Article

new media & society
2015, Vol. 17(9) 1473–1491

DOI: 10.1177/1461444814528678
nms.sagepub.com
SAGE

Complicit surveillance, interveillance, and the question of cosmopolitanism: Toward a phenomenological understanding of mediatization

Miyase Christensen
Stockholm University, Sweden; KTH Royal Institute of Technology, Sweden

André Jansson
Karlstad University, Sweden

Abstract
The institutional and meta-processual dimensions of surveillance have been scrutinized extensively in literature. In these accounts, the subjective, individual level has often been invoked in relation to subject–object, surveillor–surveilled dualities and in terms of the kinds of subjectivity modern and late-modern institutions engender. The experiential, ontological realm of the "mediatized everyday" vis-a-vis surveillance remains less explored, particularly from the phenomenological perspective of the lifeworld. Academic discourses of surveillance mostly address rhetorically oriented macro-perspectives. The same diagnosis largely applies to the debates on the cosmopolitanization process. The literature of cosmopolitan*ism* revolves around broad cultural and ethical transformations in terms of the relationship between Self and *Other*, individual and humanity, and the local and the universal. Our aim in this article is to conceptualize the dynamics that yield a *cosmopolitan Self* and an *encapsulated Self* under conditions of increasingly interactive and ubiquitous forms of mediation and surveillance.

Keywords
Complicit surveillance, cosmopolitanism, globalization, identity, interveillance, lifeworld, mediatization, phenomenology, social theory, surveillance

Corresponding author:
Miyase Christensen, Department of Media Studies, Stockholm University, Karlavägen 104, Stockholm 115 93, Sweden.
Email: miyase.christensen@ims.su.se

Introduction

The institutional and meta-processual dimensions of surveillance have been scrutinized extensively in literature (e.g. Foucault's [1975/1979] panopticism and Haggerty and Ericson's [2000] "surveillant assemblages," to name but two). In these accounts, the subjective, individual level has often been invoked in relation to subject–object, surveillor–surveilled dualities and in terms of the kinds of subjectivity modern and late-modern institutions engender. The experiential, ontological realm of the "mediatized everyday" vis-a-vis surveillance remains less explored, particularly from the phenomenological perspective of the lifeworld. Academic discourses of surveillance mostly address rhetorically oriented macro-perspectives. The same diagnosis largely applies to the debates on the cosmopolitanization process. The literature of cosmopolitan*ism* revolves around broad cultural and ethical transformations in terms of the relationship between Self and *Other*, individual and humanity, and the local and the universal. While some recent studies (Chouliaraki, 2006; Robertson, 2010) examined the relationship between news content and potentially cosmopolitan sentiments, there is clear need for empirical research that broadens the scope to go beyond news consumption and to analyze how certain "outlooks" and positionings are socially individually structured, adapted and continuously negotiated in the mediatized realm of everyday life.

Our aim in this article is to conceptualize the dynamics that yield a *cosmopolitan Self* and an *encapsulated Self* under conditions of increasingly interactive and ubiquitous forms of mediation and surveillance. In doing so, we seek to link the institutional and processual (or macro-social) considerations with the everyday subjective realm (lifeworld) and utilize phenomenology as a mediating tool to counterbalance the presumptive logics (regarding subject–outer world relations) inherent in theories of cosmopolitanism, surveillance, and mediatization. We place particular emphasis on identity development and draw upon qualitative interviews from the research project "Secure Spaces: Media, Consumption and Social Surveillance," funded by the Swedish research foundation Riksbankens Jubileumsfond. Our fieldwork, which we describe in the following part, foregrounds the simultaneously democratizing and coercive potential of technological mediations. Our arguments are developed in three theoretical steps. First, we discuss the general characteristics of the relationship between mediatization and surveillance. In this part, we establish surveillance as one prime logic underlying the current phase of mediatization and discuss the inter-relations between the two along the lines of a number of relevant concepts such as Giddens' (1990) "abstract systems," "project of the self," and "ontological security." As we seek to illustrate theoretically and empirically, the meta-processes of individualization and cultural globalization are increasingly enmeshed with mediatized forms of communicative expressivity, and, due to their "open" character, with a cosmopolitan outlook. Surveillance here is both ubiquitously implied at the abstract, macro-level (*complicit surveillance*) and utilized as a tool of sociality at the individual level of self-realization and daily communication routines (*interveillance*).

Second, we offer a discussion of "the cosmopolitan vs encapsulated self," based on the dominant strands of communication and critical social theory, and in relation to processual dimensions. In this part, as in the preceding one, a number of specific concepts and theories are discussed for the purposes of clarifying our own conceptual apparatus

and arguments—rather than providing a literature review. As we argue, the growing centrality of mediatization (partly governed by a logic of surveillance to both commercial and socio-political ends) in all spheres of life yields social and historical contingencies. Some of these (such as heavy reliance on media applications, as Turkle [2013] notes, and expressions of banal cosmopolitanism) are already present or imminent, while others are long term and more diffuse (such as the social permeation of the politico-cultural ideal of cosmopolitanism).

Finally, building on the arguments put forth in the previous parts and linking them to the everyday subjective dimension, we promote a (post-)phenomenologically (Ihde, 1990) informed understanding of how mediatization, saturated with regimes of surveillance, materializes at the individual level in cultural lifeworlds. We discuss the relationship between the multiple forms of everyday mediation (or the "mediatized lifeworld") in relation to morality and the ethical agenda of cosmopolitanism. Furthermore, we seek to highlight moments and sites where both cosmopolitan potential and ambiguity—despite the long-term, diffuse character of the cosmopolitan project itself—are discernible.

Study frame and fieldwork

The discussion put forth in this article is based upon long-term (2008–2012) fieldwork originating from a number of locales with participants of varying backgrounds. The four case studies constituting the backbone of the analysis involve in-depth interviews with 46 participants, and observations and site visits conducted in Sweden and Nicaragua. The case studies provided a comparative framework within which to locate differences and similarities based on geography, class, gender, and age. As most studies of surveillance have remained broadly conceptual and theoretical, the rationale behind our fieldwork was to build empirical backbone toward a grounded understanding of surveillance by way of incorporating individual perspectives (Jansson and Christensen, 2014). In each case, recruitment of participants started with strategic selection through representative organizations and networks. Snowballing technique was also used with personal/professional networks of the individuals themselves yielding more samples. During the selection, recruitment, and data collection/analysis processes, particular attention was paid to revealing both thematic similarities and distinct patterns across the four study groups. Ethical guidelines were followed in all cases and interviews were tape-recorded except for a few cases where the participants preferred we took notes rather than recorded the interview. Interviews were transcribed and the participants were informed of their rights to have access to the transcriptions if they wished to.

