

(Re)thinking Transnationalism and Integration in the Digital Era: A Shift Towards Cosmopolitanism in the Study of International Migrations¹

Mihaela Nedelcu

University of Bern and University of Neuchâtel

Tonight, I'm babysitting. When my wife is home alone and has to cook, for example, she turns the camera on the children and goes down to the kitchen to take care of the meal. I keep an eye on them, and if one of them starts crying, I send her a text message. (Stefan², computer programmer, 43 years old)

Nowadays, using a camera to look after one's children is hardly out of the ordinary – or it would not be, if the Romanian computing professional in the opening quote were in the next room. But he is in his apartment in Toronto, several thousand kilometers away from his wife and sons, who are spending a few months in their second home in Romania. This is a telling story about how the Internet and other information and communication technologies (ICTs) are changing the transnational experiences of migrants and nonmigrants, creating the feeling of living in a smaller world.

¹ A previous version of this chapter was first published as “(Re)penser le transnationalisme et l'intégration à l'ère du numérique. Vers un tournant cosmopolitique dans l'étude des migrations internationales?”, in *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 26(2): 33–55. The author is grateful to *REMI*'s editor for permission to publish it in this book.

² Names cited have been changed.

Once seen as a “double absence” (“not here, nor there”) (Sayad 1999), the contemporary migrant is developing new ways of being together within a web of social ties that span borders. He is able to master new geographies of everyday life and strategically use his multiple belongings and identifications within a ubiquitous regime of co-presence engendered by the technological developments of the twenty-first century. In a world transformed by increasing various border-crossing mobilities and complex globalization processes, the digital revolution transforms in complex ways the dynamics of international migrations, by generating a multiplicity of flows characterized by the simultaneity and intensity of transnational exchanges. Indeed, the above quote by a Romanian migrant living in Switzerland illustrates the chasm between such modes of communication and early twentieth-century letters sent by the Polish peasant in the United States to stay in contact transnationally (Thomas and Znaniecki [1919] 1998), or the audio tapes with which Algerian migrants living in France used to communicate with relatives back home in the 1980s (Sayad 1985).

Today, the Internet facilitates the co-presence of mobile actors in multiple locations and allows the emergence of new transnational habitus. It also enhances new connected ways of mobilization and cohesion at a distance, although there are still many (unskilled) migrants that cannot benefit yet on a large scale from the digital revolution. These phenomena reflect into new power asymmetries and inequalities, while significantly transforming how individuals perceive their place in the world. The resulting social change reveals a new meaning of migrants’ transnational practices, as well as the challenges faced by host states and the policy projects they implement to integrate these migrants.

Complex and deep interconnections between global dynamics and local processes are part and parcel of this social change. This ontological reality challenges social sciences both theoretically and methodologically, as not only does globalization alter the relationship between nation-states and their societies, but it also changes societies from within, through what Ulrich Beck (2002) calls the “cosmopolitanization of nation-state societies.” Scholars that talk about a “mobility turn” in social sciences (Urry 2007; Hannam et al. 2006) consider mobility as the main new paradigmatic approach to study society and social transformation; that is, social scholars should adopt a mobile lens, one that “connects the analysis of different forms of travel, transport, and communications” (Urry 2007: 6).

As a primary form of border-crossing movements, international migration appears as a first-choice object to study through a “mobility lens.” Nevertheless, while the mobility paradigm is gaining momentum (Cresswell 2010), this chapter takes a different epistemological argument and aims at opening the way to a new (cosmopolitan) approach to transnationalism and migrant integration in the digital era. It argues that migration studies could make a significant contribution towards a post-nation epistemological shift when related to a broader debate of the “national” limits of social sciences’ conceptual tools. I will begin by unpacking the complexities of such a research perspective based on empirical considerations. Choosing ICTs as a lens through which transnational processes may be read, I will put specific focus on three types of technology: digital and satellite media, the Internet and computer-mediated communication, and mobile telephones. In line with the topic of this book, the study of the social impact of these technologies in migration context will open discussion on a different aspect of mobility paradigm, as “the more television, but also the mobile phone and the Internet, become part of the fittings of homes, the more the sociological categories of time, space, place, proximity and place change their meaning. Because this domestic information technology interior potentially makes those who are absent present, always and everywhere” (Beck 2002: 31).

Articulated around the banal cosmopolitanization of social life and the emergence of new transnational social habitus (Nedelcu 2012), the empirical evidence offers arguments for a critique of the limits to migration theory that methodological nationalism imposes. After a brief overview of the transnational studies approach, I propose to revisit the national–transnational nexus by putting into perspective the debate raised by Ulrich Beck’s “cosmopolitan vision” to reframe the question of transnationalism. By expanding on Beck’s general social theory (Beck 2006), which is based on a cosmopolitan and ambivalent “new social grammar,” I will set forth a new avenue for research that makes possible a doubly inclusive approach. This approach allows pushing past the limits of methodological nationalism and beyond traditional dichotomies such as mobile/sedentary, native/foreign, or included/excluded in order to provide a different explanation for the coexistence of local and particularistic movements with more global and universal orientations. In conclusion, I will sketch out the principal avenues for a new research approach to the study of international migrations.

Information and Communication Technologies - A New Key Reading of Transnational Migration

In 1994, in his book *Welcome to Cyberia*, Arturo Escobar [Q7.1] drew anthropologists' attention to the need for "cybercultural studies" that could describe, analyze, and help explain how our construction of reality is changed and negotiated by the adoption of ICTs at all levels of social life (Panagakos and Horst 2006). Pushing past the initial dialectic of technological and sociological determinism (Jouët 1992), numerous scholars have turned their attention to the impact of the Internet and online interactions on identity, order, and social control; the structure and dynamic of virtual communities; and forms and principles of collective action (Kollock and Smith 1999; Wellman and Haythornthwaite 2002; Wellman and Gulia 1999; Proulx and Latzko-Toth 2000; Miller 2011). Today, digital media, Internet-mediated communication, and so-called "virtual" practices cannot be dissociated from offline practices and from individuals' daily lives (Miller 2011; Miller and Slater 2000). De facto, intense online sociability also reinforces close-range social contacts and ties, and vice versa (Wellman and Gulia 1999; Wellman and Haythornthwaite 2002; Ellison et al. 2007).

