

10

Technology, Place and Mediatized Cosmopolitanism

Miyase Christensen

1. Introduction

The past two decades of media and communication studies have been dominated by a research agenda marked by an overwhelming attention paid to two phenomena: technological change and globalization. The study of digitalization and personalization of technology, particularly in its earlier phase, focused primarily on the emancipatory potential of information and communication technologies, or ICTs (e.g., Plant, 1997; Splender, 1995). While later research incorporated a more down-to-earth appreciation of technology, technological determinism continues to be reinvoked by way of casting new media tools as powerful agents of social change. This leads to the production of reductionist visions, particularly during times of perceived technological breakthrough (such as the Arab Spring and the case of Wikileaks), and a narrow conception of the *mediatized worlds*, which we find ourselves in today. Likewise, earlier theories of globalization foregrounded mediated and imagined dimensions (e.g., Appadurai, 1996; Beck, 2004; Castells, 2012; Rantanen, 2005) as well as cultural fusion and flows, with material aspects and complexities of 'the everyday' often overlooked or underplayed. One reason for this is cookie-cutter approaches to both globalization and technological change. Another is lack of empirical studies to support grand theoretical claims.

Over the past ten years, attempts have been made to counter-balance deterministic or single-logic-based considerations of both globalization and media penetration with more context-specific paradigmatic interventions such as *transnationalism* (Khagram and Levitt, 2008; Vertovec, 1999; 2009) and *mediatization* (Hepp, 2010; Krotz, 2007), highlighting the meta-character of both processes. In various fields of the humanities and social sciences, the volume of research that addresses how socio-political and personal life are continuously transformed due to media saturation has been expanding

steadily. Everyday communication technologies such as mobile applications and online social networking have been the focus of many recent studies producing new insights. My own research on global mobility, space and mediatized worlds in Sweden revealed tensions ensuing from increased transnationality and migration. Such tensions manifest themselves in the form of both cultural interconnectivity and recognition, and closure and distrust in urban centres (Christensen, 2011; 2012).

With the aim of further nuancing ongoing debates on mediatization and globalization by way of contributing empirically based insights, in this chapter I will argue for a research agenda for a close study of mediatized lifeworlds. My analyses of globally mobile groups of people (e.g., labour and professional migrants) residing in Sweden, as well as of segments of the general population, point to the existence of social dynamics that yield a *mediatized cosmopolitanism* (or mediatized cosmopolitan worlds) that is simultaneously connected and divided. More specifically, I draw upon qualitative fieldwork conducted in Stockholm, independently and as part of research projects,¹ on urban populations and transnational migrants since 2008.

The projects and my individual studies have raised over-arching and specific questions, such as: what does the perspective of cosmopolitanism (Clifford, 1998; Stevenson, 2002; 2003) offer for the purposes of theoretically grasping both the constraints and opportunities offered by increased transnationality and mediated connectivity? Do intensified mediatization, mobility and connectivity with distant others translate into a normative change in our ethical horizons (that is, making us *either* more *or* less cosmopolitan), as has been suggested in literature (e.g., Rantanen, 2005; Robertson, 2010)? Where do we practically and epistemologically locate 'communicative practice' and 'networked sociality', and 'place' and 'technology'?²

It is impossible to conceive of cosmopolitanism(s) today without accounting for mediatized lifeworlds. Yet, while the intense mediatization of our worlds brings with it a *de facto* openness to and the possibility of connectivity with the *other* (cosmopolitanism), it also makes it possible to create mediated bubbles of closure, clash, monitoring and exclusivism as extensions of offline reality. This, in turn, necessitates considering both the *actual* and *virtual* dimensions (Morley, 2011), such as place and technology, of the meta-processes of globalization and mediatization. These processes produce various sorts of concord and dissonance, which are part and parcel of the open-ended futures brought about by cosmopolitanization.

The approach promoted here brings together Bourdieu's field theory and social phenomenology with the aim of achieving a more holistic understanding of the 'mediatized everyday'. While field theory helps to relate mediatization to certain sets of social practice and both intra-/inter-group relations, phenomenology helps to bring it down to the personal and

interpersonal levels. Further, in order to account for both macro and micro dimensions, a categorical distinction between *mediatization* and *mediation*, although they are conceptual products of the same epistemology, is utilized. Mediatization, in this context, denotes a socio-cultural meta-process whereby the media in their totality (forms, texts, technologies and institutions) saturate all spheres of life (cf. Krotz, 2007; 2008; Schulz, 2004), regardless of whether one uses a particular form of media (say, social media) or not. I take mediation, in a more confined sense here, to refer to specific everyday processes of media use, communicative practice and sociality, which bring with them both unity and cultural openness as well as division and *distinction*.