The first study involves transnational migrants (originating from Turkey, of Kurdish-Turkish ethnicities) residing in the Stockholm area (mostly suburban, migrant areas). This group constitutes one of the major migrant populations in Sweden. Both first- and second-third-generation migrants were included in the study. They are diverse in terms of class and education, with most living in residentially segregated suburban areas—where tradition and modern life converge and collide. The second study was conducted in 2008 within a Scandinavian expatriate community in Managua, Nicaragua, linked to the global development business. During fieldwork, one author spent 4 months in

Managua, allowing for experiencing the expatriate life from within. The third and fourth sets of interviews and ethnographic observations came from Stockholm inner-city and Swedish small-town settings.

A gender balance was observed among the participants and they were all active in work life. Ages of the majority of the individuals ranged between early- to mid-20s and late-40s with a number of older participants (in their 50s and 60s) involved. Most were representative of middle-class, well-educated to fairly well-educated social segments with varied political, cultural, and religious orientations. The groups, as well as the individuals within the groups, differed significantly in terms of mobility patterns, which was an important rationale behind the selection (see section "A phenomenological perspective"). At one end of the scale, the small-town informants were all locally rooted; at the other end, our sample included informants with extensive experience of migration as well as professional travel. The data were recorded, sorted, and analyzed to account for both commonalities and distinct patterns based on the characteristics of the participating groups. The longitudinal dimension of the fieldwork is important to note as it was during the course of our study that certain social media platforms and mobile applications became increasingly more prevalent.

The project also included nationally representative data, gathered through the 2009 *Society Opinion Media* survey, conducted at Gothenburg University, Sweden. This set of data provided generalizable information about people's perceptions of mediated privacy threats as well as the social functions of various media forms in everyday life (see Jansson and Christensen, 2014).

Mediatization, late modernity, and the surveillant logic

Control and human/technological progress (Bauman, 1990) and disembedding mechanisms (Giddens, 1991) constitute some of the key characteristics that mark Western modernity. As such, surveillance is nothing new. Likewise, while the rise of the narcissistic Self, dissolution of class-based identity, and the formation of new communal constellations are often associated with the post-1990s phase of globalization and the accompanying digital revolution, the increased significance of the cultural sphere (as the site to observe social change) where identificatory processes and expressivity take center-stage was already recognized and debated in the 1970s and 1980s. How can we today, at a time of unprecedented connectivity and an ever-changing and expanding repertoire of expressivity, best capture the characteristics of the dialectical interplay between the social and individual dynamics and the resulting change? Or, following Beck and Willms, in what ways can we describe "how society is reacting under the new conditions," at a time when "our familiar black/white, either/ors are becoming checkerboards of overlap" (Beck and Willms, 2004: 34)?

Taken in a broader sense and coupled with the heuristic capacity of phenomenology, mediatization provides an analytical opening to expand the cosmopolitan debate in nuanced ways. Krotz's (2008) distinction between processes and meta-processes is useful here in capturing the nonlinear, diffuse character of mediatization across time and space without reducing it to a "single logic" (Hjarvard, 2008, 2013). By taking Krotz's distinction as a starting point, we construe "process" here as corresponding to a linear,

temporally located, and spatially informed (one or multiple locales) flow of events and instances presided by certain ideas/norms. The meta-processes—as identified by Krotz—of globalization, individualization, mediatization, and commercialization, on the other hand, are imbued with a de facto "openness" and multidimensionality that characterize their spatiotemporal components and the magnitude of their impacts. Such meta-processes are manifested both in macro-level social, cultural, political change, and in the micro-realm of the lifeworld at the level of building/abolishing linkages and by way of providing new means of expressivity for the "project of the self" (Giddens, 1992).

Mediatization thus points to a long-term meta-process through which society as a whole becomes increasingly saturated with and dependent on individually and collectively mediated *capabilities* of communication technologies (see Christensen, 2013, 2014a and b). At the mundane levels of social life and self-making, which we seek to address here, mediatization implies that people's everyday practices are increasingly difficult to separate from the structures of media institutions and technologies, whereas the significance of other social structures (which are themselves subject to mediatization) is relatively loosened or altered, thus transforming the conditions of the lifeworld. As shown in our analysis below, the push and pull between capsular and cosmopolitan forces within the realms of everyday life testify to the inherently situated, volatile, and often-contradictory nature of these transformations (see Couldry, 2008; Hepp, 2010). Placed alongside other meta-processes such as globalization and individualization, mediatization then, as a conceptual framework, helps us capture the current ontologies and geographies of interconnection and encapsulation in a more nuanced way.

In the lifeworld, our search for ways of being, becoming (Hall, 1996), and belonging is enmeshed with the complicated ontology and vision that ensues from the diminishing relevance of dualities/contrasts and accompanying comfort zones. For example, the mediated understanding, at the individual level, of the volatile natures of the global economy, financial markets, political regimes, cultural borders, and perhaps most importantly of the fact that we share a global destiny with an ultimately unstable climate (Christensen, Nilsson and Wormbs, 2013) leads to a questioning of historically linear progress and trust in political institutions to ensure human prosperity (tenets of first modernity). This translates into shifts both in the operational (actual) and discursive (mediated) realms of meaning- and sense-making. While cultural and territorial belonging has been taken out of its local contexts due to globalizing mobility and mediated proximity, through everyday mediations we continuously look for ways of recreating a sense of ontological security. This involves, among other practices, reconstituting zones of recognizable narrativity and coding and of re-exoticized *Other*ness. Such examples are to be found across the groups interviewed within this project, among Swedish expatriates reviving their sense of national belonging through podcasts of certain Swedish radio talk shows, as well as among many Swedish small-town inhabitants, in their more or less sedentary, locally oriented use of social media (see also Jansson and Christensen, 2014). In doing so, and on the flip side of the coin, the anonymizing and de-subjectivizing narratives of a global, cosmopolitan culture are being altered by insertions of mediated exclusivity, digital parochialism, and seclusion which we can more readily relate to. Within these efforts of negotiating secure spaces in the "globalized local"–"localized global" equation (or, simply put, in the *social processes of the Self*), surveillance plays a significant role.