This is particularly striking in the case of mobile individuals (Silverstone 2003) and migrant communities (Nedelcu 2003; 2009 [Q7.2]; 2010) who combine various modes of interaction, information, and long-distance and close-range communication to mobilize resources and weave a dense fabric of (transnational) social ties.

I will thus take a closer look at three technologies that have contributed to a profound transformation of the processes of identity (re)construction in migration, to the mixing of cultural models, and to the establishment of new relationships among immigrant and native populations, as well as to an intensification of transnational exchanges and flows. Namely: (1) digital and satellite media; (2) the Internet; and (3) mobile telephone communications.

Digital and satellite media

Starting in the 1990s, ethnic media burgeoned thanks to new digital compression technologies and the arrival of Ku-band satellites that could broadcast large numbers of radio and television channels. So-called "diaspora broadcasting" for "minority" and "delocalized" audiences grew exponentially (Karim 1999). What was the impact of such broadcasting on identity processes, on the

emergence of new “imagined communities” in the diaspora, and on migrants’ social cohesion, citizenship, and social integration?

Several studies report cultural changes brought about by expanded access to mass media (radio, television, and newspapers) produced and distributed in both host and origin countries. Asu Aksoy and Kevin Robins, in their study of the media and cultural practices of the Turkish diaspora in the United Kingdom, France, and Germany, show that satellite television systems make it possible for migrants to “routinely watch television from Turkey, and to be thereby in synchronized contact with everyday life and events in Turkey” (Aksoy and Robins 2002: 6). This possibility transforms the way in which separation and distance from the country of origin are experienced. Further, the authors deconstruct an approach that has been framed too “nationally,” intensifying fears that satellite broadcasting of Turkish television threatens efforts towards unity, cohesion, and integration in German society (Robins 2001). Such an approach emphasizes the emergence of a “global diaspora culture” in which ethnic, national, or religious identities tend to be reinforced and essentialized. By proposing a different reading of this “banal transnationalism” (Rigoni 2001), Aksoy and Robins (2002) show that, to the contrary, such television programming offers direct contact with the reality of life in Turkey, and, consequentially, provides “cultural demythologization” that balances and corrects conservative tendencies individuals may feel with regard to their cultural identity. Thus, migrants can develop a critical attitude toward their original cultural heritage (Robins 2001). Hence, culture emerges “as a way of thinking, not of belonging” (Robins 2001: 33). This approach offers an innovative research perspective that accounts for the experiences of the “empirical people,” going beyond the “fictive unity” (Robins 2001: 30–32) of the “imagined communities” (Anderson, 1991).

In her work on Turkish and Kurdish media in Europe, Isabelle Rigoni (2001) underlines the role of ethnic media in the exercise of “total citizenship,” defined as “a key word in debates over desirable combinations of rights, responsibilities and competences” (Rigoni 2002: 1). Among other things, she notes the role of satellite television programming in updating perceptions of “territorial, cultural, social, and political belonging,” and encouraging transnational practices among the second generation.

For parents of migrants who move abroad to join their children (“generation zero,” Nedelcu 2009b), satellite television also helps to overcome social exclusion in the host society. Called upon to care for their grandchildren, they are thrust into mobility without necessarily possessing adequate social and linguistic capacities. By listening to the radio, reading newspapers online

in their mother tongue and attentively following Romanian satellite television broadcasts, these migrants succeed in preserving sociocultural stability (Nedelcu 2009c; 2009b).

The Internet

Emailed photographs, webcam images, communication via MSN, Skype, work teleconferencing, and more recently, social network sites – all of these are examples of co-presence and continuous participation that allow users, however geographically distant they may be, to remain in phase with a given world from a sociocultural standpoint. Discussion forums and email have become the most rapid and inexpensive means to communicate with friends and relatives, whether in one's country of origin or spread out across the globe. They also allow expats to network. Romanian computer programmers, for example, have used the Internet, and in particular the website www.thebans.com, to create a central migratory platform for Romanian professionals in Canada, and a privileged tool for reproducing social capital and community grouping. Indeed, online migrant networks have served as a crucible for community, making it possible for migrants to acclimate from a distance to the realities of the host society and facilitating their integration into the Canadian job market. While helping new migrants to establish roots in the host society, this website also encouraged the reproduction of the culture of origin through the creation in Toronto of a Romanian association and a Romanian school (Nedelcu 2002, 2009).

ICTs also make it possible to act on and be present in the national space from a distance. Romanian academics have used the Internet to create an e-diaspora network, and contribute to public debates as full members of Romanian civil society. Their international expertise has allowed them to have a significant impact on the process of education and research reform in Romania (Nedelcu 2009a).

It is also worth noting that social ties among migrants and nonmigrants are currently undergoing a significant transformation as ICTs have set in motion complex processes of transnational socialization. Innovative practices offer a glimpse of changes in long-distance family dynamics. The following story evokes the emergence of a co-present world in which intergenerational ties between a grandmother in Romania and her granddaughter in Toronto are reproduced in a surprising manner:

When my mother-in-law goes to Romania and my daughter cannot go with her, we've found an ingenious way for them to spend time together. They daily connect via webcam and talk to each other; my mother-in-law helps her and keeps an eye on her when she does her homework. It's convenient, and comforting to us, because we know she's not getting into trouble at home; it's a way for us to keep an eye on her, as well. (computer programmer, 35 years old)

Thus, intergenerational transmission may be (re)produced across long distances in entirely new ways, leading to the emergence of new transnational habitus (Nedelcu 2009c; 2010; 2012). Henceforth the internet is a resource of sharing in everyday life in which geographical and emotional boundaries seem considerably to diminish; a Romanian migrant in Switzerland describes how communication with the family left back home evolved through ICT's daily use:

