

Transnationalism and multiculturalism: an intellectual cul-de-sac or paths for further research?

Kuti, Simona

Source / Izvornik: **Treatises and Documents, Journal of Ethnic Studies, 2017, 79, 33 - 51**

Journal article, Published version

Rad u časopisu, Objavljena verzija rada (izdavačev PDF)

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:303:023450>

Rights / Prava: [Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 3.0 Unported / Imenovanje-Nekomercijalno-Bez prerada 3.0](#)

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-11-19**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Repository of the Institute for Migration Research - Institutional repository for storing papers and data sets](#)

Simona Kuti

Transnationalism and Multiculturalism: An Intellectual Cul-de-sac or Paths for Further Research?

Considering the assumption of the continuing importance of both transnationalism and multiculturalism, the aim is to discuss the two notions and explore their relations within the broader field of migration studies. Even though both concepts present popular keywords in academic literature, they are rarely assessed and researched together. Therefore the article sketches out possible paths for further research, involving intersections between transnationalism and multiculturalism. The first two parts of the paper discuss migrant transnationalism and multiculturalism, including their definitions, different approaches and criticisms. After comparing the two concepts and discussing their similarities and differences, possible paths for further research on multiculturalism and transnationalism are outlined, based on a differentiation between the two notions at a theoretical, public policy and social practice level. Transnationalism and multiculturalism do not lead to an intellectual cul-de-sac, but offer many potentially rewarding paths for further research.

Keywords: transnationalism, multiculturalism, migration, migrant integration, migration studies.

Transnacionalizem in multikulturalizem: intelektualna slepa ulica ali poti nadaljnjega raziskovanja?

Glede na stalni pomen obeh pojmov, tako transnacionalizma kot multikulturalizma, ju v članku obravnavamo v povezavi z migracijskimi študijami. Članek oriše možne poti za nadaljnje raziskovanje, kakor tudi presečišče obeh pojmov. V prvih dveh delih obravnava transnacionalizem in multikulturalizem migrantov, skupaj z definicijami, različnimi pristopi in kritiko obeh pojmov. Po primerjavi obeh konceptov, skupaj z njunimi podobnostmi in razlikami, so podane možnosti nadaljnjega raziskovanja multikulturalizma in transnacionalizma, ki temeljijo na razlikovanju med njima na ravni teorije, javne politike in socialne prakse. Transnacionalizem in multikulturalizem ne vodita v intelektualno slepo ulico, ampak ponujata številne obetavne poti nadaljnjega raziskovanja.

Ključne besede: transnacionalizem, multikulturalizem, migracije, integracija migrantov, migracijske studije.

Correspondence address: Simona Kuti, Institut za migracije i narodnosti / Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies, Trg Stjepana Radica 3, HR-10 000 Zagreb, Croatia, e-mail: simona.kuti@imin.hr.

ISSN 0354-0286 Print/ISSN 1854-5181 Online © Inštitut za narodnostna vprašanja (Ljubljana), <http://www.inv.si>

1. Introduction

The turn of the 21st century has been marked by the transnational turn in the social sciences and the humanities. Starting within social anthropology, the “transnational paradigm shift” (Vertovec 2009) quickly spread across different disciplines studying migration. By the end of the 1990s it was possible to conclude that “transnationalism” seems to be omnipresent, particularly when it comes to social sciences (Vertovec 2003), and that there “has been a deluge of sociological studies on immigrant transnationalism” (Morawska 2003, 619).

Approximately at the same time that transnationalism started to make its way into (and beyond) the migration studies mainstream, the backlash and a retreat from multiculturalism began (Kymlicka 2010). Multiculturalism has been declared dead several times at the beginning of the 21st century, and at the same time transnationalism seemed to have peaked in its popularity. Even though politicians have been the most vocal messengers of the death of multiculturalism, social scientists are debating whether “post-multiculturalism” accurately characterises a new era (Kymlicka 2010), and whether it represents a continuation of multiculturalism or a break from it (Gozdecka et al. 2014). Nevertheless, multiculturalism still exists in academic and public debates, and in the worst case presents a zombie concept – “dead long ago but still haunting people’s minds” (Beck 2000, 80). A number of recent studies (Colombo 2015, Pakulski 2014, Winter 2015) indicate a possible revival of multiculturalism, and a realisation of Kivisto and Faist’s (2010, 166) supposition “that its significance might increase in the future”.

Considering the assumption of the continuing importance of both transnationalism and multiculturalism as social-scientific concepts relevant to the study of human migration, the aim of this article is to discuss the two notions and examine their intersections within the broader field of migration studies. Even though both concepts present popular keywords in academic literature, they are rarely assessed and researched together.

In an attempt to ascertain whether the two concepts lead to an intellectual cul-de-sac, or offer some potentially rewarding paths for further research, the article is structured as follows: the first two parts discuss migrant transnationalism and multiculturalism, including their definitions, different approaches and criticisms. Considering the spatial limitations of the article, this part is necessarily selective, but nevertheless aims to present a brief overview of the main conceptual developments and debates. The next part of the article singles out similarities and differences between the two concepts, and sketches out possible paths for further research on transnationalism and multiculturalism (at the state policy, social practice and theoretical construct levels, cf. Kivisto & Faist 2010). The final part lays out the main conclusions, together with the potential epistemological benefits of bringing two scholarships closer together. Even though the author’s

disciplinary background is within sociology, this article aims to provide some inputs for a wider interdisciplinary field of migration studies, which deals with different aspects of complex migration and post-migration phenomena.

2. Migrant Transnationalism

Researching social processes and formations that reach across the borders of nation states represents a growing and popular field within migration studies. Nevertheless, transnationalism has been somewhat contested as a term and scientific concept. Three social anthropologists, Nina Glick Schiller, Linda Basch and Christina Blanc-Szanton, organised a workshop in 1990 in order to “conceptualize and analyze transnational migration” (Glick Schiller et al. 1992, ix). They set the goal of developing transnationalism as “a new analytic framework for understanding migration” and defined it

as the processes by which immigrants build social fields that link together their country of origin and their country of settlement. Immigrants who build such fields are designated ‘transmigrants’. Transmigrants develop and maintain multiple relations – familial, economic, social, organizational, religious, and political – that span borders. Transmigrants take actions, make decisions, and feel concerns, and develop identities within social networks that connect them to two or more societies simultaneously (Glick Schiller et al. 1992, 1–2).