The study of surveillance constitutes a relatively autonomous area of research and theorization addressing increasingly complex social questions. Surveillance is invoked here in relation to current modes of communication and the ensuing dynamics of interconnection and encapsulation with which monitoring and control are intertwined. To date, research within surveillance studies has commonly paid tribute to the Foucauldian notions of discipline and panopticism (e.g. Gandy, 1993), accompanied with more recent investigations into phenomena such as synopticism (Mathiesen, 1997). Certain theories of surveillance concentrate on the abolishment of the individual, as subjectivity as well as sociality coalesced with their own reflections (e.g. as "data doubles" or "simulations"). We suggest that late-modern society and social order rest on processes of social communication, fundamentally linked with continuous re-constructions of identity and moral belonging. Identity construction and assertions of belonging are manifested in bodily, mental, and spatial practices, which are enmeshed with technology use (complicating the notion of "experiences of reality," which is central to classical phenomenology). As one of our informants noted,

> It [social media] completely changed how you organise your social life and plan and have control over social conventions, all the business of phoning to give invitations or writing letters and waiting for answers. I don't think people remember how it was. (Swedish male, 25, Stockholm inner-city)

Explicit in this comment is the fact that a shift in the character of spaces and routines that one utilizes in daily life has a bearing on identity processes and constructions of sense of belonging (see also Christensen, 2014a). As will be discussed in the final part, we turn to Don Ihde's (1990) post-phenomenological account of the human–reality relationship through technology to account for such practices and to illustrate how technology does not only mediate, but rather that the union of human and technology is constitutive of specific modes of moral reasoning.

Furthermore, the growing prominence of mediated social surveillance in many aspects of the everyday is central to the discussion of mediatization as a dualistic movement of encapsulations versus opening of new (cosmopolitan) horizons. For one, various modes of governance and control—both in the formal and mundane sense—increasingly involve multivalent, mediated surveillance techniques. This necessitates a reconsideration of both the material and symbolic forms of power and their redistribution in the social field, and a phenomenologically informed analysis of the practices of extending and encapsulating the Self in the face of these dynamics. Following from this, in the next part we concern ourselves with two interlinked aspects in relation to surveillance: (1) the ways in which a *complicit* surveillance logic marks the meta-process of mediatization and (2) the interactive forms through which such logic manifests itself at the social and subjective levels (*interveillance*). As such, we address surveillance both at its broader abstract level and in relation to the specific everyday mediations where it is encountered.

Complicit surveillance: mediatization as systemic (dis)trust

As Haggerty and Ericson (2000) note, analysis of bureaucratic surveillance (domination via knowledge and its use in rational discipline, as Foucault sees it) and its

evolution provides insights into the structure and organization of power in modernity. The rise of modernity and the nation-state system runs parallel to the inception of surveillance practices as part of administrative power. While Giddens' (1985) notion of surveillance owes its lineage to Foucault's (1975/1979) deliberations on the subject, he departs from him considerably in the way he conceptualizes surveillance as a two-tiered practice: accumulation of coded information and direct supervision of social life (Giddens, 1985). The important point here is that in the face of digitization and mediatization, the distinction between supervision and coded information becomes obsolete (i.e. information collation becomes surveillance itself) and that surveillance is no longer a feature of the nation-state but engaged in by an amalgamation of commercial/state/non-state/military entities and used for a variety of governmental or nongovernmental purposes (see also Lyon 2007: 54).

Another important shift to note here is the fact that most forms of surveillance nowadays involve the use of personalized technologies and applications and are driven by a variety of social practices (such as online socializing) that are quickly, widely, and willingly adopted, thereby necessitating "involvement" and "commitment" on the part of the individuals and collectivities. The end result is an ever-more complex entanglement of daily social and personal practice, and technology use, which makes it difficult to differentiate between the various levels of mediatized surveillance such as industry-pushed surveillance for commercial gain and state/military intrusions (direct or indirect surveillance).

In seeking to establish a framework within which to understand the primacy of surveillance as a central logic of mediatization then, Giddens' (1990, 1991) notion of "abstract systems" (such as air travel and the banking system) has purchase in relation to the ways in which ontological security and self-maintenance are increasingly dependent upon trust in such systems. As Giddens (1991) notes, "With the development of abstract systems, trust in impersonal principles, as well as in anonymous others, becomes indispensable to social existence" (p. 120). The point is not, as he explains, that the social characteristics of the lifeworld become subsumed by abstract systems but rather that the lifeworld is retextured in conjunction with abstract systems. In late modernity, abstract systems are highly mediatized and the media themselves operate as abstract systems, entangled with the overencapsulating logic of surveillance. As such, and to the extent that trust, the modernist project of the Self (or self-branding) and ontological security are mediatized, a complicitly enacted surveillance becomes an inescapable aspect of the social processes of the Self and communicative sociality.

While the term *complicit* implicates involvement in an act that potentially has incriminating consequences, we use it here in relation to the technologically enhanced production of spatial and positional morality and to highlight two interlinked aspects of mediatized surveillance in its current phase: (1) the increasing primacy of industry-motivated partaking (consensual, semiconsensual, or nonintentional) in mediated social practice for both top–down and horizontal surveillance and (2) the role of agency in initiating/modulating the level and form of involvement from the point of entry onwards (Christensen, 2011). As one of our informants noted, "There's a social contract between myself and these free services—a legal one too—nothing is free and you have to give something in return" (Swedish male, 25, Stockholm inner-city). Similar opinions and reflections were offered by many of the individuals interviewed in all four groups. In that

sense, the panoptic and ubiquitous character inherent in the architecture of mediatized surveillance is perceivably countered and blurred by such affordances of choice and reciprocity inherent in most everyday technologies. *Complicit surveillance* also captures the growing significance attached to data doubles, as valuable assets in time and space, in assertions of morality and expressivity (e.g. participating in online political campaigns), rather than bodies themselves. The multiple hierarchies of intimacy engendered by the various modulations of technology (particularly in online social domains and through mobile applications) effectively dilute the dichotomy of the private and the public (cf. Thompson, 2011) while still allowing the users to retain a sense of such distinction. A number of participants indicated that they lean toward not being bothered by systematic monitoring unless one has something to hide.

