to maintain relationships, regular face-to-face contact is still seen as central in many urban residents' relationships. Discussion of friendships in the context of neighbourly encounters on the street, for example, are indicative of this (Heil 2012). Methodologically then, we can see that friendship infiltrates and is a part of the public life of cities that scholars already regularly examine.

Friendship as Ritualized Conviviality

In this section, I suggest that friendship can be seen as a social ritual – its repetitive nature and possibility to be transgressive mark it with the transformative potential that characterises ritualised behaviour. I first want to discuss, however, how friendship is an *affective* mode of ritual – where bodies are marked by particular affects and emotions in the performance of friendship. Cronin (2013), for example, points out in her research how friendships in workplaces are constituted *by* emotions. This crucial affective element of friend relations allows for us to better understand the more collective affective atmospheres and internal, and often invisible life of contemporary cities (c/f Bunnell, Yea et al. 2012). Relations between friends can be indicative of the ways in which the material and atmospheric elements of a city advance or discourage the expression of certain affective states. It is the combination of personal affect and emotions, together with larger structural affinities that affect the establishment of friendships. More research then also needs to be devoted to understanding these various dimensions of urban life – for they are also where a plural politics of convivial co-existence often resides and emerges from. However, emotional and affective elements are not easily interrogated, as they are often not on the 'surface' of urban life. Here, friendship may be an empirical entry point through which such research can be better accessed.

The conceptualisation of friendship as ritualised behaviour is one that also conveys the significance of friend relations in the making of a convivial urban sociality. Conviviality, here is an affect, a state of being – where diverse individuals live together in appreciation and tolerance of difference. The notion of conviviality here is drawn from Paul Gilroy's (2004) adaption of the concept of 'convivium'. The taken-for-grantedness and banality of conviviality, but also the "joyful appreciation" of this

living together with difference (Karner and Parker 2011: 360) is foregrounded in this characterisation of convivial relations. Friendship can thus be read as a ritualised form of the capacity to appreciate living with and in diversity. It is the banal and everyday enactments and performances of friendship – in the workplace with colleagues, in parks and corridors with neighbours – that this conviviality can be observed. In this way, we can then better identify both material and intangible factors that contribute to the sustenance of convivial relations. It is significant to note here that Gilroy's notion is a uniquely metropolitan one. The notion of conviviality that he identifies is tied up with urbanity in a multicultural society. Thus the role of the urban environment – including actors, architectural technologies and statist rhetoric – are seen as constitutive in the creation of the particular affect of conviviality. Affect, in this case, is thus seen as emerging from or dependent on multiple factors (Seyfert 2012).

Building on this understanding of friendship as an expression of convivial urban sociality, I suggest that friendship should be interrogated as a site for the formation of an egalitarian plural commons. Conviviality is often described as a characteristic of the everyday banal dealings with “commonplace diversity” (Wessendorf 2010). In this sense, friendships are not only indicative of or reducible to convivial social relations, but hold the potential for something more significant to occur. Following Simpson (2011), I suggest here that friendships can be indicative of the kind of “microsocial practices” that engender what Guattari terms a “process of heterogenesis” (2008), through which the potential for something different to emerge in everyday life appears. Friendship, in its ability to transcend entrenched boundaries and discriminations, is a site and social encounter that makes possible previously unconsidered socialities and configurations. We see this for instance in the crossing over of class boundaries in a highly stratified Gulf state like Saudi Arabia (Johnson and Werbner 2010), or the cooperative friendships of diverse strangers in working together towards a common goal (Sennett 2012). This, however, does not imply that all friendships possess this transgressive ability. Most friendship-based bonds reinforce rather than transcend difference. Researchers should be vigilant not to overstate the instances of non-traditional modes of friendship, or contextualise its potential significance.

Michel Foucault (1997), for example points out that friendship is an important social formation as it signifies the possibility of functioning outside normative discourses, that are not as easily possible within other relationships such as marriage or the nuclear family. Friendship is also often the basis of an informal solidarity, for example, of runaway migrant domestic workers who turn rented apartments in

Beirut into mobile counselling and mediation centres (Pande 2012); or of people of different age groups and ethnicities playing boules together in a public park (Wiesemann 2012). While being wary of overstating the potentially transformative power of friend relations, friendship can take the form of transgressive social ties that challenge norms of affiliation and contact. Friendships based along common interest groups and affinities outside prescribed notions of class, race or gender points us to possible ways in which dissimilar Others build bonds that, although sometimes fleeting, are based on principles of convivial co-existence.