I am always online: while I am cooking, the webcam is on and we talk, I can look at them at odd moments [...] With my mother, I can talk and do other things, I plug in loudspeaker, I iron, I do the cleaning, I talk to her [...] It forms a part of my everyday life [...] I don't feel as if I had left Romania. I feel so close to them as I would live over there, as a unity. (female dentist, 40 years old)

Moreover, ICTs are no longer the exclusive domain of highly qualified migrants. They are used innovatively by broad categories of mobile populations, even as new inequalities – of access and of knowledge – are emerging that discriminate against migrants who lack computer literacy (e.g., those who are under-qualified, elderly, or come from Southern-hemisphere countries) (see Wellman and Haythornthwaite 2002; Georgiou 2005; Mattelart 2009). Indeed, several studies are showing that ICTs can be resources for migrants living in precarious situations; for example, the Internet has provided new spaces for social self-expression, struggle, and integration for marginalized migrant populations. It has become a community space for Ethiopian refugees in the United Kingdom (Georgiou 2002), for example, and was a new ground for activism in the Tunisian, Mauritian, and Chinese dissident communities (Egré 2002). Burmese refugees (mainly based in India and Thailand) have appropriated the Internet as a privileged space for their political activism; at the same time, it has also served to help reinforce their identity as refugees, by essentializing certain traits and values in exile (Baujard 2008).

The Internet has also allowed the Kurdish diaspora to reinforce a space for collective memory and to express its territorial claims (Georgiou 2002).

All of these examples demonstrate that poor, undereducated, and elderly migrants, as well as those living in highly precarious situations (socially, economically, or legally) can also appropriate and use sophisticated technologies.

Mobile telephones

Mobile telephones and inexpensive prepaid phone cards have an impact on reproducing social ties in migratory situations by adding to the “social glue” that binds transnational migrants to family, colleagues, and friends who have remained in the country of origin or who reside elsewhere in the world (Vertovec 2004b).

These technologies are often associated with private usages; nevertheless, they simultaneously penetrate the public and private spaces. Claire Scopsi (2004) has studied so-called “communication shops” in Paris, in particular in the Château Rouge neighborhood, which has a high concentration of immigrant populations concentrated around the *Marché Africain* (African Market). She has shown how “the trade in collective access to digital networks” which combines international phone service, mobile phone service, fax services, and Internet access, has participated in the constitution of a public space for migrants and in the development of transnational economic activity that reflects a “multifaceted vision of integration: conscious belonging to multiple geographic spaces that is constantly reactivated by contemporary communication technologies” (Scopsi 2004).

Dana Diminescu (2002) showed how undocumented African migrants in Paris made use of mobile phones as tools of mobilization for regularization; she also described the case of Romanian street vendors of newspapers for which mobile communication was the key for networking to find work. Heather Horst (2002), while investigating the lifestyles of Somali refugees in camps in Dadaab, in northeastern Kenya, discovered the role of mobile phones’ ICT in money transfers. The refugees relied on aid from support networks and “clan” solidarity. They received constant help from peers living abroad and in particular through a semiformal system of communications and banking services operating via phone, fax, and, more recently, text messages and emails (Horst 2002).

Compounding ICTs

Current advances in digital communications combining the Internet and mobile phone technologies have opened the way for new usages. Wireless connections have turned computers into portable communication tools; they have also facilitated online channels for interactive communication that are accessible through an ever-increasing number of devices. Mobile telephones are now as multifunctional as computers, providing continuous multimedia connectivity with which users can surf the web, check email, watch television, and access medical services. The resulting opportunities for mobile individuals to proliferate their ties to different worlds of belonging are becoming ever bigger.

New technologies also make it possible to reproduce interactions resembling face-to-face communication by combining written, vocal, and visual forms of expression. An interviewee in Toronto, for example, communicates with her sister via email and text message on a daily basis. They email each other every morning, and may send each other multiple text messages in the course of the day (often via the Internet to avoid expense) to share immediate feelings or offer a quick answer to a question. In this way, over a great distance, they reproduce and extend the complicity that has linked them since childhood. At the same time, audiovisual conversations over Skype bring together their extended family, spread out across Canada, Romania, the United States, and Switzerland. Family members may thus make quick collective decisions on family issues and problems, for example regarding aging parents (Nedelcu 2010). Are such delocalized “family councils” held in a virtual “non-space” a prototype for new transnational social structures? At the very least, we can affirm with some certainty that these new modes of interaction – through rapid, frequent communications – provide what Christian Licoppe calls a “connected presence.” “It is through the frequency and continuity of this flow – in which the fact of calling counts at least as much if not more than which is said, and which a presence is guaranteed by expressing a state, feeling or emotion rather than by constructing a shared experience through relating past events and giving one’s news – that the strength of the interlocutors’ mutual engagement in the relationship is guaranteed” (Licoppe 2004: 152).

Madianou and Miller (2012) have noticed the importance of the “shift towards a situation of multiple media”; they propose the concept of polymedia to capture, on the one hand, the “new emerging environment

proliferating communicative opportunities” and on the other hand, “the social and emotional consequences of choosing between a plurality of media rather than simply examining the particular features and affordances of each particular medium” (Madianou and Miller 2012: 8). These authors show “how the existence of multiple alternatives within an integrated communicative structure leads to a different environment for relationship themselves[Q7.3]” (Madianou and Miller 2012: 14). The compound use of ICTs thus constitutes an important strategy for “constructing or imagining a ‘connected relationship’, and enabling them to overlook their physical separation – even if only temporarily” (Wilding 2006: 132).

Unpacking Transnationalism: Complex Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives

For the past twenty years, studies of international migrations have been influenced by the paradigm of transnational mobility. The notion of transnationalism, most developed by American sociologists and anthropologists, points to the emergence of a “social process in which migrants establish social fields that cross geographic, cultural and political borders” (Glick-Schiller et al. 1992: ix). The migrants here are therefore “living lives across borders” (Grillo 2000). Their sociability networks weave a strong social fabric that stretches beyond national borders, inscribed – at the very least – in the host and home country (Potot 2007), while their identities are defined with regard to more than one nation-state (Glick-Schiller et al. 1994). This has given rise to new analytical models, as well as a resurgent interest in the use of older ideas, such as the diaspora, to describe new realities (Chivallon 2006; Schnapper 2001; Dufoix 2008). The transnational approach has also made it possible to deconstruct the image of the uprooted and “doubly absent” migrant (Sayad 1999), who, it was supposed, broke with the country of origin in order to assimilate with the host society. Instead, this approach highlights the virtues of imagining a “connected migrant” (Diminescu, 2005), one who is an actor in multiple exchanges between host and home society, flexible enough to switch between “here and there,” to alternate, and even to become co-present.