This volume is dedicated to exploring, from varied perspectives, how 'mediatization is interwoven with a changing social process of *constructing* the world'. Close scrutiny of mediatized life conditions in our societies today reveals how sociality and identity processes are unthinkable without considering both the material and symbolic dimensions of networked social connectivity and communication. While the materialistic basis of Bourdieuan sociology makes visible the internal and external group dynamics and power geometries that are *reconstructed* by transnationalization and mediatization, a phenomenological approach helps to generate an *inside view* (Berger and Luckmann, 1967) to grasp current modes of communication and sense-making in certain settings in order to reveal positional particularities which are otherwise lost in the Bourdieuan model. Thus, phenomenology is instrumental in reminding us how social reality is not neutral or external, but continuously produced within the highly mediatized worlds of groups and individuals. Supported by an empirical backbone, this two-tiered framework allows a more rounded view of *mediatized cosmopolitanism* as it crystallizes in the everyday cultural realm of mediatized lifeworlds. Through this approach, the role of key components such as *technology* and *place* can also be better explicated rather than left implicit, and techno-determinism alleviated.

The discussion is put forward in two steps. In the first part, I seek to highlight the importance of thinking media change and the so-called transnational condition together with place and technology. I introduce cosmopolitanism as an analytical tool to account for institutional and spatial transformations that ostensibly cosmopolitanize social life, on the one hand, and identity processes, subjective positionalities and moral outlooks which are presumed to have gained a cosmopolitan character due to intense mediatization, on the other. Following from this, the second part offers reflections on the value of using Bourdieu's field theory and phenomenology (Berger and Luckmann, 1967; Ihde, 1990) together in understanding the interrelations between mediatization and the cultural vision of cosmopolitanism (*mediatized cosmopolitanism*). In the final part, I return to the prospects and challenges of addressing the cultural

dimensions of mediatization from a non-media-centric but technology- and place-conscious perspective.

2. Media and cultural cosmopolitanism in a transnational context

In considering the rapidly and radically diversifying nature of society and politics of the late 1980s/early 1990s, the globalization paradigm provided a discursive tool to frame the transformations in institutional, technological and cultural domains. The grandiose discourses, such as deterritorialization, borderless economy and cultural fusion, which ensued from this paradigm of change often glossed over continuities and socio-cultural particularities. The massive transformations in the media environment at this time (technological as well as economic convergence) and a mediated saturation of everyday life with global forms and content had clear linkages with the overall process of globalization. Media penetration was seen as both fuelling and emerging as a product of the spatialization of capitalism, making mediatization and globalization profoundly linked processes. While accurately capturing certain dimensions of institutional and technological change, *the real and the virtual* were dichotomized in some earlier discourses of globalization, producing a disconnect between the rhetoric of progress and the material reality of late capitalism. Such framings characterized by either instrumental or substantive understandings of technology to which I return, however, were also marked by determinism.

Over the past decade, to counter-balance the limitations of globalism, there has been a marked increase in references made to the 'transnational condition' and transnationalization of the media across social sciences and humanities. Unlike the generalistic rhetoric of the globalization paradigm, then, spatio-temporal and contextual specificity and 'difference' remain integral to social analysis in transnationalism (cf. Christensen, 2013b; Christensen and Jansson, 2011). The same is true for the non-deterministic theoretical interventions of 'mediatization' where it has been historically contextualized and construed as a complex meta-process rather than a singular logic (Hepp, 2010; Krotz, 2008).

Against this backdrop, there has been a noted increase in the publications that address various forms of cosmopolitanism (Brown and Held, 2011; Held, 2010, to name but a few). While transnationalism cannot be equated with cosmopolitanism, the increased interest in cosmopolitanism is, in many ways, linked with heightened mediatization and trans-border flows. In its simplest sense, cultural cosmopolitanism implies an openness towards the *Other* and ethically oriented self-reflexivity articulated as boundary-crossing and questioning of dominant categories. There are many different takes on cosmopolitanism, ranging from cultural to political cosmopolitanism(s) (see, e.g., Delanty, 2009), from Beck's (2004) visionary and philosophical

accounts to Hannerz's (1990) cosmopolitan competences; from Habermas' (2006) normatively defined cosmopolitan democracy and to more vernacular, practice-oriented cosmopolitanisms (e.g., Bhabha, 1996; Nava, 2007; Nowicka and Rovisco, 2009; Werbner, 1999).