Transnationalism challenges the classical view on international (im)migration as a unilinear move from the country of origin to the country of reception, and the accompanying assumption that (im)migrants sever all social ties with individuals, groups and organisations in the country of origin. In this view, migrants were supposed to gradually assimilate into the society of reception, preferably cutting off their emotional attachments to the country of origin as well. Unlike the “unilinear assimilationist paradigm of classical migration research” (Levitt & Glick Schiller 2004, 1005), transnational framework does not predefine migrants as permanent. Since migration is not seen as a one-way process, migrants’ frequent mobility and other ways of sustaining relations with people and organisations in the country of origin also have an important role in conceptualising transnationalism.

Even though transnationalism first appeared within migration studies in the 1990s, transnational was used in the late 1950s within the field of international law and international relations, and particularly in the 1960s within the field of economics, referring to the activities of global corporations. The invention of the term is usually attributed to Randolph S. Bourne who wrote the essay “Trans-national America” in 1916 (Bourne 2006), and used the adjective in a manner that corresponded more to multiculturalism (Waldinger 2013) than to contemporary transnationalism.

This pioneering definition of transnationalism quickly attracted scholarly attention, including criticisms. For instance, Sarah J. Mahler (1998) criticised it for providing

ample space for any number of individual and group activities that span borders to be construed as transnational – from visitation to sending remittances, to making telephone calls. / ... / [T]he definition offers little assistance for evaluating the content, intensity and importance of transnational ties, for examining the interests served through these ties and, perhaps most fundamentally, for establishing a typology of transnational actors – individuals, families, households, hometown associations, governments etc. (Mahler 1998, 74).

Some critics also emphasised the terminological inadequacy of transnationalism, e.g. its incompatibility with nationalism as a political doctrine, social and political movement and a collective sentiment (Božić 2004), and suggested *transstate* as a more suitable term for describing dense connections across state borders (Faist 2008, Waldinger & Fitzgerald 2004). Others questioned transnationalism's novelty and criticised the concept's tempocentrism and technological determinism (Foner 1997, Waldinger & Fitzgerald 2004).

Nevertheless, scholarship on transnationalism proliferated rapidly, together with its derivatives – *transmigration*, *transmigrants*, *transnation*, *transnationals* etc. By the end of the 1990s Stephen Vertovec (1999, 449–456, cf. Božić 2004, 189–190) identified six distinct meanings of transnationalism, not limited to migration studies:

1. social morphology (diasporas, transnational networks, transnational public spheres, transnational communities);
2. type of consciousness (dual or multiple identifications, awareness of multi-locality, transformations of identity);
3. mode of cultural reproduction (syncretism, creolization, cultural translation, hybridity, new ethnicities, transnational consumption);
4. avenue of capital (transnational corporations, transnational transactions, transnational entrepreneurship);
5. site of political engagement (INGOs, transnational social movement organizations, transnational political activities of diasporas);
6. (re)construction of 'place' or locality (translocalities, virtual neighbourhoods) (Vertovec 1999, 449–456).

The uncritical terminological and conceptual proliferation of transnationalism has been reflected in ways of conducting research and many researchers "have emphasized different aspects of transnational experiences, have conducted their studies at different levels of analysis, and have used a variety of theoretical and methodological approaches" (Itzigsohn 2000, 1128). Authors have developed different types and analytic categories of transnationalism, depending on the

scope, content, geographic orientation, frequency and intensity of transnational activities. Alternative metaphors such as transnational social fields (Levitt & Glick Schiller 2004), transnational social spheres (Gupta & Ferguson 1992) and transnational social spaces (Faist 2000, Pries 2001) also proliferated, and in some cases conceptually developed separately from transnationalism (Kuti & Božić 2016).

In an effort to elaborate and validate transnationalism as a research field, Alejandro Portes and associates (1999, 219) proposed “delimit[ing] the concept of transnationalism to occupations and activities that require regular and sustained social contacts over time across national borders for their implementation”. Such a definition excludes occasional and irregular transnational activities, such as sporadic gifts to family members left behind, or one time real-estate purchases in the home country (Portes et al. 1999). Besides introducing stricter requirements for including a cross-border activity into transnationalism, Portes and associates (1999, 220) “define the individual and his/her support networks as the proper unit of analysis”, focusing the phenomenon of transnationalism on grassroots initiatives of ordinary migrants.¹ In addition, Portes (2001, Portes et al. 2007) distinguishes immigrant transnationalism from other grassroots activists from the civil society who engage in regular and sustained cross-border activities.

In order to further delimit the realm of transnational and justify a distinct research area, Portes (2001, 2003) developed a typology of cross-border activities. He differentiates international, multinational and transnational activities in political, economic and socio-cultural spheres. International activities are “conducted by states and other nationally-based institutions in other countries” (Portes 2001, 186), multinational activities are “conducted by institutions whose purposes and interests transcend the borders of a single nation-state” (Portes 2001, 186), while transnational activities are “initiated and sustained by non-institutional actors / ... / undertaken on their own behalf, rather than on behalf of the state or other corporate bodies” (Portes 2001, 186). Research on migrant transnationalism should concentrate on *grassroots enterprises*, but interactions with other levels of analysis (e.g. international policies or multinational actors) are also recognised as fruitful avenues for research (cf. Portes et al. 2007).