Conclusion: strategies for future research

This paper thus far has attempted to urge scholars to turn the gaze more frequently and intensely on the enactment of friendship relations in contemporary diverse cities. It has first attempted to provide a working definition of urban friendship networks as “communities of convenience”. This characterization emphasizes the importance of both instrumental and pleasurable elements of friendships in contemporary cities. The paper has then gone on to show how such a focus on friendship is productive for two interrelated reasons. Firstly, friendship, is a productive lens through which we can unpack and interrogate the slippages and overlaps between private and public modes of affiliation. Secondly, friendship is an affective mode of interaction, and thus can be seen as a ritualised form of convivial relation. This also then suggests that friendship is a fertile space for the potential formation of a plural and egalitarian public sphere.

In conclusion, I point out that the methods for investigating the enactment of friendships are those that are already being employed by researchers. It is acknowledged, for example, that workplaces are where much socialisation occurs and friendships developed (Cronin 2013), especially for migrants (van Hoven and Meijering 2005). However, there are a dearth of studies that ethnographically unpack workplace relationships, and the outcomes for workers’ experiences of city life, beyond narrow understandings of efficiency and productivity. Thus, more focused ethnographic research on ordinary and banal friendships need to be explored as a means of thickening our understandings of diverse city life – part of thrashing out the complexities of everyday encounter that cannot be understood only through surveys and questionnaires. In being open to friendship’s emotional components, which

are important constitutive elements of the phenomenon, ethnographic writing and thick descriptions of urban encounters I suggest are the most effective ways in which researchers can convey atmospheres and affects. It is in unpacking the very *doing* of friendship that contributes to productive understandings. The friendships that many ethnographers develop with their informants are just one example of this, and also merit further examination. Much writing around friendship and contemporary conviviality in urban areas has been restricted to the UK and Western Europe, where these discourses are most dominant in Anglophone academia. Research on friendship as a mode of convivial co-existence should be broadened to include fast-growing urban centres in Asia, the Middle East and Africa.

While this essay does not aim to exhaustively describe friendship within urban contexts, it provides a starting point from which more directed research can take off. It remains then for urban scholars to more explicitly recognize elements of friendship in their research, and interrogate these social phenomena in conversation with broader understandings of the politics of living together in dense and diverse cities. This move opens up a sphere of investigation of a social phenomenon so central to many urban lives, but the importance of which has yet to be fully acknowledged.

Bibliography

- Adams, R. G. and G. Allan (1998). *Placing Friendship in context*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Allan, G. (1998). Friendship and the private sphere. *Placing Friendship in context*. R.G. Adams and G. Allan. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press: 71-91.
- Amin, A. (2002). "Ethnicity and the multicultural city: living with diversity." *Environment and Planning A* 34: 959-980.
- Amin, A. (2012). *Land of Strangers*. London, Polity.
- Britton, M. L. (2011). "Close Together but Worlds Apart? Residential Integration and Interethnic Friendship in Houston." *City & Community* 10(2): 182-204.
- Bunnell, T., S. Yea, et al. (2012). "Geographies of friendships." *Progress in Human Geography* 36(4): 490-507.
- Cronin, A. M. (2013). "Between friends: Making emotions intersubjectively." *Emotion, Space and Society* in press.
- de Regt, M. (2008). "High in the Hierarchy, Rich in Diversity: Asian Domestic Workers, Their Networks, and Employers' Preferences in Yemen." *Critical Asian Studies* 40(4): 587-608.
- Deener, A. (2010). "The 'black section' of the neighbourhood. Collective visibility and collective invisibility as sources of place identity." *Ethnography* 11(1): 45-67.