Despite the fact that there are ideological/epistemological 'fault lines' (Hannerz, 2005) that divide cultural and political cosmopolitanists (see also Robertson, 2010), there are common questions born of mediatization which are closely linked with increased digitalization and individualization of media technologies (cf. Krotz, 2007; 2008) and the intertwining of technological connectivity and tradition (cf. Morley, 2007). At the ontological everyday level, a mediatized perceptiveness of the declining roles of historicism (in understanding and predicting social and natural forces) and distrust in institutional governance brings with it a *de facto* acceptance of open-endedness. As Beck and Willms (2004) rightly note, 'not only is the future indeterminate, but its indeterminacy is part of the meaning of present' (p. 34). Assuming we have passed beyond the linear historicism and positivism of the modern towards an inevitably open-ended late modernity, phenomena such as growing transnational economic connections, migration and global financial crises, environmental destruction and consumption of global media and commodities remind us that we share a global future – however glum or bright one can envision it to be in the face of climate change and resource scarcity. This adds to the relevance of cosmopolitan ideals, reviving the debate around global citizenship and mediated cultural processes in enabling shared visions.

On the flip side, such open-endedness and the cosmopolitan emphasis on the universals also engender reflexes of protectionism, racism and parochialism and a mediated search for ontological security through formations of new 'home territories'. As such, and against a transnational backdrop, cosmopolitanization of social life and mediatization then need to be seen as yielding both acceptance of, and resistance to, the moral and ethical ideals of openness. I invoke cosmopolitanism here vis-à-vis mediatization, as there is clearly a need for (and a gap to be filled by) critically oriented and empirically supported analyses that intervene in the debate and address cultural dimensions of cosmopolitanism. One can ask, among other questions, what heightened connectivity translates into in everyday realities of cultural lifeworlds.

3. Thinking fields and mediatized lifeworlds together

Following from this discussion, and to further narrow down the scope, we should note here the accentuated role the individual/individualization and consumption have gained in parallel to globalization and mediatization. A research agenda that specifically addresses the sociology of mediatization and cosmopolitanization, then, needs to be further nuanced by

considerations of location and technology in situated contexts (*de facto* engaging with the individual, and his/her networks and consumptive practices) in order to capture particularities. Such an agenda would involve discussing the role of both structures and subjective positionings in mediatized lifeworlds to address the simultaneously connecting and constraining forces of mediatization and trans-border flows. As a case in point, our study on various segments of the Swedish population of both migrant and native origin living in Stockholm revealed that place and technology factor heavily into both how fields and habitus are shaped and how agency is steered (Christensen, 2012; 2013a).

The overall discourse of globalization underscores deterritorialization and downplays place and borders. The mediatization debate, in general, has understandably avoided emphasizing architectural variations in technology in order not to reproduce the techno-determinism of earlier accounts such as those generated by 'Internet Studies'.³ While at its meta-level I would argue against framing the longitudinal process of *mediatization* as a fragmented phenomenon and as singular sets of practice (as in consumption of Media A vs. Media B), the qualitative interviews are illustrative of the significance and persistence of both locational elements and increasingly complex variations of technological features (among other important factors) that condition everyday mediations. On the whole, how individuals and groups are socially positioned, the accumulation of capital, and the development of a Bourdieuan 'feel for the game' are clearly intertwined with geographic markers and the extent to which an expressive capacity is afforded by dominant technological applications.

Offline space, such as place of origin and the urban environment where one lives (in addition to class, gender, education and moral-political orientation), has a significant role in influencing perceptions of selfhood and *Otherness* and global mobility. The interviews revealed ambivalence and distrust (about/of both technology and changes in society) when it comes to personal views of media saturation of everyday life and mobility. A German female, aged 42, who moved to Sweden 13 years ago commented on global mobility and cosmopolitanization of cities:

I almost don't dare answer honestly. I'm critical about borders, I don't think you should have open borders because of criminality. I see immigration critically because of criminality and other things, but I think it's important that we as Europeans can move freely, so there are two sides.
(personal interview, 2012)

Views regarding state-regulated control of borders and movements differed from one individual and group to another. Self-regulation and self-monitoring were often pointed to as means to take advantage of the open connectivity that technology and globalization bring, while avoiding the

pitfalls (cf. Christensen, 2013a). On the whole, some of the informants displayed reflexivity and awareness along with acceptance (even if not moral approval) of the 'control' dimension of mediatized societies and human/cultural flows. Some were more critical. One inner-city resident, a 30-year-old British female who migrated from the UK, noted:

It's a double-sided question. For me personally I have absolutely no problem with being photographed or registered. I can see for some people that they would feel it was Big Brother checking up on them, but on the other side it's a safety measure, a way of protecting property such as schools. In an ideal world you wouldn't need it but we're not in an ideal world.