Interveillance: mediatization as desire of monitoring

The pervasiveness of complicit surveillance, as it evolves in contemporary mediatized societies, can be fully understood only through a close consideration of everyday social forces.As we noted above, social dependence on (and trust in) abstract systems of control is generally instilled as "a price worth paying" for the perceived social advantages of extended connectivity and mobility (e.g. Best, 2010; Kim, 2004)—sometimes relatively negotiable, sometimes not. Advancing the surveillant logic as one of mediatization, as stated above, is to position it, at the subjective level, as a logic expressed through and grounded in the social processes of the Self. These processes are differently ordered, however, and relatively volatile. Principally, we may here distinguish between those open systems of sociality and control (Deleuze, 1992), which are often associated with contemporary networked media, and the more place-bound community formations and disciplinary enclosures that marked early modern society (Foucault, 1975/1979)—as well as a third form of social solidarity and control pertaining to the traditional society of collective communities (Durkheim, 1912/1973). While one may indeed pinpoint the first mode of sociality, where the meta-processes of individualization and mediatization most clearly seem to converge, as the principal logic of network society (see Wittel, 2001), our point is that mediatization, precisely because it constitutes a multidimensional meta-process, cuts across such divisions. Similarly, what we here refer to as the regime of *interveillance*, fueled by the expanding prospects of mediated self-enclosure and self-disclosure, is socially contained and governed, but not tied to any one particular kind of sociality or Self. Our interviews illustrated that participants who initially may have worried about their privacy when using social media have now profoundly integrated it into their lives, with some even describing it as an "extension" of their everyday lives.

Simply put, interveillance then refers to three modes of routinized social monitoring and expressivity, integrated through the technological architecture of many contemporary media platforms: (1) watching and judging networked Others (morally, aesthetically, etc.); (2) watching Others watching oneself, that is, sensing and anticipating the gazes of strangers as well as fellow group members; and (3) watching one's own data double, that is, the hypermediated Self in the shape of, for instance, geographical positionings and personalized publicity offers.

In previous accounts of similar developments—from Andrejevic's (2005) critical notion of "lateral surveillance," referring to "the work of watching one another," to Koskela's (2006) more optimistic notion of a media-sustained "empowering exhibitionism," through which moral boundaries are transgressed—the mediatized desires of "seeing and being seen" have often been discursively linked directly to the altered technological conditions of late modernity. As argued above, the mediatization process has to be conceived of in a less linear sense. This is to say that the media as such rarely construct any new social desires in the more foundational sense, but rather reinforce, channel, and exploit desires already constituted by the composite character of social and individual lives. Also "traditional," or residual, communities and relationships (related to family, religion, local heritage, etc.) retain their positions in media space, both deploying and negotiating technological affordances of social monitoring. As Lauer (2011) suggests, social encounters are information-rich events. We would add that such encounters cannot be captured by relatively uncomplicated concepts such as lateral surveillance, empowering exhibitionism or interactive surveillance. Interveillance, as we propose here, is not a singular phenomenon linked merely to the volatile "network sociality" of open systems. Rather, it is a complex, media-enhanced social regime, which saturates the symbolic and emotive interplay between social subjects at the most common level of human life—that is, at the level of self-creation and ontological security—producing a multitude of social contingencies (see Jansson, 2012, 2014).

This becomes particularly obvious in the context of social networking sites. Our interviews present many examples of how the routinized "checking" of others is bound up with self-monitoring and social discipline. This includes the monitoring of whether/how one is exposed by friends (through tags, images, etc.) and a reflexive stance toward the moral premises of social integration:

> When I was drunk the very last time … I went on Facebook the day after and discovered that "no, hell, now I'm up there." I was standing there with my girlfriend's sister, and it was nothing bad really about the picture, but at that point it was like … "*that's* how it was … " Like a reminder. But I've kept that picture on Facebook, so now I can look at it and see "that's how stupid I am when I'm drunk, and I will never be that again" [laughs]. (Swedish male, 26, small-town setting)

This is also a reminder of the ambiguity of the individualization meta-process. Whereas individualization certainly points to the relativization and opening-up of life biographies and social collectives, turning identity into an increasingly self-reflexive "project," as argued by Giddens (1991), Beck (2002, 2004/2006), and others, it also integrates a plethora of countermovements, reactions, and resistances (see, for example, Maffesoli, 1988/1996).

In the current shape "networked society" takes, what might be seen as a technologically spurred "media effect" (i.e. interveillance practices) must be traced to the deeper layers of social desires and perceptions. These, in turn, are to be understood as "remediated," that is, modulated within and through the complex meta-processes of mediatization and individualization themselves. The previous interview quote is clearly illustrative

of such dynamics. Above all, the combined effect of social and technological integration, affecting "open" systems and "closed" systems in a similar vein (while not implicating any clear-cut dichotomy), is that the prospects of standing outside of those networks and platforms become an increasingly distinctive, or radical, social act. In other words, the mediatization of sociality, the complex remediation of various social desires, involves the *naturalization* of interveillance as a regime of "common practice," as well as a further process of social diversification and distinction when it comes to its modus operandi. One informant commented, "I don't think we're heading towards control, control's a funny word though, control's one thing, knowing a lot about you is another thing" (Swedish female, 37, Stockholm suburb). Similar remarks were made by other informants during the interviews pointing to a current social negotiation process of what privacy, control, monitoring, and surveillance mean. We will look closer at these dynamics in the final part of the article.

Cosmopolitanization and capsularization: converging stories of mediatization

As we sought to point out in our discussions of complicit surveillance and interveillance, second modernity in general, and the meta-process of mediatization in particular, contain what seems to be a paradox of self-making. On the one hand, the expanding means of communication—transport as well as social media—and the commodified desire, the moral/commercial encouragement to reach the formerly unreachable (such as other lands as well as friends, relatives and virtual others elsewhere), denote a condition of cosmopolitan exploration or "world-openness" (Delanty, 2009). On the other hand, one can detect a parallel culture of mediatized skepticism and doubt and a desire to monitor and control—our *Selves* and *Others*; bodies and minds—through technology. One may in the latter case refer to anything from medical innovations (e.g. birth control, ultrasound, and depression pills) to personalized mobile media, granting enhanced connectivity, and thus security, to their users. The story of second modernity is therefore one in which the *cosmopolitan Self* and the *encapsulated Self* figure as the metaphors of an increasingly complex dualism. As will be argued shortly, mediatization not only spurs this dualism in ontological terms; the concept also provides an analytical agenda for unraveling the convergence between cosmopolitanization and capsularization. Let us first consider these meta-processes in turn.