Even though stressing a lack of consensus and conceptual precision about transnationalism has become somewhat axiomatic (Al-Ali & Koser 2002), Alejandro Portes (2003, cf. Kuti 2014) has singled out several theoretical convergencies on migrant transnationalism. According to Portes (2003, 874), researchers in this field have reached a certain level of consensus on the point that “transnationalism represents a novel perspective, not a novel phenomenon”. There are many examples of transnational activities among immigrants in the past, but nevertheless “new technologies in transportation and telecommunications / ... / greatly facilitate[d] rapid communication across national borders and long distances” (Portes 2003, 875). Such developments contributed to the discovery

of transnationalism as a new perspective on phenomena that existed in the past, but were not recognised as worthy of scholarly attention (Portes 2003).

Second, “transnationalism is a grassroots phenomenon” (Portes 2003, 875). Despite the attempts to include governments and corporations as transnational actors “from above” (cf. Guarnizo & Smith 1998), the majority of the literature on (migrant) transnationalism deals with initiatives of ordinary people to establish and maintain lasting economic, political and cultural ties across national borders (Portes 2003, 875). Another strand of research within the framework of transnationalism has focused on the cross-border activities of “nongovernmental associations and activists for human rights, the environment and other global causes” (Portes 2003, 876).

Third, “not all immigrants are transnationals” or transmigrants (Portes 2003, 876). Scholarly enthusiasm around a novel perspective and a novel field of study has led to exaggeration of the scope of actual transnational practices among migrants. Additionally, qualitative case studies used in pioneering anthropological studies usually sampled on the dependent variable (that is, transnationalism). This methodological issue has been identified as “responsible for obscuring the absence of transnationalism in the everyday lives of many migrants” (Portes 2003, 876) and the perception among scholars that all immigrants are transmigrants. Subsequent quantitative studies confirmed the existence of transnational practices among different groups of migrants in different settings, but in many cases only a minority of migrants regularly engaged in transnational practices (Guarnizo et al. 2003, Portes et al. 2002).

Fourth, “immigrant transnationalism has macro-social consequences” (Portes 2003, 877). According to Portes (2003):

While from an individual perspective the act of sending a remittance, buying a house in the migrant’s hometown, or traveling there from time to time have purely personal consequences, in the aggregate they can modify the fortunes and the cultures of these towns and even of the countries of which they are part (Portes 2003, 877–878).

Migrant economic remittances, both regular and occasional, can turn into a significant source of foreign exchange and investments for home communities² (Portes 2003), while social remittances as “local-level forms of cultural diffusion” (Levitt 1998, 926) can give rise to significant socio-cultural and political consequences.

Finally, scholars in the field of (migrant) transnationalism agree that “the extent and forms of transnational activism vary with contexts of exit and reception” (Portes 2003, 879). In the USA, various migrant groups differently engage in transnational activities depending on their urban/rural origin and whether their home country is in a violent conflict, or in a peaceful situation (Portes 2003). The context of reception (e.g. the level of discrimination in a host

society, geographic concentration or dispersal of a migrant group) also affects the intensity and type of transnational engagement (Portes 2003). In addition, transnational activities can vary depending on “geographical proximity of sending and receiving contexts, histories of interdependence between nation-states and localities, patterns of migration and processes of settlement” (Vertovec 2009, 18–19), and change during time.

Even though the number of studies on migrant transnationalism may have stagnated in comparison to the first decade of the 21st century, it still presents a popular research theme and assumes a significant place in contemporary migration studies (cf. Dahinden 2017).

3. Multiculturalism

Unlike transnationalism, multiculturalism has been declared dead by several politicians and some scholars. Others, in contrast, emphasise a substantial growth of multicultural policies (Modood 2013, Banting & Kymlicka 2013), and predict an increase in multiculturalism’s conceptual significance in the future (Kivisto & Faist 2010, Žagar 2008). The latter possibility can be illustrated by a number of recent scholarly articles and debates (re)problematizing different aspects of multiculturalism (e.g. Antonsich 2016, Colombo 2015, Gregurović 2016, Pakulski 2014, Winter 2015). Just like transnationalism, multiculturalism has been a contested term, but its contestation, in contrast, has reached beyond academic debates, becoming part of the public discourse. It is therefore not surprising that (English) online dictionaries often include the term multiculturalism, while seldom produce any results for the term transnationalism. Multiculturalism is thus defined as “the presence of, or support for the presence of, several distinct cultural or ethnic groups within a society” (Oxford Dictionaries), or “the belief that different cultures within a society should all be given importance” (Cambridge Dictionary). Collins Dictionary in contrast distinguishes two meanings: “1) the state or condition of being multicultural, 2) the policy of maintaining a diversity of ethnic cultures within a community” (Collins Dictionary). The second meaning is closer to definitions of multiculturalism in professional or discipline-specific dictionaries, which are significantly broader and include the history of multiculturalism, its geographical context, philosophy, criticisms and even assessments of its political and conceptual future (e.g. Abercrombie et al. 2006, Turner 2006).³

Although it originated in Canada in the early 1970s as a public policy to promote and maintain diversity of cultures, various theoretical approaches to multiculturalism have developed within the social sciences and the humanities. Similar to transnationalism, multiculturalism has become a popular field of study resulting in many types and categories in scholarly literature, not limited to migration and ethnic studies. It also reached a variety of public domains,

including medicine, psychotherapy, marketing, criminal law and public relations (Vertovec 2010).

In an attempt to map different theoretical approaches to multiculturalism in sociological terms, Douglas Hartmann and Joseph Gerteis (2005) distinguish three ideal types of multiculturalism in social theory. Instead of unidimensional approaches to diversity (i.e. assimilationism vs. multiculturalism), the authors differentiate two dimensions: cultural (basis of cohesion) and relational (basis of association). Cultural bases for cohesion can be either substantive moral bonds and practices, or procedural norms and laws, while societal basis for association can be either in individual interactions or via groups (Hartman & Gerteis 2005, 222–223). Introducing a two-dimensional framework enables Hartman and Gerteis (2005, 219) to distinguish “four distinct visions of difference” in social theory, three of which present types of multiculturalism: cosmopolitanism, interactive pluralism and fragmented pluralism. Although they emphasised that different versions present ideal types and not specific theories, Hartman and Gerteis (2005) illustrated particular types with different authors. Their typology was complemented by Peter Kivisto and Thomas Faist (2010) who included examples of corresponding state policies, along with additional illustrations from the scholarly literature. A combination of two interpretations of approaches to multiculturalism and assimilationism is shown in the Table 1.