Nevertheless, migrant transnationalism is not a recent phenomenon (Thomas and Znaniecki [1919] 1998; Portes et al. 1999; Vertovec 1999; Schnapper 2001). Indeed, migratory movements, long-distance exchanges, and the multiple identifications of migrants pre-date the modern era and the political organization of the nation-state. However, in their contemporary

form, transnational practices largely benefit from contemporary technologies. The Internet, mobile telephones, and digital media have all engendered possibilities for co-presence that were difficult even to imagine few decades ago. They enabled new forms of migrant transnationalism characterized not only by the growing intensity of transnational exchanges and activities, but also by a ubiquitous system of communication that allows migrants to connect with multiple, geographically distant and culturally distinct worlds with which they identify and participate on a daily basis (Vertovec 2009; Nedelcu 2010). As a result, the intensity and the simultaneous nature of current, everyday transnational activity have led to the emergence of new ways of being in the world, as well as to the transformation of social structures and the emergence of transnational habitus (Vertovec 2004a; Nedelcu 2009c; 2010).

These new technological capabilities are transforming the significance of the territorial rooting of migrants' social life. Many migrants move easily within transnational social spaces and frame new social configurations by creating new social and political geographies. Online migrants thus embody many complexities resulting from the cosmopolitanization processes of interconnected social worlds: multiple, overlapping spaces of belonging; multipolar systems of references, loyalties, and identifications; increasingly complex citizenship regimes; interconnected lifestyles; and the ability to act at a distance in real time (Beck 2006; Nedelcu 2009[Q7.2]; 2010; Georgiou 2010[Q7.4]).

Integration projects and transnational projections of the nation-state

Transmigrants witness a tension between host states' expectations regarding their integration and "long-distance nationalism" that is maintained through forms of social and political participation in which they can engage from outside national borders (Glick-Schiller and Fouron 2001). This reality has caught the attention of countries of origin while raising concerns in host states. Until now, social scientists have taken a greater interest in the reactions of states of origin,³ which often revisit their policies to include citizens living

³ In order to account for the diversity of origin states' policies, Peggy Levitt and Nina Glick-Schiller (2003) propose the following typology: (1) The *transnational* nation-state, which treats emigrants as long-term, long-distance members: the state grants them double citizenship and their socio-economic and political participation is entirely taken into account in national policy; (2) the *strategic, selective* state which, while encouraging certain forms of long-distance nationalism, prefers to maintain full control of how its citizens are invested; and (3) the *disinterested* and *denouncing* state, which treats its citizens as non-nationals, and as even as deserters and traitors.

abroad (Guarnizo and Smith 1998). Numerous states have adapted legislative tools and extended their range of action through measures such as consular and ministerial reforms, new investment policies intended to attract emigrant funding and regulate emigrant remittances, extension of political rights through dual citizenship or dual nationality, extension of state protection and public services, implementation of policies intended to reinforce emigrants' sense of belonging, etc. (Levitt and Glick-Schiller 2003). Far from reflecting the dilution of the nation-state, these initiatives signal a redefinition of state prerogatives beyond territorial borders (Levitt and de la Dehesa 2003). This redefinition talks about "global nations' policies," "long-distance nationalism," "deterritorialized nations," "globalization of domestic politics," or "globalization of grassroots politics" (Glick-Schiller and Fouron 2001; Vertovec 2001; Glick-Schiller et al. 1994; Smith 1994).

Models implemented by host states to spur migrants' social and political integration often confront a broad range of transnational practices and modes of belonging. In reaction to this reality, most states fall back on valorizing national identity and reinforcing the instruments by which they control international migration. Their discourse may go as far as expressing fears that the effects of transnational allegiances threaten immigrants' assimilation and integration, and therefore jeopardize economic stability, cultural homogeneity, and social cohesion (Portes 1999).

While migrants' transnational practices challenge the national political sphere, one can nevertheless note a systematic absence of studies that examine the relationship between migrant transnationalism, politics, and civil society within host states (Waldinger and Fitzgerald 2004). This lack is manifest in the academic scholarship, which runs the risk of focusing exclusively on the positive effects experienced in areas of origin, at the expense of occluding changes to host spaces brought on by transnationalism. This observation raises a more general argument, which deplores the absence of a transnational political framework that would allow a different political approach to the question of migratory movements and individuals' dual or even more multiple loyalties (Beck 2006).

Methodological nationalism and the epistemological limits of migratory theories

The heuristic value of the transnational paradigm resides precisely in its ability to encapsulate the disconnection between state, national, cultural, and

geographical borders. Furthermore, by deconstructing the territorial equation between State, nation and society, transnational scholarship puts forward serious arguments for changing the lens through which social scientists perceive and analyze the world. As Andreas Wimmer and Nina Glick-Schiller observe, “we have been able to begin to analyze and discuss transnational migration and long distance nationalism because we have changed the lens through which we perceive and analyze the world” (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002: 322).

The debate surrounding the limits of methodological nationalism has expanded since the end of the 1990s, mainly within the Anglo-American and German academic communities (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002; Chernilo 2006; Levitt and Glick-Schiller 2003; Beck 2006; Sassen 2003). Methodological nationalism relies on the “territorialization of social science imaginary and the reduction of the analytical focus to the boundaries of the nation-state” (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002: 307). Social practices in spheres as diverse as production, culture, language, work, education, etc. are defined and standardized with regard to “their container,” the nation-state, and are at the least designed as “national” (Beck 2000). Nevertheless, the question arises of how to approach the plural identities, multiple allegiances, and transnational actions increasingly characterizing mobile lifestyles. Territorial correlation seems no longer to be a precondition for defining and expressing national belonging (Levitt and Glick-Schiller 2003; Faist 2000); transnationalism should be considered as an integral part of the process of redefining what is national. This approach marks an epistemological turning point in sociological research (Beck and Lau 2005).