In Beck's problematization of the nation-state, and its historical role as a conveying and controlling structure of a civilized society, cosmopolitanization is associated with the condition of second modernity (Beck, 2004/2006: Chapter 1). During first (or high) modernity, citizenship was an exclusively national matter, and to the extent there existed cosmopolitans, in terms of Kant's ideal of "world citizens," those were predominantly public *men* with an intellectual vision of a universal state. Cosmopolitan society existed merely as a conceived space, a futurological trope, beyond the predominant realities of nationalism. Contemporary globalization, however, denotes the pluralization of borders and the implosion of the dualism between the national and the international (Beck, 2002: 19). Consequently, the term "cosmopolitan" can no longer be reserved to a philosophical orientation or attitude, to a cosmopolitan*ism*, but it is something that takes on a "real"

presence in people's lives, in the shape of *cosmopolitanization*. According to Beck (2004/2006), the deterritorialization of cultural formations leads to increasingly banal experiences of the cosmopolitan condition, marked more significantly by emotional processes than by reflexivity: "Everyday life has become cosmopolitan in banal ways; yet the insidious concepts of nationalism continue to haunt people's minds almost unabated, not to speak of the theories and research practices of the advanced social sciences" (Beck, 2004/2006: 19).

This explication of the complex overlapping of first and second modernity, nationalism and cosmopolitanism, encourages us to imagine *cosmopolitan space* as a multilayered symbolic-material process integrating past conceptual and emotional structures. Similarly, the *cosmopolitan Self* does not correspond to *one* clear-cut disposition, or *one* sense of belonging, but may integrate vernacular experiences of territorial insecurity, threat, and loss, as well as more subversive manifestations of identity and identification. Whereas particular groups and individuals may ethically subscribe to a coherent set of foundational values, cosmopolitan selves are always negotiated in relation to both habitus and particular time–space contexts. As noted earlier, this is also part of the cosmopolitan outlook; it is a problematization of essentialism and linearity. It is an outlook that necessitates what Beck (2002) calls the *dialogic imagination*, which is a matter of seeing "the other" within oneself, to rediscover the national as the *internalized global* (Beck, 2002: 23, 35–36). Such a relational view of cosmopolitanism, which also marks Delanty's (2009) notion of "world-openness," Tomlinson's (1999) "ethical glocalism," and Silverstone's (2007) discussion of hospitality, is open to a variety of expressive modes, making it difficult to envision any "pure" cosmopolitan subject even in the theoretical sense.

The cosmopolitan Self, then, by its very nature, is a rhetorically as well as operationally destabilized and decentered Self, a Self that continuously challenges the logics and conditions of its own "being and becoming" (Hall, 1996). Whereas cosmopolitanism at the social level may be regarded as a "logic of practice," implying that certain interpretive competences are internalized as part of practical sense (Bourdieu, 1980/1990), at the ethical level, it de facto necessitates an orientation toward encounters with the *Other*, and thus self-contestation.

The *encapsulated Self* entails the very opposite outlook, an ethical desire to avoid ontological threats and problematic encounters with the *Other*. It corresponds to the social logic of dwelling, moving, and fantasizing in a seamless, uninterrupted, and securitized manner. Providing an interesting parallel to Beck's view, De Cauter (2004) suggests that capitalism as such promotes an ideology of *capsularization*, implying that *heterotopia*, those controlled, exceptional territories ("Other spaces") outlined by Foucault (1967/1998), are turned into the normal state. In a society of growing disorder and global threats, enclosed spaces must be created in order to provide security to citizens and consumers whose work it is to keep the commercial wheels turning. As in Caldeira's (1996) notion of "new aesthetics of security," contemporary urbanism celebrates sealed, controlled spaces, following either the *ecology of fantasy* ("Disneyfication") or the *ecology of fear*—or the integration of both. In both cases, territorial demarcations are reproduced through material as well as representational processes, notably mediated forms of surveillance. Theme parks, gated communities, airports, and increasingly also

entire neighborhoods constitute simulations of the public sphere through which cities and regions become increasingly (segre)gated both vertically and horizontally: "The result is a paradigm in which entertainment and control, openness and isolation, come together" (De Cauter, 2004: 34). While it is theoretically reasonable then to conceive of the cosmopolitan and the encapsulated Self as opposite modes of identity formation, at the practical and social levels they are intertwined. Because of the ambiguous, even threatening (to some) ideals inherent in cosmopolitan ethics, late-modern societies nurture and enact both old and new forms of surveillance—notably in the name of civic and territorial rights. To some extent, *the public acceptance* of (banal) cosmopolitanization even depends upon the parallel implementation of—and *public complicity* with—surveillance, as a guarantor of social continuity and belonging. In other words, surveillance, due to its enduring administrative and moral capacity, has been made an integral component of the cosmopolitanization process.

The growing interdependency of capsularization and cosmopolitanization can be discerned in various realms of society, typically invoking glocal regimes of social sorting. For example, while many affluent, mobile class fractions may travel through increasingly frictionless global corridors, encapsulated by *deterritorializing surveillance*, keeping both professional and private contacts "at their fingertips," the same (media) technologies may raise barriers for those whose mobility is not desired from commercial and/or political points of view. Places like airports and border-stations, and increasingly also various shopping venues, online and offline, operate as high-technological "classification engines," where travelers' and consumers' identities and civil liberties are ultimately securitized (see Graham, 2005; Klauser, 2009; Lyon, 2007: Chapter 6; Parks, 2007). Mediatization then has to be understood as a multimodal process that (in our context) sustains two competing and interdependent developments at the same time—cosmopolitanization and capsularization. The social articulations of these phenomena, both beyond and alongside their macro-dimensions, must be studied at the level of social practice and lived experience—thus making it relevant to adapt a phenomenological perspective.