- DeFina, R. and L. Hannon (2009). "Diversity, Racial Threat and Metropolitan Housing Segregation." *Social Forces* 88(1): 373-394.
- Derrida, J. (2006). *The Politics of Friendship*. London, Verso.
- Fenton, L. (2005). "Citizenship in Private Space." *Space and Culture* 8(2): 180-192.
- Foucault, M. (1997). Friendship as a way of life. *Ethics: Subjectivity and Truth*. P. Rabinow. London, Penguin. 1: 135-140.
- Gilroy, P. (2004). *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture?* London, Routledge.
- Guattari, F. (2008). *The three ecologies*. London, Continuum.
- Heil, T. (2012). "Fragile convivialities: everyday living together in two stateless but diverse regions, Catalonia and Casamance." *MMG Working Paper* 12-18: 1-34.
- Huang, S., B. Yeoh, et al., Eds. (2005). *Asian Women as Transnational Domestic Workers*. Singapore, Marshall Cavendish Academic.
- Jensen, S. (2008). *Gangs, Politics & Dignity in Cape Town*. London, James Currey Publishers.
- Johnson, M. (2010). "Diasporic Dreams, Middle-Class Moralities and Migrant Domestic Workers Among Muslim Filipinos in Saudi Arabia." *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 11(3): 428-448.
- Johnson, M. and P. Werbner (2010). "Diasporic Encounters, Sacred Journeys: Ritual Normativity and the Religious Imagination Among International Asian Migrant Women." *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology* 11(3): 205-218.
- Karner, C. and D. Parker (2011). "Conviviality and Conflict: Pluralism, Resilience and Hope in Inner-City Birmingham." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 37(3): 355-372.
- Kathiravelu, L. (2012). "Social Networks in Dubai: Informal Solidarities in an Uncaring State." *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 33(1): 103-119.
- Khalaf, S. (2010). "Dubai Camel Market Transnational Workers: An Ethnographic Portrait." *City & Society* 22(1): 97-118.
- Landau, L. B. and I. Freemantle (2009). "Tactical Cosmopolitanism and Idioms of Belonging: Insertion and Self-Exclusion in Johannesburg." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(3): 375-390.
- Lindquist, J. (2012). "The Elementary School Teacher, the Thug and his Grandmother: Informal Brokers and Transnational Migration from Indonesia." *Pacific Affairs* 85(1): 69-89.
- Osella, F. and C. Osella (2000). "Migration, Money and Masculinity in Kerala." *The Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 6(1): 117-133.
- Pande, A. (2012). "From "Balcony Talk" and "Practical Prayers" to Illegal Collectives: Migrant Domestic Workers and Meso-Level Resistances in Lebanon." *Gender & Society* 26(3): 382-405.
- Pelican, M. (2012). "Friendship among pastoral fulbe in northwest cameroon." *African Study Monographs* 33(3): 165-188.
- Sennett, R. (2012). *Together: The Rituals, Pleasures and Politics of Cooperation*. London, Allen Lane.
- Seyfert, R. (2012). "Beyond Personal Feelings and Collective Emotions: Toward a Theory of Social Affect." *Theory, Culture & Society* 29(6): 27-46.
- Simone, A. (2004). "People as Infrastructure: Intersecting Fragments in Johannesburg." *Public Culture* 16(3): 407-429.
- Thrift, N. (2005). "But malice aforethought: cities and the natural history of hatred." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 30(2): 133-150.

- Walsh, K. (2007). "'It got very debauched, very Dubai!' Heterosexual intimacy amongst single British expatriates." *Social and Cultural Geography* 8(4): 507-533.
- Wessendorf, S. (2010). "Commonplace Diversity: Social Interactions in a Super-diverse Context." *MMG Working Paper* 10-11: 1-36.
- Wiesemann, L. (2012). "Public spaces, social interaction and the negotiation of difference." *MMG Working Paper* 12-08: 1-26.
- Wise, A. (2007). "Multiculturalism from Below: Transversal Crossings and Working Class Cosmopolitans." *Paper Presented at COMPAS Annual Conference (extended version)*.
- Wise, A. and S. Velayutham (2009). Introduction: Multiculturalism and Everyday Life. *Everyday Multiculturalism*. A. Wise and S. Velayutham. New York, Palgrave Macmillan: 1-20.