(personal interview, 2012)

A native Swedish female aged 69, from Stockholm, reflected on the ambivalent nature of mediatized life (in response to the question of 'future trends' and penetration of technology) by commenting: 'In one way it's a reduction of freedom and it becomes more of a surveillance society. But at the same time it gives opportunities; I wouldn't say freedom, but opportunities to be used in positive ways' (personal interview, 2012).

While mediated communication, in some cases, was seen as an alternative to the restrictions and exclusivism of actual space and mobility, borders and enclaves also exist in online domains in numerous ways for numerous reasons. To give a few examples from my interviews with Turkish and Kurdish migrants, a young Turkish man in his twenties described how he created different groups and sets of personal data such as photos (practically producing different data-doubles of himself) on his Facebook page. He maintained differentiated personal profiles among his relatives, friends and family in Sweden and Turkey to protect his privacy about his sexual preference and prevent his lifestyle from being monitored (personal interview, 2009). Young Turkish and Kurdish women, in particular, noted how social media made possible alternative ways of connecting and arranging meetings to circumvent offline spatial closures and 'neighbourhood monitoring' (personal interviews 2008–11). I should briefly note here that Turkish migrants form neighbourhoods based on the geographic region in Turkey they originate from and live in close proximity to each other, making monitoring an everyday routine, which troubled many of the younger individuals interviewed. Swedish metropolises such as Stockholm, Gothenburg and Malmö are highly segregated areas where a great majority of the migrants live in suburban parts.

A young woman living in a student flat in Uppsala noted that, while she avoids dedicating her evenings to watching popular Turkish soaps on television, she time-shifts and quickly watches segments online and reads chats and information pages on the web before visiting family and relatives 'to have something to talk about'. She explained that she preferred

Swedish and international channels but did not want to give the impression to her family that she is alienated from her culture or has become too much of a Swede – potentially leading to the diminishing of symbolic capital in certain contexts (personal interview, 2008). Online constellations using place-based resignification that both reclaim presence in the centre and maintain home-oriented ties provide another example of strategized mediation and how Bourdieu's (1990 [1980]) *social field* constitutes an intermediary position between actual territories and virtual flows (sometimes affording resistance and power, and sometimes the reproduction of existing hegemonic categories or new forms of segregation and parochialism). 'Isvecli Turkler (Swedish Turks)', 'Isvec Turkleri (Turks of Sweden)', 'Turkar i Stockholm (Turks in Stockholm)', 'Isvec'teyiz (We are in Sweden)', 'A Group for the Swedish Turkish' and 'Isvecli Konyalilar' (Swedes from Konya) constituted some of the popular Facebook groups at the time of the fieldwork (Christensen, 2011; 2012). As was revealed during the interviews, some of these groups rivalled with each other, displaying forms of symbolic violence such as deleting messages/announcements posted by the administrators of other groups.

While it is not possible to follow Bourdieu to the depths of his analytical vision in this short chapter, it should be noted that the incorporation of Bourdieuan theory (1984 [1979]; 1990 [1980]) has dual relevance here. First, habitus and social field (and accumulation of capital and power) provide an intermediary analytical tool between the macro realm of political economic analysis and everyday cultural dimensions. His conception of field is based on an understanding of power, its unequal distribution and the forms of domination/subordination it enables. Such a material configuration of power and power relations remains key in understanding societal order, social relations and mediated communicative practice. Second, his reflexive sociology allows taking globalization and mediatization beyond their abstract levels and addressing their complexities in empirical contexts, ultimately producing them as 'theories of practice' (see also Bourdieu and Wacquant, 1992). As Bourdieu (1990 [1980], p. 25) argues, this 'presupposes a critical objectification of the epistemological and social conditions that make possible both a reflexive return to the subjective experience of the world and also the objectification of the objective conditions of that experience'. The entangled meta-processes of mediatization and cosmopolitanization of social fields and everyday lifeworlds clearly necessitate such a dialectical view and reflexivity.

Bourdieu himself did not address 'the transnational' as a category in which non-nation-state-centric fields and habitus take shape. Taking it a step further here, his notion of the field allows a construction of transnational social formations as fields with both porous and rigid boundaries. While the construct of field is directly associated with class-based professional and cultural domains, if we are to take fields, akin to Jenkins (1992, p. 85), as

social arenas defined by 'the stakes that are at stake', then the similarities between differentiated fields and the particular geographies and practices of being/becoming (Hall, 1996) generated by transnational dynamics become obvious. Although there are marked differences in economic, social and cultural capital across the members of transnational groups, they also constitute stakeholders, within the host-country context they live in, with common aims and inclinations towards (1) acquiring representation and recognition in the larger social arena and (2) engaging in collective and individual pursuits of symbolic power accumulation as well as resistance within the field itself (creating intra-group tensions).