Table 1: Different Perspectives on Multiculturalism

		Basis of cohesion (cultural dimension)	
Basis for association (relational dimension)		Substantive moral bonds	Procedural norms
	Individual in society	Assimilationism (e.g. Schlesinger, Brubaker, Joppke; France as exemplar)	Cosmopolitanism (e.g. Hollinger; USA or Britain as exemplars)
	Mediating groups	Interactive Pluralism (e.g. Alexander, Taylor + Kymlicka, Parekh; Canada and Australia as exemplars)	Fragmented Pluralism (e.g. Portes & Rumbaut; Young; no existing society fits this model)

Sources: Adapted from Hartmann & Gerteis (2005) and Kivisto & Faist (2010).

The authors’ interpretations differ most when it comes to “segmented assimilation” (Portes & Rumbaut 2001, Portes & Zhou 1993) as illustrative of fragmented pluralism. Hartmann and Gerteis (2005, 229) describe this orientation as characterised by “the existence of a variety of distinctive and relatively self-contained mediating communities” between the individual and the nation. Although Hartmann and Gerteis (2005) also mention Iris Marion Young’s work as an example of fragmented pluralism in theory, Kivisto and Faist (2010) emphasise their misinterpretation of segmented assimilation in this context. Namely, “[Hartmann and Gerteis] depict segmented assimilation as amounting to entry into distinctive sectors of society that both in terms of related patterns of cultural values and social interaction function in isolation from other sectors”

(Kivisto & Faist 2010, 189–190). According to Kivisto and Faist (2010), none of the world's liberal democracies matches this model, and under the assumption that "multiculturalism is a product of elite decision making /.../ it is inconceivable that any [political and/or cultural] elites would actively endorse or promote such societal balkanization" (Kivisto & Faist 2010, 190). Therefore, Kivisto and Faist (2010) consider cosmopolitanism and interactive pluralism as the only viable forms of multiculturalism.

Other typologies most often include two or three types of multiculturalism, and vary according to assigned labels, classification criteria, level of sophistication and/or elaboration, disciplinary approach etc. (cf. Mesić 2006). Barret (2013), for example, differentiates symbolic, structural and dialogical multiculturalism. Symbolic multiculturalism emphasises the preservation of cultural differences reduced to "symbolic markers of ethnic groups such as clothing, food and music" (Barret 2013, 4). Structural multiculturalism aims to alleviate more substantial societal inequalities resulting from the political, economic and social disadvantages of minority groups (Barret 2013). Dialogical multiculturalism, represented by Bhikhu Parekh (2000), emphasises institutionalised dialogue between (non-homogeneous) cultures and "represents a normative stance on how multiculturalism should be implemented rather than a description of an actual system of policies" (Barret 2013, 5).⁴

When it comes to institutionalisation and practice of multiculturalism in different countries, Michel Wievorka (1998) differentiates its integrated and disintegrated variants. (Relatively) integrated multiculturalism is the type of multiculturalism in Canada, and particularly in Sweden and Australia, which does not include a strict separation between the cultural (politics of recognition) and the economic dimension (politics of redistribution, Wievorka 1998). Disintegrated multiculturalism, on the other hand, is illustrated by the case of the USA where demands for social equality (affirmative action) and demands for cultural recognition have been formulated by different actors in different historical moments. Wievorka (1998) concludes that "in so far as multiculturalism is not expected to distinguish between dealing with social inequalities and lack of respect for and recognition of cultures, the theoretical unity of multiculturalism is not conveyed here by a unity of practice" (Wievorka 1998, 889).

Will Kymlicka (2010) distinguishes three patterns of multiculturalism targeting different minority groups: indigenous peoples, historic national minorities and immigrant groups. In line with this division and concerning the level of concrete policies, Banting and Kymlicka (2006, 2013) have developed the Multiculturalism Policy Index (MCPI) seeking to capture the multiculturalist turn. MCPI includes nine policy indicators for indigenous peoples, six for national minorities and eight policies concerning immigrant groups. Since post-immigration multiculturalism (Modood 2013) is of particular importance in the context of migration studies and transnationalism, eight policies concerning

immigrants are listed here:

1. constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism, at the central and/or regional and municipal levels;
2. the adoption of multiculturalism in the school curriculum;
3. the inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in the mandate of public media or media licensing;
4. exemptions from dress codes, either by statute or by court cases;
5. allowing of dual citizenship;
6. the funding of ethnic group organizations to support cultural activities;
7. the funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction;
8. affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups (Banting & Kymlicka 2013).

Given that the beginning of the 21st century has been marked by the (alleged) retreat from multiculturalism, its demise, failure, a backlash against it and even proclaimed death (Colombo 2015, Vertovec & Wessendorf 2010), Banting and Kymlicka (2013) demonstrate that the retreat is more evident at a discursive than at a multicultural policy level. MPCII shows the “stability and expansion of multicultural policies in the first decade of the twenty-first century” in Europe (Banting & Kymlicka 2013, 579). One of the exceptions is the Netherlands, where the MPCII score significantly dropped in 2010 in comparison to 2000, while e.g. Belgium, Finland, Greece, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Spain and Sweden recorded stronger multicultural policies (Banting & Kymlicka 2013).⁵ Authors also note a “proliferation of ‘civic integration’ policies” (Banting & Kymlicka 2013, 586) which are not incompatible with multicultural policies and often develop around existing programmes.