The Epistemological Contribution of the Cosmopolitan Approach to the Sociology of (Transnational) Migrations

Academics seeking new interpretations of the transnationalization of the social life have focused on the articulation of regional dynamics within global processes (Wimmer and Glick-Schiller 2002; Levitt and de la Dehesa 2003), and on the production of the global in local contexts as well as at the core of national processes and institutions (Sassen 2003). Contrasting perspectives are produced as scales of observation alternate, placing the global and the local at two extremes of the same ontological continuum (Roudometof 2005; Sassen 2003). Not only does globalization alter the relationship between nation-states and their societies, but it also changes societies from within, through what

Ulrich Beck (2002) calls the “cosmopolitanization of nation-state societies.” This transformation highlights the importance of the local/sub-national scale in the analysis of global phenomena, since a large number of institutional components – identified as national from a national perspective – are operating grounds for dynamics previously identified as global. Saskia Sassen calls this process “denationalization,” and points to the heuristic limits of conceptualizing the local within a pyramidal hierarchy of scales (local → regional → national → global) based on the criteria of physical and/or geographical proximity (Sassen 2003).

Ulrich Beck (2006) takes another epistemological approach, arguing for a cosmopolitan sociology that would push beyond the dualizing opposition of the nation-state and the inter/trans/multi-national. “Politically ambivalent, reflexive” (Beck 2006: 23), and “vernacular” (Werbner 2006), the cosmopolitan perspective is based on the principle of “additive inclusion” – “both [...] and [...],” rather than “either [...] or” – or, put another way, on “including the other’s difference,” or “the other’s otherness.” Oppositions such as national/international, and within/outside are thus supplanted by the idea of cumulative order. The internalization of difference and otherness makes possible the coexistence of global and local dynamics, as well as nationalist and transnational orientations. It produces a pluralistic vision of belonging that takes into account the possibility of occupying different social positions in relation to different national societies. In this way, “the cosmopolitan model is about being equal and being different at the same time. This is the ‘cosmopolitan grammar;’ it’s not about saying, there is no longer distinction between us and them” (Rantanen 2005: 258). This approach aims at providing a general theory that requires sociological concepts, methods, and traditional debates to be reformulated (Latour 2003). The key characteristic of this model resides in the dialogic imagination, that is, in the ability of social actors to creatively perceive and appropriate the contradictions and similarities of different cultures while at the same time contributing to the emergence of a new value, that of respecting others’ cultures (Beck 2006).

This “methodological cosmopolitanism” (Beck and Sznaider 2010) is particularly inspiring when it comes to research on transnational migrations, and sheds new light on the multitude of interdependences that exist between states and individuals, at different levels and scales of aggregation. It provides an interesting alternative to “ethnocentric nationalism” and “particularist multiculturalism” (Vertovec 2001). It places the following concepts at the core of analysis: (1) internal globalization (Beck 2002), glocalization (Robertson 1994; Roudometof 2005), and cosmopolitanization (Beck 2002;

2006) of social reality expressed through the change in everyday life experienced by those exposed to global stimuli, whether or not they are transnational migrants; (2) emerging forms of transnational social life that create transnational social structures (transnational communities, transnational spaces, and social fields) and transnational habitus; (3) a continuum or spectrum of attitudes and positions with regard to these changes, with cosmopolitan attitudes at one end and local attitudes at the other, based on individuals' degree of openness to other cultures and of the strength of their cultural and territorial attachment to specific places, traditions, and institutions (Roudometof 2005; Beck 2006).

This sociological template seems particularly promising, and should lead to a better understanding of the consequences of glocalization processes on individual mobility and to a deeper comprehension of the multiform, multiscale interdependences created between migratory processes and globalization.

The Challenges of a Cosmopolitan Reading of Migrant Integration and Transnationalism in the Digital Era

The empirical data described in the first section of this chapter shows that the impact of ICTs on migratory processes and migrants' transnational practices is dialogic (Morin 1990); that is, it generates complex realities combining different, dual logics. These logics are based on complementary, contradictory, and even opposing principles, which "are not simply juxtaposed, but actually necessary to one another" (Morin 1990: 99). Indeed, ICTs may help preserve particularism and reinforce cultures and identities of origin while at the same time enabling a critical position with regard to these same cultures. They may help migrants understand their host society and integrate into it. ICTs also make it possible for migrants to create new ties with their places of origin; to engage in economic, social, and political activities in a transnational space; and to forge cosmopolitan identities.

This, however, raises new questions. How can the nation-state's ideal of homogeneity and cultural belonging be reconciled with transnational migrants' ability to move within widened social spaces, manipulate multiple identity references, and act beyond state borders? How can persisting tensions between migrant aspirations and practices, and between state principles and rationales be interpreted? What direction is the political project of migrant

integration taking, and what challenges do nation-states face in an era when many individuals live in a state of constant connection with the broader world?

From the cosmopolitan perspective, examining migrants' use of ICTs points towards a couple of key dimensions of the glocalization of social experiences and the transnationalization of social structures. First, this area of study raises the question of the transformation of the national sphere of social experience as well as the emergence of new transnational habitus. Globalization and localization are processes that feed one another and which result in significant shifts in relationships among individuals, job markets, nations, and state structures. The nation-state is no longer the unique repository for cultural norms and values, nor is it the sole regulator of social and political belonging. On the one hand, ICTs offer individuals the opportunity to appropriate cosmopolitan values, to develop deterritorialized biographies, and to act from a distance in real time. On the other, they make it possible to cultivate and defend particularist values and to continue identifying with a culture of origin while living in the broader world (Nedelcu 2009c). Cosmopolitan orientations thus appear at the same time that local rootedness is established (Gustafson 2009). However, this dialogical reality generates new social tensions, as well as mobilization against the changes brought about by this "internal globalization" (Beck 2002).