A phenomenological perspective

While an integrated understanding of social phenomena in relation to their institutional and processual dimensions (as elaborated above) remains vital, their everyday human forms (and, accompanying complexities) cannot be fully grasped without accounting for the interpretive and situated dimensions of experience. The task of discerning how the encapsulated and the cosmopolitan coalesce (converge/diverge) within the framework of everyday lived experiences of reality presents us with an empirical challenge. In this part, taking stock of our own fieldwork in Sweden and Latin America between 2008 and 2012, as well as of secondary sources, we elaborate a nuanced approach to these complexities using Don Ihde's (1990) experimental phenomenology (or, post-phenomenology as it is more commonly known). While our empirical work provides the backbone to these discussions as a whole, our aim here is to conclude by way of endorsing, in concise terms, a research approach in which the macro-social dimensions and phenomenological accounts come together to produce a holistic understanding of "social change" and of

current modes of communication/sense-making in view of mediatization (see also Christensen, 2014b for further discussion).

To start with, and before we turn to Ihde, our understanding of cultural lifeworlds and meaning- and sense-making processes is one that regards mediatized culture as the common cultural denominator of late modernity. Social life (and socialization) rests upon collective sense-making and meaning-production processes, hence on consensus building (as well as negotiation and contestation) around ideas and convictions commonly understood in certain terms (e.g. the common understanding of mobile phones as "social necessity" rather than pure luxury; or, the common understanding of not wearing pajamas to the office). Such processes are most apparent in the training and education of children toward helping them internalize common codes and acts and structures of thinking/reasoning/feeling. Mediatized "common culture" (in the Schutzian [Schutz and Luckmann, 1973] sense) then denotes everything from familial life to a broad range of "taste" (culinary, intellectual, material, sexual, leisurely, etc.) to market structures and income regimes to moral choice of particular sorts (e.g. pro-life vs pro-choice).

While mediatization, akin to globalization, is a meta-process that has been going on for a long time (not a haphazard occurrence of the post-Cold War, "digital," era), it remains true that both in scalar terms and in relation to the textural density of the forms it assumes, it has reached a level where it is impossible to think of macro- and micro-realities without accounting for (technologically) mediated codes and conduct. Media technologies then, as Ihde (1990) has it, which are themselves embedded in culture (just as other everyday technologies that permeate life from eye-glasses to aerosols to cancer treatment), do not distantiate human mind and body from reality but they reconstitute them in it.[1] The sorts of morality and moral spaces produced in cultural lifeworlds, in return, are not merely affected by technology use. Rather, the "technologically textured ecosystem" or the "technosystem" (Ihde, 1990: 3) is generative of particular modes of positional and spatial morality. Ihde's phenomenology is particularly apt for the purposes of our study in which we try to link—on the basis of the contextual and locational dependence of meta/processes and lifeworlds on technology—the production of morality (e.g. the morally specific character of *complicit surveillance* and *interveillance*) to the ethically specific agenda of cosmopolitanism which, on the face of it, stands in stark contrast to surveillance and regimes of alienating and *Othering*.

As we saw in section "Mediatization, late modernity, and the surveillant logic," interveillance is to be understood precisely as a mutually co-constructed regime, sustained through technological capabilities as well as the desires and social forces of self-making. In relation to his social media use (and resonating with views expressed by most other informants), one individual noted during the interviews:

> I don't have a problem with it because I'm quite careful about what I put out. Certain things I don't put out, you know, I wouldn't put anything personal on my own site, I wouldn't discuss family matters online, what I put out is pretty basic, football scores, expressing my hatred towards Manchester United [laughs]. (Swedish male, 37, Stockholm suburb)

This illustrates that interveillance today is to be understood as a key site of textural alteration and negotiation, technologically as well as in moral terms.

Recent studies of the uses of social media have presented interesting illustrations of how the three modes of interveillance are managed in everyday social practice, and what their social consequences might be. Unsurprisingly, many studies present evidence of encapsulating, rather than cosmopolitan patterns of interaction. For instance, Abe (2009) concluded in a Japanese study that the so-called interactivity of social networking sites foremost operated as the negation of hospitality, and thus constituted a realm of anticosmopolitan boundary work. Such examples point to the emotional centrality of, or the desire for, social integration, security, and control via online networking, that is, a general condition of encapsulating technosystems. Empirical research also reveals the ways in which interveillance practices, and individual subjects' *experiences* of such practices, articulate and give shape to the cosmopolitanization process. Such articulations, in turn, hold the potential to provide further in-depth understandings of the social and symbolic power dimensions inherent in cosmopolitanization.

Among our four case studies, the one conducted in a Swedish small-town area speaks about lifestyles whose general orientation points toward the family and the social bonds of local community life, rather than toward the world and the *Other*. All informants are locally rooted and have little experience of living or working abroad. In those cases where longer trips have occurred, they have taken place during the morally and socially sanctioned, or "bracketed," youth period. Through these interviews, which indeed represent a broad stream of the Swedish population, one can start charting the contours of "sedentarist" technosystems, through which interveillance operates above all as a force of social and ethical reproduction at the local level. This does not mean that there is a prevalence of explicitly anticosmopolitan sentiments. But the realization of Self is ultimately measured against people within one's close circles, and interveillance technologies, which are integrated in everyday life to a large extent (notably Facebook), are generally found to be unproblematic "as long as one has nothing to hide."

One of our informants, a female social worker in her early-40s, mentions that she misses her youth when she had the chance to travel the world and take up temporary jobs. At the same time, she stresses that she is happy with the house and the small-town atmosphere where she lives, and that most societal issues have a tendency to become "too big," generating the social risk of "knowing too little" and "having the wrong opinion." Here, social media play a securitizing role, confirming the continuity of community life on a day-to-day basis:

> I find it hard to go up in the mornings when I must go to work. If I'm not working then I wake up immediately. I don't know why, but I guess I don't have the energy to meet the world. But then, finally, I go up and put on the coffee. Before I do that, I turn on the computer, and then I make a couple of sandwiches, and then I sit down by the computer and check Facebook. That's the first thing I do.

This is an example of how, in a ritual sense, Facebook (and other media platforms) often takes over, or at least complements, the long-established role of morning papers and radio in Scandinavian countries. Our study of middle-class, inner-city inhabitants of the city of Stockholm yielded similar results, although big city dynamics add other dimensions to daily routines and mediation patterns. A young male (age 25) remarked

"I'm on FB every hour if I can. It's up to you. If you don't participate you don't get anything back so it stimulates rewards. For example I put out a picture of my 1st hand rental apartment contract and got 42 likes." Our interviews also confirm that the introduction of smartphones further accentuates the integration of interveillance practices, in the shape of "browsing" and "checking out" what others are doing, alongside (rather than apart from) other practices.