In an attempt to mark a beginning of a new era in debates over immigrant and ethnic integration, some authors use the term post-multiculturalism. According to Wong (2015, 69), “[a] central aspect of ‘post-multiculturalism’ discourse is based on the perception and claim that multiculturalism is not working, / ... / and is segregating / ... / diverse ‘racial’, ethnic, and religious groups”, while for Vertovec (2010, 91) post-multiculturalist policies and discourse combine “a strong common identity and values / ... / with the recognition of cultural differences”. Nevertheless, some authors state that it is unclear whether the term post-multiculturalism denotes a continuation or a retreat from its predecessor (Gozdecka et al. 2014), and criticise the post-multiculturalist critique for simplifying multiculturalism (Kymlicka 2010). Putting these issues aside, it is evident that multiculturalism is still present in scholarly and public debates surrounding immigration, even though it has multiple meanings and types. Therefore it is justifiable to inquire its relations to transnationalism, another popular concept within migration studies.

4. Similarities and Differences between Transnationalism and Multiculturalism: Sketching Some Paths for Further Research

43

In order to sketch possible paths for further research on transnationalism and multiculturalism within migration studies, it seems useful to single out similarities and differences between the two notions at a general level.⁶ First of all, both concepts are quite popular catchphrases and keywords in scholarly discourse, not limited to migration studies. For instance, the EBSCOhost SocINDEX database offers 8,786 texts for the search on multiculturalism and 3,518 for transnationalism. Adjective forms result in even more hits (19,053 for multicultural and 14,601 for transnational) in the research database.⁷

In part as a result of this popularity, both transnationalism and multiculturalism have many meanings, various definitions and approaches. For example, Ley (2010, 190) has characterised this variety as the “semantic breadth of multiculturalism” while Pakulski (2014, 25) notes its “proliferation of meanings”, “semantic evolution” and “conceptual stretch”, even if limited to the case of a single country. Similar characterisations and descriptions have also become almost commonplace for transnationalism (cf. Vertovec 1999, 2009).⁸

In relation to the previous point, migrant transnationalism and post-immigration multiculturalism represent merely one of several types. Transnationalism and multiculturalism are both wider in scope, conceptually and empirically, and are not limited to (post)migration variants, which are the focus of this paper. Furthermore, both notions are characterised by a lack of theoretical clarity, and have been contested and criticised for their vagueness, polysemy, lack of conceptual precision etc. Consequently, both are misunderstood in many ways and instances, albeit with different social consequences. Multiculturalism as a public policy and its subsequent transfer and appropriation to public discourse has had different social consequences to scholarly debates on migrant transnationalism. In addition, transnationalism and multiculturalism are both sometimes (mis) understood as antithetical, or at least incompatible, to migrant integration. Nevertheless, both are sometimes analysed and compared as different modes of integration (e.g. Faist 2000).

Two concepts also diverge in several points. For instance, transnationalism and multiculturalism imply different geographical scopes. Multiculturalism is usually conceptualised and researched within nation-state containers as a public policy, while transnational processes presuppose transcending national borders and the creation of transnational social spaces, including actors in various locations in at least two nation-states. In relation to the previous point, multiculturalism and transnationalism involve different actors and different directions of social actions. Studies of migrant transnationalism most often concentrate on

the grassroots initiatives of ordinary people, while multiculturalism, as a state policy and a political programme, is implemented top-down. Research on transnationalism and multiculturalism most often involves different levels of analysis as well. Studies of migrant transnationalism are usually conducted at micro- and meso-levels of analysis, while studies of multiculturalism usually include macro-level comparisons between different nation states (e.g. Koopmans 2010, 2013), or the development or effects of relevant policies within a single nation state (e.g. Tavan 2012, Vasta 2007).

Finally, in comparison to multiculturalism, the normative or policy dimension of transnationalism is less developed, even though transnationalism is gaining its policy momentum within the so called migration and development nexus. Nevertheless, transnationalism is still largely studied as a social practice and a process, and not as a programme or a policy.⁹

Despite their general differences, it is possible to sketch several paths for further research on multiculturalism and transnationalism within migration studies. As a starting point, three meanings of multiculturalism (as a state policy, social practice and a theoretical construct, Kvisto & Faist 2010, 165) are converted into levels in order to accommodate intersections between multiculturalism and transnationalism, and to discuss possible paths for further research. This division is heuristic and analytical in many ways, and possible research themes presented here are certainly not exhaustive, and are subject to (re)interpretation. Even though migration studies is an interdisciplinary field drawing from several disciplines, the possible research relations between multiculturalism and transnationalism are discussed primarily from a sociological perspective.

At a theoretical construct level, it is possible to synthesise different approaches and conceptualisations of transnationalism and multiculturalism, and relate them to broader theoretical perspectives within the social sciences or migration studies. There are many theoretical works which attempt to recapitulate different approaches to either of the two notions, and this paper is a modest attempt to build on existing scholarship and add a comparative perspective. Another possible path is to examine the application of transnationalism and multiculturalism, e.g. Gerring's (1999) analytical framework for understanding concept formation (cf. Božić 2004) in a selected case. From the sociology of scientific knowledge perspective, it is also possible to track the development and institutionalisation of transnationalism and multiculturalism in research projects, university curricula, PhD programmes and specialised research and education institutions, from a selected national or cross-national perspective (across time and space). It is also possible to compare a number of books and scholarly articles in leading journals for a selected time frame, and relate them to various contextual factors, locally, nationally and/or internationally. In addition, it might be possible to track a differential development of the two notions in relation to relevant public policies, locally, nationally or supranationally.

When it comes to the state (or local) policy level, it is possible to analyse and evaluate different policy documents, and compare definitions and the policy operationalisation of multiculturalism and transnationalism into specific measures. In order to relate and put in perspective the existence and expansion (or retraction) of different policies, it may be feasible to develop indicators for public policies pertaining to transnational (e.g. diaspora) links and compare the results for selected countries with the MCPI (Banting & Kymlicka 2013) or other existing indices. It may be possible to track the development of particular policies and relate them to wider concepts such as immigrant integration, social cohesion, development etc., also frequently used in relevant public policy documents. Such an analysis could include selected countries of immigration and emigration, supranational regulations and intergovernmental or international organisations, depending on a particular case. Below the national level, relevant public policies could be explored at local or regional levels. In order to maintain a critical perspective, public policy analysis should also emphasise an evaluation aspect, determining outcomes and the functionality of policy measures.