Second, the internal globalization questions immigration and integration policy with regard to the everyday practice of migrants as well as with regard to strategies of identity. It also returns the attention of political and academic communities to the question of global governance for migration. It highlights the need to define an overarching conceptual framework for the management of migratory movements, in order to balance the economic needs of markets with the expectations and well-being of migrants as well as the forms of inclusion and civil participation to which they have access. It is evident that mobility has become a major issue, one that "should mobilize all the actors involved in the management of migratory flows" (Badie et al. 2008: 60). Certain analysts are forecasting a path – as inevitable as it is inexorable – towards a "cosmopolitan integration [...] based on a paradigm shift in which diversity is the solution, rather than the problem" (Beck 2007).

Conclusion

Revisiting the national–transnational link from a cosmopolitan perspective, two important ideas come to light. First, migratory theories cannot be dissoci-

ated from broader epistemological debates. In this respect, the “cosmopolitan lens” and more specifically “methodological cosmopolitanism” seem to be heuristically interesting alternatives for the “mobility paradigm” when looking at the complexity of transnational dynamics within migration processes. Second, transnational processes and integration processes cannot be properly understood without taking into account their intrinsic dialogical interdependence (e.g., the coexistence of dual logics and processes that coexist, and even feed one another).

A cosmopolitan approach makes it possible to understand the dynamic propelling the emergence of public spheres that bring migrants and nonmigrants together around collective claims and demands, be they local or transnational. It also implies dismantling the binary opposition of the transnational paradigm and multicultural and assimilationist models (Vertovec 2004a; Portes 2001). This becomes possible by adopting a multi-perspectival, multiscale approach through which to “observe and investigate the boundary-transcending and boundary-effacing multi-perspectivalism of social and political agents through very different ‘lenses’. A single phenomenon, transnationality, for example, can, perhaps even must, be analyzed both locally and nationally and transnationally and trans-locally and globally” (Beck and Sznaider 2010: 398).

From this angle, using ICTs as a cosmopolitan lens for interpreting the articulation of integration and transnationalism opens up new avenues of research that can be organized into at least four main axes:

- Co-presence. The role of ICTs (internet, mobile phones, digital and satellite media) should be studied in relation to the densification of transnational social spaces and the emergence of new transnational habitus. What impact has been created on the appearance of co-present, connected, transnational, and even cosmopolitan lifestyles by the instantaneous nature of communications and long-distance social interactions’ new regimes of ubiquity? What forms of social reproduction and participation do ICTs encourage? How do they fashion the everyday lives of interconnected migrant and nonmigrant populations?

- *Multiple identities*. What impact do ICTs have on different forms of identification and identity construction in migratory situations? What meaning do migrants using ICTs assign to their transnational practices and how do they locate themselves with regard to their host and home societies? What effects do transnational dynamics mediated by ICTs have on nonmigrants? Do ICTs help essentialize feelings of belonging to a culture of origin, or, on the contrary, do they contribute to the emergence of a new kind of identification with a cosmopolitan culture?

– *Participation*. What modes of social, economic, and political participation do online migrants develop within the country of origin? As they encourage the consolidation of “nations unbound” (Basch et al. 1994), do transnational online practices hinder the acquisition of the skills needed for integration in the host country, or do they, on the contrary, make it possible for migrants to diversify their resources and to participate in all spheres of social, economic, and political life? What effects do transnational participative dynamics have on the world of nonmigrants?

– *The management of migration*. Do new alliances exist among actors able to participate in the global governance of migratory movements? What roles do ICTs play in controlling migratory flows? What changes can they bring about in the polarized relationships between northern- and southern-hemisphere countries? What future can be imagined for integration models while accounting for the cosmopolitanization of the everyday lives of migrant and nonmigrant populations?

These are questions that have only begun to be explored; yet they are crucial in researching international migrations, and presage much work and reflection in the years to come.

References

- Aksoy, A., and Robins, K. (2002) “Banal Transnationalism: The Difference that Television Makes,” Transnational Communities Programme (ESRC) Working Paper WPTC-02-08. <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk> (last accessed July 25, 2008).
- Anderson, B. (1991) *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Badie, B., Brauman, R., Decaux, E., Devin, G., and Wihtol de Wenden, C. (2008) *Pour un nouveau regard sur les migrations. Construire une gouvernance mondiale*. Paris: Découverte.
- Basch, L., Glick-Schiller, N., and Szanton Blanc, C. (1994) *Nations Unbound: Transnational Projects, Postcolonial Predicaments, and Deterritorialized Nation-States*. New York: Gordon and Breach.
- Baujard, J. (2008) “Identité ‘réfugié’, identité transversale. Les réfugiés à Delhi au sein des dynamiques institutionnelles, communautaires et associatives.” [Q7.5] <http://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-00350124/en/> (last accessed February 12, 2009).
- Beck, U. (2000) *What is Globalization?* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Beck, U. (2002) “The Cosmopolitan Society and Its Enemies,” *Theory, Culture & Society*, 19(1–2): 17–44.