What we discussed earlier in broader terms in relation to cultural cosmopolitanism and cosmopolitanization of fields and the everyday is also at play in transnational contexts. In many ways, migrant groups develop various forms of adaptive sensibilities and a vernacular repertoire of resources to cope within and across cosmopolitanized fields. Yet, it should be importantly noted here that transnationalism and cosmopolitanism cannot be conflated. For instance, the general absence of transnational *others* in the cultural imagination and civic realm of the host countries also engenders cultural reflexes towards seeking belonging through marginal expressivity. In some cases, individuals and groups find refuge in mediated rearticulations of home and nation in larger-than-life forms, turning home-bound symbolism into a site of worship. Similar reflexes of rejection, hostility and racism are present among native populations, simultaneously creating cosmopolitanized zones of contact and exclusivism alongside each other in urban centres.

The roles of communication and mediation, symbolic accumulation, and the complexities of capital conversion (which Bourdieu does not elaborate in depth) beyond class boundaries constitute areas in need of fresh inquiry in order to fully grasp 'mediatized everyday lifeworlds' in specific contexts today. Theoretically, the incorporation of the trope of transnationalism is complementary to the Bourdieuan transhistoricity and lack of attention to epochal, spatial and cultural particularity in his discussion of fields and capital. Empirically, the *inside view* of social phenomenology (Berger and Luckmann, 1967; Berger, Berger and Kellner, 1973; Schütz and Luckmann, 1973) and Ihde's (1990) phenomenology of technology further complement Bourdieu's sociology by way of allowing a more honed appreciation of the role of geography and technology – or, 'the subjective geography of technology' (Morley, 2007, p. 250). Such an approach would solidify *mediatized cosmopolitanism* as a grounded approach that rests upon both structural/institutional and agentic/experiential considerations. It would also offer a theoretically and empirically meaningful ground to regard the dual forces of cosmopolitanization and mediatization in their complexity and contradictions. As Atkinson (2010) elaborates, Bourdieu's epistemology is compatible with the individual lifeworld to 'adequately handle the heterogeneity and subtlety of human lives' (p. 5).⁴

In relation to transnational groups, which we took as a case in point here, there is already a rich body of literature exploring the linkages between digital communication use and migrant communities (cf. Adams and Ghose, 2003; Nakamura, 2002) in relation to both the place of mediation in the everyday lives and political deliberation and cultural expression. My fieldwork is illustrative of how mobility runs parallel to significant and complex forms of boundedness. Fixity of field/s (*strategies*) is challenged, if not eliminated, through mediations of place and technological intervention (*tactics*).⁵ At the same time, mediated communication opens the door for the creation of new borders. Ethnographic analysis and a phenomenological perspective (both phenomenological geography and phenomenology of technology and media) provide a framework to understand how individuals engage with the world via media technologies.

To continue with phenomenology of geography, as noted in my analysis of the migrant groups in Sweden (cf. Christensen, 2012), the city of residence and the city of origin have significant material and symbolic meanings that impact upon patterns of sociality, communication and cultural practice. Through mediated (technologically and otherwise) signification, space becomes place and its meaning is continuously contested and reinvented. Rather than detaching, mediations of place reattach. Moores (2006; 2007) and Moores and Metykova (2010) also advocate a phenomenological approach to the study of transnational groups and mediation. As Moores (2006, emphasis added) notes:

How are time-space routines and dwellings – at different geographical scales – reconstructed, with the possibility that experiences of at-homeness could be modified and multiplied? Is there a reorganization of senses of reach and experiential horizons that accompanies this process? *Crucially, from my perspective, do media sometimes figure significantly in those transformations?*

Phenomenological geography provides a useful conceptualization of place whereby the latter is 'understood as more than simply a spatial location. It is location that has been transformed by the routine practices and feelings of its inhabitants' (Moores and Metykova, 2010). While this perspective, as Moores and Metykova argue, allows for an individual's 'environmental experiences' to develop and change over time, it makes visible historical and cultural specificities.

Don Ihde's (1990) experimental phenomenology (or, post-phenomenology) is useful in further nuancing the debates around mediatization and cosmopolitanization. Mediatized culture (parallel to global mobility and market forces) figures as the common cultural denominator of late modernity and is deeply entrenched in everyday lifeworlds and meaning-and sense-making processes (cf. Christensen and Jansson, forthcoming). Social life and communicative practice rest upon collective

sense-making and meaning-production through negotiation and contestation of ideas and visions. Through this process, both practices and habits (e.g., uptake, over time, of technological artefacts as necessity rather than luxury items or capital value of certain acts and symbolic exchanges over others) and fields and habitus are shaped and reshaped.