Finally, the social practices level appears to be the richest for further research on intersections between multiculturalism and transnationalism. Colombo (2015, 815) has already noted the increasing scholarly interest in studying “everyday multiculturalism” – “the daily negotiation of cultural difference in urban contexts”. Combination with the study of migrants’ transnational practices could lead to ascertaining the effects of the context of reception on the intensity and type of migrants’ transnational engagement (cf. Portes 2003, Portes et al. 1999) in their everyday life. Such a study might determine the relative importance of migrants’ local and (transnational) pluri-local social interactions, and explore the level of simultaneity (Levitt & Glick Schiller 2004) in their daily practices, in a particular (trans)national or local context.

Multiculturalism can also be conceived as a backdrop for migrant transnational practices in settings characterised by different policies dealing with diversity (Žagar 2007, 2008), thus combining phenomenal and policy levels. Such an endeavour might include a cross-national comparative analysis of one migrant group in several immigration countries. A more complex analysis could deal with possible intersections of different types of transnational practices with different types of multiculturalism (e.g. Hartman & Gerteis 2005). Such an effort would presuppose a multi-sited comparative research project, including the main exemplar countries (Kivisto & Faist 2010), and one or several migrant groups.

Finally, existing studies suggest that transnationalism is not incompatible with integration (Hammond 2013, Lacroix 2013). Since multiculturalism pertains to a particular form of integration, future studies might deal with multiculturalism and transnationalism via integration, adding a new component to the three analytical levels (social practices, public policy and social theory). Such

an analysis is particularly important since “[t]he practice of multiculturalism was increasingly associated with forms of ‘unhealthy’ political transnationalism that made it potentially divisive and fragmentary” (Wong 2015, 82), particularly in the public discourse. In addition, more studies should employ multi-sited (cross-country) comparative research designs (one migrant group in several locations, or several groups in several locations) in order to further explore the relations between transnational practices, multicultural policies and migrant integration.

5. Conclusion

Instead of declaring the death of multiculturalism and by assuming the continuing importance of both transnationalism and multiculturalism within migration studies, this article has tried to sketch out possible avenues for further research involving intersections between the two notions. Migrant transnationalism and multiculturalism have been discussed, including their definitions, types, various approaches and some criticisms. After comparing the two concepts and examining some similarities and differences between them, possible paths for further research on multiculturalism and transnationalism have been laid out, based on the differentiation between the two notions at the public policy, social practice and theoretical level. It is possible to conclude that transnationalism and multiculturalism do not lead migration studies into an intellectual cul-de-sac, but offer many potentially rewarding paths for further research, some of which have been outlined in this paper. The social practices level appears as the richest for further research on intersections between multiculturalism and transnationalism, including “everyday multiculturalism” (Colombo 2015) or simultaneity (Levitt & Glick Schiller 2004). However, in order to avoid a further uncritical proliferation of meanings (and sometimes types) of both transnationalism and multiculturalism, it is useful to clearly define one’s approach in the future research studies and place them against (or next to) the existing research.

Finally, introducing a transnational perspective into the study of multiculturalism might yield potential epistemological benefits and correct some research biases. For instance, including different levels and scales of analysis beyond the national container, to which the study of multiculturalism has been so strongly connected, might alleviate “methodological nationalism” (e.g. Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2003) of multiculturalism. On the other hand, introducing hybridity and dynamics could de-essentialise and de-reify multiculturalism, and its “[tendency] to classify individuals and groups by a singular (ethnic, above all) identity” (Gomarasca 2013, 70). In addition, the study of the social processes within and beyond multicultural(ist) societies could also alleviate the “naïve normativity” of transnationalism, or the tendency of “portraying transnational phenomena in an excessively positive light” (Amelina & Faist

2012, 1708), and re-ground transnational practices in relevant social settings, without losing sight of the fact that national and local regulations and policies still matter.

47

References

- Abercrombie, N., Hill, S. & Turner, B. S. (eds.), 2006. *The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology*. Penguin Books, London.
- Al-Ali, N. & Koser, K., 2002. Transnationalism, International Migration and Home. In N. Al-Ali & K. Koser (eds.) *New Approaches to Migration? Transnational Communities and the Transformation of Home*. Routledge, London, 1–14.
- Amelina, A. & Faist, T., 2012. De-naturalizing the National in Research Methodologies: Key Concepts of Transnational Studies in Migration. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 35 (10), 1707–1724.
- Antonsich, M., 2016. Interculturalism versus Multiculturalism – The Cattle-Modood Debate. *Ethnicities* 16 (3), 470–493.
- Barret, M., 2013. Interculturalism and Multiculturalism: Concepts and Controversies. In M. Barrett (ed.) *Interculturalism and Multiculturalism: Similarities and Differences*. Council of Europe Publishing, Strasbourg, 15–41.
- Banting, K. & Kymlicka, W. (eds.), 2006. *Multiculturalism and the Welfare State: Recognition and Redistribution in Contemporary Democracies*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Banting, K. & Kymlicka, W., 2013. Is There Really a Retreat from Multiculturalism Policies? New Evidence from the Multiculturalism Policy Index. *Comparative European Politics* 11 (5), 577–598.
- Beck, U., 2000. The Cosmopolitan Perspective: Sociology of the Second Age of Modernity. *The British Journal of Sociology* 51 (1), 79–105.
- Bourne, R. S., 2006. Trans-National America. *The Atlantic Monthly* (July/August), 58–59.
- Božić, S., 2004. Nacionalizam – nacija, “transnacionalizam” – “transnacija”: mogućnosti terminološkog usklađivanja. *Revija za sociologiju* 35 (3/4), 187–203.
- Cambridge Dictionary, *Definition of Multiculturalism*, <http://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/multiculturalism> (accessed 9 February 2017).
- Collins Dictionary, *Definition of Multiculturalism*, <https://www.collinsdictionary.com/dictionary/english/multiculturalism> (accessed 9 February 2017).
- Colombo, E., 2015. Multiculturalisms: An Overview of Multicultural Debates in Western Societies. *Current Sociology Review* 63 (6), 800–824.
- Dahinden, J., 2017. Transnationalism Reloaded: The Historical Trajectory of a Concept. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 40 (9), 1474–1485.
- Faist, T., 2000. Transnationalization in International Migration: Implications for the Study of Citizenship and Culture. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 23 (2), 189–222.
- Faist, T., 2008. Transstate Spaces and Development. Some Critical Remarks. In L. Pries (ed.) *Rethinking Transnationalism. The Meso-Link of Organisations*. Routledge, London, New York, 63–79.
- Foner, N., 1997. What’s New about Transnationalism? New York Immigrants Today and at the Turn of the Century. *Diaspora* 6 (3), 355–375.
- Gerring, J., 1999. What Makes a Concept Good? A Critical Framework for Understanding Concept Formation in the Social Sciences. *Polity* 31 (3), 357–393.