- Beck, U. (2006) *Qu'est-ce que le cosmopolitisme*. Paris: Aubier.
- Beck, U. (2007) "Réinventer l'Europe. Une vision cosmopolite," *Cultures & Conflits*, 68: 17–29.
- Beck, U., and Lau, C. (2005) "Second Modernity as a Research Agenda: Theoretical and Empirical Explorations in the 'Meta-change' of modern society," *The British Journal of Sociology*, 56(4): 525–57.
- Beck, U., and Sznaider, N. (2010) "Unpacking Cosmopolitanism for the Social Sciences: A Research Agenda," *The British Journal of Sociology*, 61(3): 381–403.
- Chernilo, D. (2006) "Social Theory's Methodological Nationalism: Myth and Reality," *European Journal of Social Theory*, 9(1): 5–22.
- Chivallon, C. (2006) "Introduction – Diaspora: Ferveur académique autour d'un mot," in Berthomière, W. and Chivallon, C., eds., *Les diasporas dans le monde contemporain*, 15–27. Paris: Editions Karthala & MSHA.
- Cresswell, T. (2010) "Towards a Politics of Mobility," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28(1): 17–31.
- Diminescu, D. (2002) "L'usage du téléphone portable par les migrants en situation précaire," *Hommes et Migrations*, 1240: 66–79.
- Diminescu, D. (2005) "Le migrant connecté. Pour un manifeste épistémologique," *Migrations/Société*, 17(102): 275–92.
- Dufoix, S. (2008) *Diasporas*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Egré, P. (2002) "Internet, nouveau territoire de lutte pour les opposants politiques en exil," *Hommes et Migrations*, 1240: 53–61.
- Ellison, N. B., Steinfield, C., and Lampe, C. (2007) "The Benefits of Facebook 'Friends': Social Capital and College Students' Use of Online Social Network Sites," *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 12(4): article 1. <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol12/issue4/ellison.html>.
- Escobar, A. (1994) "Welcome to Cyberia: Notes on the Anthropology of Cyberspace," *Current Anthropology*, 35(3): 211–31.
- Faist, T. (2000) "Transnationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 23(2): 189–222.
- Georgiou, M. (2002) "Les diasporas en ligne, une expérience concrète de transnationalisme," *Hommes et Migrations*, 1240: 10–18.
- Georgiou, M. (2005) "Mapping Diasporic Media Cultures: A Transnational Cultural Approach to Exclusion," in Silverstone, R., ed., *Media, Technology and Everyday Life in Europe: From Information to Communication*, 33–53. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L., and Szanton Blanc, C. (1992) "Towards a Definition of 'Transnationalism': Introductory Remarks and Research Questions," in "Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 645: ix–xiv.

- Glick-Schiller, N., Basch, L., and Szanton Blanc, C. (1994) "From Immigrant to Transmigrant: Theorizing Transnational Migration," *Anthropological Quarterly*, 68(1): 48–63.
- Glick-Schiller, N., and Fouron, G. (2001) *George Woke Up Laughing: Long Distance Nationalism and the Search for Home*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Grillo, R. (2000) *Transmigration and Cultural Diversity in the Construction of Europe*. [Q7.6] <http://www.uoc.edu/web/cat/promocio/simposium/english/Grilloeng.rtf> (last accessed October 23, 2007).
- Guarnizo, L. E. (1997) "The Emergence of a Transnational Social Formation and the Mirage of Return among Dominican Transmigrants," *Identities*, 4(2): 281–322. [Q7.7]
- Guarnizo, L. E., and Smith, M.P. (1998) "The Locations of Transnationalism," in Guarnizo, L. E., and Smith, M. P., eds., *Transnationalism from Below*, 3–31. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Gustafson, P. (2009) "More Cosmopolitan, No Less Locals: The Orientations of International Travellers," *European Societies*, 11(1): 25–47.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., and Urry, J. (2006) "Editorial: Mobilities, Immobilities and Moorings," *Mobilities*, 1(1): 1–22.
- Horst, C. (2002) "Transnational Dialogues: Developing Ways to Do Research in a Diasporic Community," Transnational Communities Programme (ESRC) Working Paper WPTC-02-13. <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk> (last accessed August 1, 2008).
- Jouët, J. (1992) "Relecture de la société de l'information," in Chambat, P., ed., *Communication et lien social*, 177–90. Paris: Descartes.
- Karim, K. (1999) "From Ethnic Media to Global Media: Transnational Communication Networks among Diasporic Communities," Transnational Communities Programme (ESRC) Working Paper WPTC-99-02. <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk> (last accessed August 1, 2008).
- Kollock, P., and Smith, M. (1999) "Introduction: Communities in Cyberspace," in Smith, M., and Kollock, P., eds., *Communities in Cyberspace*, 3–25. London: Routledge.
- Latour, B. (2003) "Is Re-modernization Occurring – And If So, How to Prove It? A Commentary on Ulrich Beck," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 20(2): 35–48.
- Levitt, P. (1998) "Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion," *International Migration Review*, 32(4): 926–48. [Q7.8]
- Levitt, P., and de la Dehesa, R. (2003) "Transnational Migration and the Redefinition of the State: Variations and Explanations," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 26(4): 587–611.
- Levitt, P. and Glick-Schiller, N. (2003) "Transnational Perspectives on Migration: Conceptualizing Simultaneity," *International Migration Review* 38(3): 1002–39.
- Licoppe, C. (2004) "'Connected' Presence: The Emergence of a New Repertoire for Managing Social Relationships in a Changing Communication Technoscape," *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 22(1): 135–56.

- Madianou, M., and Miller, D. (2012) *Migration and New Media: Transnational Families and Polymedia*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Mattelart, T. (2009) “Les diasporas à l’heure des technologies de l’information et de la communication: petit état des saviors,” *tic&société*, 3(1–2): 11–57.
- Miller, D. (2011) *Tales from Facebook*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Miller, D., and Slater, D. (2000) *The Internet: An Ethnographic Approach*. Oxford and New York.
- Morin, E. (1990) *Introduction à la pensée complexe*. Paris: ESF.
- Nedelcu, M. (2002) “L’instrumentalisation de l’espace virtuel par une communauté de professionnels immigrés. Vers une nouvelle forme d’organisation diasporique?” *Autrepart*, 22: 147–65.
- Nedelcu, M. (2003) “Les technologies d’information et de communication: support de l’émergence d’une diaspora roumaine?” *Balkanologie*, VII(1): 43–63.
- Nedelcu, M. (2006) “Les nouvelles technologies, creuset d’une nouvelle dynamique diasporique des Roumains,” in Chivallon, C., and Berthomière, W., eds., *Les diasporas dans le monde contemporain*, 159–74. Paris: Coédition Karthala & MSHA. [Q7.9]
- Nedelcu, M. (2009a) “Du brain drain à l’e-diaspora: vers une nouvelle culture du lien à l’ère du numérique,” *tic&société*, 3(1–2): 152–73.
- Nedelcu, M. (2009b) “La génération zéro: du sédentaire à l’acteur circulant. Effets de mobilité sur la génération des parents des migrants roumains hautement qualifiés à Toronto à l’ère du numérique,” in Cortes, G. and Faret, L., eds., *Les circulations transnationales. Lire les turbulences migratoires contemporaines*, 187–98. Paris: Armand Colin.
- Nedelcu, M. (2009c) *Le migrant online. Nouveaux modèles migratoires à l’ère du numérique*. Paris: L’Harmattan.
- Nedelcu, M. (2010) “Les migrants online: identités, habitus transnationaux et nouveaux modèles du lien social à l’ère du numérique,” *Revue d’études comparatives Est-Ouest*, 41(4): 49–72.
- Nedelcu, M. (2012) “Migrants’ New Transnational Habitus: Rethinking Migration through a Cosmopolitan Lens in the Digital Age,” in “Digital Migrations and Diasporas,” special issue of *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(9): 1339–56.
- Panagakos, A., and Horst, H. (2006) “Return to Cyberia: Technology and the Social Worlds of Transnational Migrants,” *Global Networks*, 6(2): 109–24.
- Portes, A. (1999) “Conclusion: Towards a New World: The Origins and Effects of Transnational Activities,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 463–77.
- Portes, A. (2001) “Introduction: The Debates and Significance of Immigrant Transnationalism,” *Global Networks*, 1(3): 181–93.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E., and Landolt, P. (1999) “The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 217–337.