In our third study, conducted among Scandinavian development workers in Latin America—individuals and groups who maintain globally oriented lifestyles, and actively promote a cosmopolitan ethical agenda—the enactments and experiences of interveillance are different. Whereas these informants also reproduce various regimes of enclosure through their media use, what emerge are relatively exclusive, re- as well as deterritorializing technosystems. This can be seen, for example, in the creation of distinctive status groups online, the enactment of various encapsulating filtering and monitoring functions, and the usage of online tools for setting up offline meetings and events at foreign places (personal interviews, 2008; see also Polson, 2011, 2013). Cosmopolitanism, therefore, is notoriously difficult to disentangle from accumulation of capital, which in turn implies that it becomes a disposition that is often, paradoxically, held within certain encapsulated enclaves and reproduced through various forms of complicit surveillance (speaking of both personalized media use and the overarching structures of abstract systems).

The Nicaraguan study, on the whole, indicates that since such mediated acts of social monitoring and bonding—as well as complicity in surveillance at the most general level (in relation to travel, dwelling, etc.) and in terms of "adaptation to digital architectural control" (see Best and Tozer, 2012: 401)—were regularly negotiated within a cosmopolitan ethical structure, coupled with critical attitudes toward capsular forces in society, they often lead to experiences of moral dissonance. Through interveillance and complicity, then, the desire to monitor may indeed align with a cosmopolitan disposition, albeit not without friction, to the extent that cosmopolitanism necessitates a certain level of connectivity, curiosity, and world-openness, ultimately expressed as a desire to reach authentic understandings and experiences of the *Other*, and of *Other* spaces. As seen in many realms of social life, however, the desire and capacity of observing the *Other*, as well as the ability of mastering various monitoring systems, are systematically linked to high levels of reflexivity, and to the exercise of power.

The development of "digital self-reflexivity" has broader implications as well and is part of the continuous negotiation process between tradition and liberation. As found in our study among young Turkish migrants in Sweden (personal interviews, 2008–2011), online privacy, that is, the control of information about oneself (cf. Thompson, 2011), was reflexively managed to be displayed/made available or restricted/modulated as part of establishing hierarchies of intimacy and power within one's circles. Both male and female participants in this group indicated, during the interviews, that they use social media and mobile applications to offset power and control that arise from the traditional and spatially segregated settings that they physically find themselves in. Some of them also pointed out that they monitor their own mediated information very carefully to avoid, to the extent possible, certain groups and individuals (such as family members or diasporic representative organizations) seeing posts that they meant for friends or

professional contacts. Private information is thus managed and traded as *symbolic capital* to command respect and admiration, sometimes even at the risk of losing potential friends and jobs because of the very nature of the information made available (see also Abe, 2009). This condition, currently reinforced and popularized through the linked interfaces of different online platforms (such as Facebook and Spotify) and the commercial imposition to "share" things with others, necessitates increasingly refined tactics/strategies for modulating individual digital performances (enclosure and disclosure) within various lifestyle sectors (notably leisure interests and taste patterns). This development can be seen as one of the more consequential textural alterations of recent times, again manifesting the generative role of interveillance, understood simultaneously as a social regime and a technosystem within the overarching logic of complicit surveillance.

Final remarks

While media may nurture cosmopolitan values and mobilities in the classical sense, as an intellectual resource for "world-citizens," they may just as well provide an encapsulating shelter from the potentially confusing mélange of global culture. In between these two positions, we find various shades of what Beck (2002: 30–31) calls banal cosmopolitanism (intertwined with the logic of encapsulation). It is particularly within and through these banal forms of cosmopolitanization, which materialize through the complex experiential realm of the everyday, that the interlinked regimes of complicit surveillance and interveillance take shape and gain social momentum. One might suggest that encapsulation and cosmopolitanism stretch out and cover up the gray areas in each other: the risk of monotonousness and homogeneity in encapsulation is alleviated via cosmopolitanized virtual zones (through the use of various media forms), and the vulnerability of the cosmopolitan Self is remedied by portable zones of encapsulation via the same media (e.g. the usage of security-enhancing mobile media when on the move). What both sides of the mediatization process share, then, is not only the accentuated status of social reflexivity but also the dependency on various abstract systems of communicative standardization (cf. Giddens, 1991). The inherent need to trust the technological and administrative efficiency of these systems and comply with increasingly self-generating, interactive processes of surveillance imply that cosmopolitan moments rarely come without the preconditions of encapsulation—a situation that may carry with it various experiences of moral dissonance and ontological insecurity.

The theoretical interrogation of cosmopolitanism vis-a-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. One way of generating more structured understandings of these ambiguities, we suggest, is to look closely into cultural lifeworlds, which may in turn be related to the structural principles of social fields, to gain empirically grounded perspectives on how individuals cope with such practices and processes and to what ends.

Funding

The authors wish to thank the Swedish research funding agencies Riksbankens Jubileumsfond for funding the project "Secure Spaces: Media, Consumption and Social Surveillance" and Vetenskapsrådet for funding the project "Cosmopolitanism from the Margins: Mediations of Expressivity, Social Space and Cultural Citizenship."

Note

1. This, of course, is not to disregard vast populations and geographies which remain outside the technological lagoon of the West.

References

Abe K (2009) The myth of media interactivity: technology, communications and surveillance in Japan. *Theory, Culture & Society* 26(2–3): 73–88.

Andrejevic M (2005) The work of watching one another: lateral surveillance, risk, and governance. *Surveillance & Society* 2(4): 479–497.

Bauman Z (1990) *Thinking Sociologically*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Beck U (2002) The cosmopolitan society and its enemies. *Theory, Culture & Society* 19(1–2): 17–44.

Beck U (2004/2006) *The Cosmopolitan Vision*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Beck U and Willms J (2004) *Conversations with Ulrich Beck*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Best K (2010) Living in the control society: surveillance, users and digital screen technologies. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 13(1): 5–24.

Best K and Tozer N (2012) Scaling digital walls: everyday practices of consent and adaptation to digital architectural control. *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 16(4): 401–417.