- Giroux, H. A., 1993. The Politics of Insurgent Multiculturalism in the Era of the Los Angeles Uprising. *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 26 (1), 12–30.
- Glick Schiller, N., Basch L. & Blanc-Szanton, C. (eds.), 1992. *Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration: Race, Class, Ethnicity, and Nationalism Reconsidered*. Annals of New York Academy of Sciences 645, New York.
- Gomasca, P., 2013. Multiculturalism or Hybridisation? Cultural Mixing and Politics. *Diversities* 15 (2), 67–80.
- Gozdecka, D. A., Ercan, S. A. & Kmak, M., 2014. From Multiculturalism to Post-Multiculturalism: Trends and Paradoxes. *Journal of Sociology* 50 (1), 51–64.
- Gregurović, S., 2016. Multikulturalizam u europskom kontekstu: dosezi i nesuglasja. *Migracijske i etničke teme* 32 (3), 353–374.
- Guarnizo, L. E., Portes, A. & Haller, W., 2003. Assimilation and Transnationalism: Determinants of Transnational Political Action among Contemporary Migrants. *American Journal of Sociology* 108 (6), 1211–1248.
- Guarnizo, L. E. & Smith, M. P., 1998. The Locations of Transnationalism. In M. P. Smith & L. E. Guarnizo (eds.) *Transnationalism from Below*. Journal of Comparative Urban and Community Research 6, Transaction Publishers, Brunswick (NJ), 3–34.
- Gupta, A. & Ferguson, J., 1992. Beyond “Culture”: Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7 (1), 6–23.
- Hammond, L., 2013. Somali Transnational Activism and Integration in the UK: Mutually Supporting Strategies. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39 (6), 1001–1017.
- Hartmann, D. & Gerteis, J., 2005. Dealing with Diversity: Mapping Multiculturalism in Sociological Terms. *Sociological Theory* 23 (2), 218–240.
- Itzigsohn, J., 2000. Immigration and the Boundaries of Citizenship: The Institutions of Immigrants’ Political Transnationalism. *International Migration Review* 34 (4), 1126–1154.
- Kivisto P. & Faist, T., 2010. *Beyond a Border: The Causes and Consequences of Contemporary Immigration*. Pine Forge Press, Thousand Oaks.
- Koopmans, R., 2010. Trade-Offs between Equality and Difference: Immigrant Integration, Multiculturalism and the Welfare State in Cross-National Perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36 (1), 1–26.
- Koopmans, R., 2013. Multiculturalism and Immigration: A Contested Field in Cross-National Comparison. *Annual Review of Sociology* 39, 147–169.
- Kuti, S., 2014. Izbjegličke studije i migrantski transnacionalizam: od ignoriranja do novih mogućnosti. *Polemos* 17 (1/2), 29–47.
- Kuti, S. & Božić, S., 2016. *Transnacionalni socijalni prostori. Migrantske veze preko granica Hrvatske*. Jesenski i Turk, Zagreb.
- Kymlicka, W., 2010. The Rise and Fall of Multiculturalism? New Debates on Inclusion and Accommodation in Diverse Societies. *International Social Science Journal* 61 (199), 97–112.
- Lacroix, T., 2013. Collective Remittances and Integration: North African and North Indian Comparative Perspectives. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 39 (6), 1019–1035.
- Levitt, P., 1998. Social Remittances: Migration Driven Local-Level Forms of Cultural Diffusion. *International Migration Review* 32 (4), 926–948.
- Levitt, P. & Glick Schiller, N., 2004. Conceptualizing Simultaneity: A Transnational Social Field Perspective on Society. *International Migration Review* 38 (3), 1002–1039.
- Ley, D., 2010. Multiculturalism: A Canadian Defence. In S. Vertovec & S. Wessendorf (eds.) *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies and Practices*. Routledge, London, 190–206.