- Potot, S. (2007) *Vivre à l'Est, travailler à l'Ouest. Les routes roumaines de l'Europe*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Proulx, S., and Latzko-Toth, G. (2000) "La virtualité comme catégorie pour penser le social: l'usage de la notion de communauté virtuelle," *Sociologie et sociétés*, 32(2): 99–122.
- Rantanen, T. (2005) "Cosmopolitanization – Now! An Interview with Ulrich Beck," *Global Media and Communication*, 1(3): 247–63.
- Rigoni, I. (2001) "Les medias des migrants de Turquie en Europe," in Rigoni, I., and Blion, R., eds., *D'un voyage à l'autre. Des voix de l'immigration pour un développement pluriel*, 207–20. Paris: Karthala.
- Robertson, R. (1994) "Globalisation or Glocalization?" *The Journal of International Communication*, 1(1): 33–52.
- Robins, K. (2001) "Au-delà de la communauté imagine? Les médias transnationaux et les migrants turcs en Europe," *Réseaux*, 107: 20–39.
- Roudometof, V. (2005) "Transnationalism, Cosmopolitanism and Glocalization," *Current Sociology*, 53(1): 112–35.
- Sassen, S. (2003) "Globalization or Denationalization," *Review of International Political Economy*, 10(1): 1–22.
- Sayad, A. (1985) "Du message oral au message sur cassette: la communication avec l'absent," *Actes de la Recherche en Sciences Sociales*, 59: 61–73.
- Sayad, A. (1999) *La double absence. Des illusions de l'émigré aux souffrances de l'immigré*. Paris: Seuil.
- Schnapper, S. (2001) "De l'Etat-nation au monde transnational. Du sens et de l'utilité du concept de diaspora," *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 17(2): 9–36.
- Scopsi, C. (2004) "Représentations des TIC en milieu migrant: le cas des "boutiques de communication" de Château-Rouge." PhD thesis, Université Paris X – Nanterre. <http://www.clairescopsi.com/these> (last accessed November 28, 2009). [Q7.10]
- Silverstone, R. (2003) "Media and Technology in the Everyday Life of European Societies," EMTEL Thematic Report. <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/EMTEL> [Q7.11] (last accessed July 12, 2008).
- Silverstone, R. (2006) "Media and Communication in a Globalised World," in Barnett C., Robinson, J., and Rose, G., eds., *A Demanding World*, 55–102. Milton Keynes: The Open University. [Q7.12]
- Smith, M. P. (1994) "Can You Imagine? Transnational Migration and the Globalization of the Grassroots Politics," *Social Text*, 39: 15–33.
- Thomas, W., and Znaniecki, F. ([1919] 1998) *Le paysan polonais en Europe et en Amérique. Récit de vie d'un migrant*. Paris: Nathan.

- Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Vertovec, S. (1999) "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism," *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2): 447–62.
- Vertovec, S. (2001) "Transnational Challenges to the 'New' Multiculturalism," Transnational Communities Programme (ESRC) Working Paper WPTC-01-06. <http://www.transcomm.ox.ac.uk> (last accessed May 1, 2003).
- Vertovec, S. (2004a) "Trends and Impacts of Migrant Transnationalism," COMPAS Working Paper No. 3. Oxford: Centre on Migration, Policy and Society.
- Vertovec, S. (2004b) "Cheap Calls: The Social Glue of Migrant Transnationalism," *Global Networks*, 4: 219–24.
- Vertovec, S. (2009) *Transnationalism*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Vertovec, S., and Cohen, R. (2002) "Introduction," in Vertovec, S., and Cohen, R., eds., *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context and Practice*, 1–22. New York: Oxford University Press. [Q7.13]
- Waldinger, R. (2006) "Transnationalisme des immigrants et présence du passé," *Revue Européenne des Migrations Internationales*, 22(2): 23–41. [Q7.14]
- Waldinger, R., and Fitzgerald, D. (2004) "Transnationalism in Question," *American Journal of Sociology*, 109(5): 1177–95.
- Wellman, B., and Gulia, M. (1999) "Net Surfers Don't Ride Alone: Virtual Communities as Communities," in Kollock, P., and Smith, M., eds., *Communities and Cyberspace*, 167–94. New York: Routledge.
- Wellman, B., and Haythornthwaite, C. (2002) *The Internet in Everyday Life*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Werbner, P. (2006) "Vernacular Cosmopolitanism," *Theory, Culture & Society*, 23(2–3): 496–98.
- Wilding, R. (2006) "'Virtual' Intimacies? Families Communicating across Transnational Contexts," *Global Networks*, 6(2): 125–42.
- Wimmer, A., and Glick-Schiller, N. (2002) "Methodological Nationalism and Beyond: Nation-State Building, Migration and the Social Sciences," *Global Networks*, 2(4): 301–34.