Mediatization, both in scalar terms and in relation to the textural density of the forms it assumes, has reached a level (Christensen and Jansson, forthcoming) where it is impossible to think of the structural and the everyday realms without taking into account technological modifications. As Ihde (1990) frames it, media and accompanying technologies are themselves embedded in culture (just like other historical technologies, such as papyrus). They do not distance human mind and body from reality, but they reconstitute them in it. Cultural positionality and the sorts of morality and normativity (such as cosmopolitanism) produced in mediatized lifeworlds, in return, are not merely 'affected' by technology and media use. Rather, the 'technologically textured ecosystem' or the 'technosystem' (Ihde, 1990, p. 3) is generative of particular modes of belonging/identity and spatial morality. Such an understanding of technology and mediation underlines the redundancy of dichotomizations, as in real vs. virtual. Phenomenology of technology, then, allows a vision that exceeds the limitations of instrumental and substantive theories of technology, where the former regards technology as merely manufactured and subservient to politics and culture, and the latter attributes to it autonomy above all competing processes and norms (as in dystopic scenarios of destruction by technological agents).

4. Mediatized worlds – mediatized cosmopolitanism

The role of the media, particularly in relation to cultural globalization, has been explored extensively in media studies. Media-centrism, inadequate contextualization and lack of empirical studies have been commonly pointed to as problems. In the mediatization literature, less attention has been paid to critical considerations of place, power dynamics and technology. While it is virtually impossible to do justice to such questions in a short chapter, taking the provocative and inspiring scope afforded by this edited volume as a starting point, I sought to offer some reflections and point to further questions to which the current mediatization debate leads us.

Combined, Bourdieu's reflexive sociology and social phenomenology have a high degree of relevance for grasping how the structural and everyday experiential dimensions of our media-saturated worlds are yielding a mediatized cosmopolitanism. Culture, for Bourdieu, is a contested realm through which the social order of hierarchies and power is reproduced. His vision reveals the complexities of the ways in which class and culture are intertwined and explicates the material dimensions of mediatization and social reproduction. Yet, the modernist bend in his understanding of the collective and individual realm and his collapse of cultural signification and

class into a singular model of reproduction of dominant status through capital accumulation make it difficult to account for the particularities of space, technology and experience. In different but complementary ways, phenomenology and transnationalism open up discursive and empirical possibilities for regarding communication and persons (or communicating persons) and for better grasping the inherent contradictions (i.e., openings and closures) that underlie mediatized cosmopolitanism.

In this framework, geography/place and technology remain as interfaces (in both actual and rhetorical senses) that mediate, generating both nearness and distance, and both proximity and alienation (Bauman, 1989; Silverstone, 2007). Mediated 'place-making' and the persistence of *territoriality* in the technological realm have significance here. While the discourses of globalization and networked connectivity commonly emphasize deterritorialization and placeless flows, mediated modes of sociality and visibility, akin to offline place and social relations, are governed as much by a logic of divisions, borders and control as they are by a technologically enabled openness and inclusions. Mediatized cosmopolitanism is distinct from earlier conceptualizations linking media to cosmopolitanism, roughly put, on a cause-effect axis (cf. Rantanen, 2005). We need not only be concerned with *whether* individuals can/have become true cosmopolitans or the extent to which mediated imaginary fosters genuinely cosmopolitan dispositions.

What needs further attention within the mediatization debate is the resulting tension fields due to the cosmopolitanization of everyday lifeworlds. Both the mediated and physical broadenings of our reach and possibilities are accompanied by a new 'feel for the game' and new social-cultural aspects to consider. This necessitates keeping checks and balances on our paradigms and toolboxes. While mediatized cosmopolitanism and extension of the *self* correspond to 'the erosion of distinct boundaries dividing markets, states, civilizations, cultures, and not least of all the lifeworlds of different peoples' (Beck, 2007), it also brings new possibilities for bounding, controlling and reifying hegemonic roles. As we argue elsewhere, the theoretical interrogation of cosmopolitanism vis-à-vis mediatization, then, finds itself caught up between the impossibility of thinking of cosmopolitanism without actual and virtual forms of encapsulation and the paradoxical nature of the moral-ethical compromise such encapsulation entails for the cosmopolitan vision (Christensen and Jansson, forthcoming). One way of generating deeper understandings of these ambiguities is to look closely into everyday lifeworlds through the lens of nuanced theoretical and empirical frameworks.