- Mahler, S. J., 1998. Theoretical and Empirical Contributions Toward a Research Agenda for Transnationalism. In M. P. Smith & L. E. Guarnizo (eds.) *Transnationalism from Below*. Journal of Comparative Urban and Community Research 6, Transaction Publishers, Brunswick (NJ), 64–100.
- MCPI – *Multiculturalism Policy Index*, <http://www.queensu.ca/mcp/> (accessed 14 February 2017).
- Mesić, M., 2006. *Multikulturalizam*. Školska knjiga, Zagreb.
- Modood, T., 2013. *Multiculturalism. A Civic Idea*. Polity Press, Cambridge, Malden.
- Morawska, E., 2003. Disciplinary Agendas and Analytic Strategies of Research on Immigrant Transnationalism: Challenges of Interdisciplinary Knowledge. *International Migration Review* 37 (3), 611–640.
- Outhwaite, W. (ed.), 2006. *The Blackwell Dictionary of Modern Social Thought*. Blackwell Publishing, Malden, Oxford, Carlton.
- Oxford Dictionaries, *Definition of Multiculturalism*, <https://en.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/multiculturalism> (accessed 9 February 2017).
- Pakulski, J., 2014. Confusions about Multiculturalism. *Journal of Sociology* 50 (1), 23–36.
- Parekh, B., 2000. *Rethinking Multiculturalism Cultural Diversity and Political Theory*. Macmillan Press, Basingstoke, London.
- Portes, A., 2001. Introduction: The Debates and Significance of Immigrant Transnationalism. *Global Networks* 1 (3), 181–193.
- Portes, A., 2003. Conclusion: Theoretical Convergencies and Empirical Evidence in the Study of Immigrant Transnationalism. *International Migration Review* 37 (3), 874–892.
- Portes, A., Escobar, C. & Walton Redford, A. 2007. Immigrant Transnational Organizations and Development: A Comparative Study. *International Migration Review* 41 (1), 242–281.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E. & Haller, W. J., 2002. Transnational Entrepreneurs: An Alternative Form of Immigrant Economic Adaptation. *American Sociological Review* 67 (2), 278–298.
- Portes, A., Guarnizo, L. E. & Landolt, P., 1999. The Study of Transnationalism: Pitfalls and Promise of an Emergent Research Field. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2), 217–237.
- Portes, A. & Rumbaut, R. G., 2001. *Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation*. University of California Press, Berkeley, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.
- Portes, A. & Zhou, M., 1993. The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and its Variants. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 530, 74–96.
- Pries, L., 2001. The Approach of Transnational Social Spaces: Responding to New Configurations of the Social and the Spatial. In L. Pries (ed.) *New Transnational Social Spaces. International Migration and Transnational Companies in the Early Twenty-first Century*. Routledge, London, 3–22.
- Ritzer G. (ed.), 2005. *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*. Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi.
- Tavan, G., 2012. No Going Back? Australian Multiculturalism as a Path-Dependent Process. *Australian Journal of Political Science* 47 (4), 547–561.
- The World Bank, 2016. *Migration and Development Factbook 2016*, <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTPROSPECTS/Resources/334934-1199807908806/4549025-1450455807487/Factbookpart1.pdf> (accessed 8 February 2017).
- Turner, B. S. (ed.), 2006. *The Cambridge Dictionary of Sociology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Vasta, E., 2007. From Ethnic Minorities to Ethnic Majority Policy: Multiculturalism and the Shift to Assimilationism in the Netherlands. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 30 (5), 713–740.

- Vertovec, S., 1999. Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (2), 447–462.
- Vertovec, S., 2003. Migration and other Modes of Transnationalism: Towards Conceptual Cross-Fertilization. *International Migration Review* 37 (3), 641–665.
- Vertovec, S., 2009. *Transnationalism*. Routledge, London, New York.
- Vertovec, S., 2010. Towards Post-Pulturalism? Changing Communities, Conditions and Contexts of Diversity. *International Social Science Journal* 61 (199), 83–95.
- Vertovec, S. & Wessendorf S., 2010. Introduction: Assessing the Backlash against Multiculturalism in Europe. In S. Vertovec & S. Wessendorf (eds.) *The Multiculturalism Backlash: European Discourses, Policies and Practices*. Routledge, London, 1–32.
- Waldinger, R., 2013. Immigrant Transnationalism. *Current Sociology* 61 (5/6), 756–777.
- Waldinger, R. & Fitzgerald, D., 2004. Transnationalism in Question. *American Journal of Sociology* 109 (5), 1177–1195.
- Wievorka, M., 1998. Is Multiculturalism the Solution? *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 21 (5), 881–910.
- Wimmer, A. & Glick Schiller, N., 2003. Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology. *International Migration Review* 37 (3), 576–610.
- Winter, E., 2015. Rethinking Multiculturalism After its “Retreat”: Lessons From Canada. *American Behavioral Scientist* 59 (6), 637–657.
- Wong, L., 2015. Multiculturalism and Ethnic Pluralism in Sociology. An Analysis of the Fragmentation Position Discourse. In S. Guo & L. Wong (eds.) *Revisiting Multiculturalism in Canada*, Sense Publishers, Rotterdam, 69–90.
- Žagar, M., 2007. Diversity Management – Evolution of Concepts: International, Constitutional, Legal and Political Regulation and Management of Ethnic Pluralism and Relations, Including Prevention, Management and/or Resolution of Crises and Conflicts as Components of Diversity Management. *Treatises and Documents, Journal of Ethnic Studies* 52, 6–37.
- Žagar, M., 2008. Diversity Management and Integration: From Ideas to Concepts. *European Yearbook of Minority Issues* 6 (2006/2007), 307–327.

Notes

- ¹ One of the first attempts to differentiate types of transnationalism was the distinction between “transnationalism from above” and “transnationalism from below” (Guarnizo & Smith 1998).
- ² According to The World Bank (2016) estimates, remittance flows have exceeded \$601 billion worldwide in 2015, of which \$441 billion was estimated to have flown to developing countries.
- ³ In contrast, multiculturalism is conspicuously absent in The Blackwell Dictionary of Modern Social Thought (Outhwaite 2006) and in Encyclopedia of Social Theory (Ritzer 2005).
- ⁴ Some types of multiculturalism denote more radical conceptions challenging the societal *status quo*. According to Mesić (2006, 126), most authors have adopted the term critical multiculturalism to denote its socially critical variant, opposing more socially affirmative liberal versions of multiculturalism. Other similar labels include insurgent multiculturalism (Giroux 1993), resistance or even revolutionary multiculturalism (McLaren 1995, 1996, in Mesić 2006).
- ⁵ When discussing MCPI scores, it is important to note that the existence of a policy should not be uncritically equated with its functionality in practice.

- ⁶ A more detailed discussion of particular types or approaches to transnationalism and multiculturalism, and their possible intersections, would largely surpass the spatial limitations of the article and is left for some future endeavours.
- ⁷ Reported results refer to the basic search conducted in February 2017.
- ⁸ It might also be worthy to note that the first use of “transnational” (Bourne 2006) corresponded more to the contemporary meaning of multiculturalism than transnationalism.
- ⁹ Hence, suffix -ism makes more sense in multiculturalism than in transnationalism.