Bourdieu P (1980/1990) *The Logic of Practice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Caldeira T (1996) Fortified enclaves: the new urban segregation. *Public Culture* 8(2): 303–328.

Chouliaraki L (2006) *The Spectatorship of Suffering*. London: SAGE.

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, pp. 222–238.

Christensen M (2013) TransNational media flows: key concepts and debates. *International Journal of Communication* 7: 2400-2418.

Christensen M (2014a) Complicit surveillance and mediatized geographies of visibility. In: *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives*. New York: Peter Publishing, pp. 15-31.

Christensen M (2014b) Technology, place and mediatized cosmopolitanism. In: Hepp A and Krotz F (eds) *Mediatized Worlds: Culture and Society in a Media Age*. New York: Palgrave-McMillan, pp. 159-173.

Christensen M, Nilsson A and Wormbs N (2013) "Changing Arctic – Changing World". In: Miyase Christensen, Nilsson A and Wormbs N (eds), *Media and the Politics of Arctic Climate Change: When the Ice Breaks*, NY: PalgraveMacMillan, pp. 157-171.

Couldry N (2008) Mediatization or mediation? Alternative understandings of the emergent space of digital storytelling. *New Media & Society* 10(3): 373–392.

De Cauter L (2004) *The Capsular Society: On the City in the Age of Fear*. Rotterdam: NAi Publishers.

Delanty G (2009) *The Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Renewal of Critical Social Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deleuze G (1992) Postscript on the societies of control. *October* 59: 3–7.
Durkheim E (1912/1973) Forms of the religious life. In: Bellah R (ed.) *Durkheim, on Morality and Society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, pp. 269–297.
Foucault M (1967/1998) Of other spaces. In: Mirzoeff N (ed.) *The Visual Culture Reader*. London: Routledge, pp. 229–236.
Foucault M (1975/1979) *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
Gandy O (1993) *The Panoptic Sort: A Political Economy of Personal Information*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
Giddens A (1985) *The Nation-State and Violence*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Giddens A (1990) *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
Giddens A (1991) *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Giddens A (1992) *The Transformation of Intimacy: Sexuality, Love and Eroticism in Modern Societies*. Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.
Graham S (2005) Software-sorted geographies. *Progress in Human Geography* 29(5): 562–580.
Haggerty KD and Ericson RV (2000) The surveillant assemblage. *British Journal of Sociology* 51: 605–622.
Hall S (1996) Cultural studies and the politics of internationalization. In: Morley D and Chen KH (eds) *Stuart Hall: Critical Dialogues*. London: Routledge, pp. 392–410.
Hepp A (2010) Researching "mediatized worlds": non-media-centric media and communication research as a challenge. In: Carpentier N, Tomanic Trivundza I, Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt P, et al. (eds) *Media and Communication Studies Intersections and Interventions*. Tartu: University of Tartu Press, pp. 37–50.
Hjarvard S (2008) The mediatization of religion: a theory of the media as agents of religious change. In: Hjarvard S (ed.) *Northern Lights 2008. Yearbook of Film & Media Studies*. Bristol: Intellect Press, pp. 9–26.
Hjarvard S (2013) *The Mediatization of Culture and Society*. London: Routledge.
Ihde D (1990) *Technology and the Lifeworld: From Garden to Earth*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
Jansson A (2012) Perceptions of surveillance: reflexivity and trust in a mediatized world (the case of Sweden). *European Journal of Communication* 27(4): 410-427.
Jansson A (2014) Textures of interveillance: a socio-material approach to the integration of transmedia technologies in domestic life. In: Jansson A and Christensen M (eds) *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang.
Jansson A and Christensen M (2014) *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives*. New York: Peter Lang Publishing.
Kim M (2004) Surveillance technology, privacy and social control: with reference to the case of the electronic national identification card in South Korea. *International Sociology* 19(2): 193–213.
Klauser F (2009) Interacting forms of expertise in security governance: the example of CCTV surveillance at Geneva International Airport. *The British Journal of Sociology* 60(2): 279–297.
Koskela H (2006) "The other side of surveillance": webcams, power and agency. In: Lyon D (ed.) *Theorizing Surveillance: The Panopticon and Beyond*. Cullompton: Willan Publishing, pp. 163–181.
Krotz F (2008) The meta-process of "mediatization" as a conceptual frame. *Global Media and Communication* 3(3): 256–260.
Lauer J (2011) Surveillance history and the history of new media: an evidential paradigm. *New Media & Society* 14(4): 566–582.
Lyon D (2007) *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Maffesoli M (1988/1996) *The Time of the Tribes*. London: SAGE.
Mathiesen T (1997) The viewer society: Michel Foucault's Panopticon revisited. *Theoretical Criminology* 1(2): 215–234.
Parks L (2007) Points of departure: the culture of US airport screening. *Journal of Visual Culture* 6(2): 183–200.
Polson E (2011) Social media and the production of a new global middle class. *Communication, Culture & Critique* 4(2): 144–163.
Polson E (2013) A gateway to the global city: mobile place-making practices by expats. *New Media & Society*. Epub ahead of print 30 October 2013. DOI: 10.1177/1461444813510135.
Robertson A (2010) *Mediated Cosmopolitanism. The World of Television News*. Malden, MA and Cambridge: Polity Press.
Schutz A and Luckmann T (1973) *The Structures of the Life-World*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
Silverstone R (2007) *Media and Morality: On the Rise of Mediapolis*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Thompson JB (2011) Shifting boundaries of public and private life. *Theory, Culture and Society* 28(4): 49–70.
Tomlinson J (1999) *Globalization and Culture*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
Turkle S. (2013) *Alone Together: Why We Expect More from Technology and Less from Each Other*. New York: Basic Books.
Wittel A (2001) Toward a network sociality. *Theory, Culture & Society* 18(6): 51–76.

Author biographies

Miyase Christensen is Professor of Media and Communication Studies at Stockholm University; Guest Professor at the Department of Philosophy and History of Technology—Royal Institute of Technology (KTH); and Visiting Senior Fellow at the LSE. She is an Editor-in-Chief of *Popular Communication* and Co-editor of *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives* (2014, Peter Lang).

André Jansson is Professor of Media and Communication Studies at Karlstad University, Sweden. Jansson is Co-editor of *Media, Surveillance and Identity: Social Perspectives* (2014, Peter Lang).