Notes

1. 'Secure Spaces: Media, Consumption and Social Surveillance' (2008–12), research project funded by Riksbankens Jubileumsfond (Swedish National Bank);

- preliminary work as part of 'Cosmopolitanism from the Margins: Mediations of Expressivity, Social Space and Cultural Citizenship' (2012–15), research project funded by the Swedish Academy of Sciences; and, 'Kinetic Élites: The Mediatization of Social Belonging and Close Relationships among Mobile Class Fractions' (2012–15), research project funded by the Swedish Academy of Sciences.
2. This chapter does not directly address these questions, but they inform the general discussion presented here.
 3. By 'Internet Studies' I mean the body of uncritical, celebratory scholarship that has been produced on media use from the 1990s onwards.
 4. Bourdieu himself acknowledges that he drew insights from phenomenology. Yet, that field-activity always leads to reproduction in Bourdieu's sense, and actual reflexivity is merely a feature of habitus (rather than an individual agentic attribute), occurring during times of crisis and movement between fields, remains problematic – hence the need for incorporating phenomenology.
 5. In the sense of de Certeau (1984).

References

- Adams, P. C. and Ghose, R. (2003) 'India.com: The construction of a space between'. In: *Progress in Human Geography*, 27(4), pp. 414–37.
- Atkinson, W. (2010) 'Phenomenological additions to the Bourdieusian toolbox: Two problems for Bourdieu, two solutions from Schutz'. In: *Sociological Theory*, 28, pp. 1–19.
- Appadurai, A. (1996) *Modernity at large: Cultural dimensions of globalization* (Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press).
- Bauman, Z. (1989) *Modernity and the Holocaust* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press).
- Beck, U. (2004) 'Cosmopolitical realism: On the distinction between cosmopolitanism in philosophy and the social sciences'. In: *Global Networks*, 4(2), pp. 131–56.
- Beck, U. (2007) 'A new cosmopolitanism is in the air', In: *Sign and Sight*. <http://www.signandsight.com/features/1603.html> (Date accessed 1 May 2010).
- Beck, U. and Willms, J. (2004) *Conversations with Ulrich Beck* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Berger, P. L. and Luckmann, T. (1967) *The social construction of reality* (New York: Anchor Books).
- Berger, P., Berger, B. and Kellner, H. (1973) *The homeless mind. Modernization and consciousness* (New York: Vintage Books).
- Bhabha, H. (1996) 'Unsatisfied: Notes on vernacular cosmopolitanism'. In: Garcia-Morena, L. and Pfeifer, P. C. (eds) *Text and nation* (London: Camden House), pp. 191–207.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984 [1979]) *Distinction: A social critique of the judgement of taste* (London: Routledge).
- Bourdieu, P. (1990 [1980]) *The logic of practice* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Bourdieu, P. and Wacquant, L. J. D. (1992) *An invitation to reflexive sociology* (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press).
- Brown, G. W. and Held, D. (2011) *The cosmopolitanism reader* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Castells, M. (2012) *Networks of outrage and hope: Social movements in the internet age* (London: Polity).
- Christensen, M. (2011) 'Online social media, communicative practice and complicit surveillance in transnational contexts'. In: Christensen, M., Jansson, A. and Christensen, C. (eds) *Online territories: Globalization, mediated practice and social space* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing).

- Christensen, M. (2012) 'Online mediations of sociality in transnational spaces: Cosmopolitan re/formations of belonging and identity in the Turkish diaspora'. In: *Journal of Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 35(5), 888–905.
- Christensen, M. (2013a) 'Complicit surveillance and mediatized geographies of visibility'. In: Jansson, A. and Christensen, M. (eds) *Media, surveillance and identity: A social perspective* (New York: Peter Lang).
- Christensen, M. (2013b) 'Transnational media flows: some key questions and debates'. In: *International Journal of Communication*, 7, pp. 2400–2418.
- Christensen, M. and Jansson, A. (2011) 'Fields, territories and bridges: Networked communities and mediated surveillance in transnational social space'. In: Fuchs, C., Boersma, K., Albrechtslund, A. and Sandoval, M. (eds) *The internet & surveillance* (London: Routledge).
- Christensen, M. and Jansson, A. (forthcoming) 'Complicit surveillance, interveillance and the question of cosmopolitanism: Towards a phenomenological understanding of mediatization'. In: *New Media and Society*.
- Clifford, J. (1998) 'Mixed feelings'. In: Cheah, P. and Robbins, B. (eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and feeling beyond the nation* (University of Minnesota), pp. 362–71.
- de Certeau, M. (1984) *The practice of everyday life* (Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Delanty, G. (2009) *The cosmopolitan imagination: The renewal of critical social theory* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Habermas, J. (2006) *Time of transitions* (Cambridge: Polity).
- Hall, S. (1996) Cultural studies and the politics of internationalization. In: Morley, D. and Chen, K. H. (eds) *Stuart Hall: Critical dialogues* (London: Routledge), pp. 392–410.
- Hannerz, U. (1990) 'Cosmopolitans and locals in a world culture'. In: *Theory, Culture and Society*, 7(2), pp. 237–51.
- Hannerz, U. (2005) 'Two faces of cosmopolitanism: Culture and politics'. In: *wStatsvetenskaplig Tidskrift*, 107(3), pp. 199–213.
- Held, D. (2010) *Cosmopolitanism: Ideals, realities and deficits* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Hepp, A. (2010) 'Researching "mediatized worlds": Non-media-centric media and communication research as a challenge'. In: Cammaerts, Bart, Carpentier, Nico, Tomanić Trivundža, Ilija, Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, Pille, Sundin, Ebba, Olsson, Tobias, Kilborn, Richard and Nieminen, Hannu (eds) *Media and communication studies: Intersections and interventions* (Tartu: University of Tartu Press), pp. 37–48.
- Ihde, D. (1990) *Technology and the lifeworld: From garden to earth* (Bloomington, Minneapolis: Indiana University Press).
- Jenkins, R. (1992) *Pierre Bourdieu* (London: Routledge).
- Khagram, S. and Levitt, P. (2008) 'Constructing transnational studies'. In: Khagram, S. and Levitt, P. (eds) *The transnational studies reader: Intersections and innovations* (New York: Routledge).
- Krotz, F. (2007) 'The meta-process of "mediatization" as a conceptual frame'. In: *Global Media and Communication*, 3(3), pp. 256–60.
- Krotz, F. (2008) 'Media connectivity: Concepts, conditions, and consequences'. In: Hepp, A., Krotz, F. and Moores, S. (eds) *Network, connectivity and flow: Key concepts for media and cultural studies* (New York: Hampton Press).
- Moores, S. (2006) 'Media uses and everyday environmental experiences: A positive critique of phenomenological geography'. In: *Particip@tions: Journal of Audience and Reception Studies*, 3(2).

- Moore, S. (2007) 'Media and senses of place: On situational and phenomenological geographies', *Media@lse Electronic Working Paper 12*, Department of Media and Communications (London School of Economics and Political Science), <http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/media@lse> (date accessed 1 July 2010).
- Moore, S. and Metykova, M. (2010) '“I didn't realize how attached I am”': On the environmental experiences of trans-European migrants'. In: *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 13(2), pp. 171–89.
- Morley, D. (2007) *Media, modernity and technology: The geography of the new* (London: Routledge).
- Morley, D. (2011) 'Afterword: Electronic landscapes: Between the actual and the virtual'. In: Christensen, M., Jansson, A. and Christensen, C. (eds) *Online territories: Globalization, mediated practice and social space* (New York: Peter Lang), pp. 273–90.
- Nakamura, L. (2002) *Cybertypes: Race, ethnicity, and identity on the internet* (New York: Routledge).
- Nava, M. (2007) *Visceral cosmopolitanism: Gender, culture and the normalisation of difference* (Oxford: Berg).
- Nowicka, M. and Rovisco, M. (2009) 'Introduction: Making sense of cosmopolitanism'. In: Nowicka, M. and Rovisco, M. (eds) *Cosmopolitanism in practice* (Farnham: Ashgate), pp. 1–16.
- Plant, S. (1997) *Zeros and ones. Digital women and the new techno culture* (London: Doubleday).
- Rantanen, T. (2005) *The media and globalization* (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage).
- Robertson, A. (2010) *Mediated cosmopolitanism. The world of television news* (Malden and Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Schulz, W. (2004) 'Reconstructing mediatization as an analytical concept'. In: *European Journal of Communication*, 19(1), pp. 87–101.
- Schütz, A. and Luckmann, T. (1973) *The structures of the life-world* (Evanston: Northwestern University Press).
- Silverstone, R. (2007) *Media and morality: On the rise of mediapolis* (Cambridge: Polity Press).
- Splender, D. (1995) *Nattering on the net* (Toronto: Garamond Press).
- Stevenson, N. (2002) 'Cosmopolitanism, multiculturalism and citizenship'. In: *Sociological Research Online*, 7(1), <http://www.socresonline.org.uk/7/1/stevenson.html>.
- Stevenson, N. (2003) *Cultural citizenship: Cosmopolitan questions* (Maidenhead: Open University Press).
- Vertovec, S. (1999) 'Conceiving and researching transnationalism'. In: *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 22(2), pp. 447–62.
- Vertovec, S. (2009) *Transnationalism* (London: Routledge).
- Werbner, P. (1999) 'Global pathways: Working-class cosmopolitans and the creation of transnational ethnic worlds'. In: *Social Anthropology*, 7(1), pp. 17–35.