REPRESENTATIONS OF ONLINE AND OFFLINE COMMUNICATION PRACTICES OF A DIASPORIC COMMUNITY: THE CASE OF THE ROMANIAN DIASPORA

ALINA ELENA ROMASCU*
MARIA MICLE**

ABSTRACT

This study was carried out in the context of the migratory phenomenon of the Romanian population, which has seen a marked increase in recent years. The theoretical anchoring of the research lies, on the one hand, in the theoretical approaches that deal with the relationships between the concept of diaspora and the diaspora as a social phenomenon and category of practices and, on the other hand, on the theoretical foundations of theories of representations. Starting with the research question, through which we intended to identify the most widespread practices of online communication of the Romanian diaspora, which contribute to the preservation of the cultural identity of the country of origin, as well as to the adaptation of the new socio-cultural environment of life, this study proposes an analysis of a set of data consisting of the responses of 899 members of the Romanian diaspora from 43 countries all over the world, collected between May and October 2019. This analysis helped to identify representations of online and offline communication practices of the Romanian diaspora.

Keywords: *migration, Romanian diaspora, communication practices, representations, diasporic communities.*

STUDY CONTEXT AND THEORETICAL PREMISES

Migration is one of the processes that have deeply influenced Romanian society today; it is one of the main migrations from Eastern Europe to Western

* Senior Lecturer PhD. Università di Corsica Pasquale Paoli, FLLASHS. Laboratoire LISA-UMR 6240, Avenue Jean Nicoli, Campus Mariani, 20250 Corte, France. E-mail: ali.e.romascu@gmail.com.
** Lecturer, PhD.m West University of Timisoara, Faculty of Political Science, Philosophy and Communication Science. 4 Blvd. V. Parvan, Timisoara 300223, Romania. E-mail: maria.micle@e-uvt.ro.

Europe, a dynamic migration that requires a differentiated and complex approach (Anghel and Horváth, 2009). During the communist period, given the very strict control of the population in terms of people movement, introduced by the Ceauşescu regime, migration was limited or prevented to the maximum. Thus, in 1957, around 2,464 migrants were officially registered. By comparison, in 1990, just after the fall of the regime, around 96,929 persons emigrated; during this period, the most significant migration was ethnic migration. In the second half of the 1980s, there was a sharp increase in applications for political asylum (Anghel and Horváth, 2009).

After the fall of the communist regime in December 1989, during the first years, there was, a rather temporary and exploratory migration (Diminescu, 2009) followed by economic migration (Quffa, 2015; Sandu, 2018), i.e., migrants who went to work especially in countries in the Western and Northern Europe that needed labour force. With Romania's accession to the European Union in 2007, there was a significant migration of Romanian nationals to the European Union countries, as people could move freely without having to meet special conditions to return to the territory of the Member States of the European Union. Statistics show that this exodus of the population has accelerated sharply in recent years (ONU 2017). According to the data published by the National Statistics Institute, the Romanian migration has increased. During 2018, 239,000 more people than in 2017 left the country. This migration has intensified in recent years so that, according to the data for 2019, the number of the Romanian citizens living outside the country' borders amounts to 9.7 million, of which 5.6 million are in the diaspora[1].

There are certainly many factors that have caused this migration, but among those that have had the most impact and are worthwhile to be mentioned are the unfavourable economic situation and the political and social situation that have generated a strong psychological pressure on individuals by pushing them to move to places that could allow their development (Dănăcică, 2010). In particular, one of the reasons often mentioned by Romanians as a cause for migrating is their low personal or family income. They choose to go to Western countries in order to have higher incomes and, thus, better professional recognition (Quffa, 2015). In this context, there is a *brain-drain* phenomenon, that is, the migration of highly skilled people: in 2005, for instance, more than a quarter of Romanian migrants were highly skilled (Prelipceanu, 2008; Nedelcu, 2010).

However, given the historical context of the country, it is important to emphasize the lack of diasporic tradition during the post-communist period. This new community with no migratory past has therefore been forced to adapt and

---

[1] Radio Europa Libera Romania: "Ministrul pentru românii de pretutindeni : 9,7 milioane de români traiesc în afara graniţelor ţării, iar 5,6 milioane sunt in diaspora", Retrieved May 11, 2019 from https://romania.europalibera.org/a/ministrul-pentru-diaspora-9-7-milioane-de-romani-traiesc-in-afara-granitelor-tarii-iar-mai-mult-de-jumatate-sunt-in-diaspora/30073056.html.

invent its standards: to overcome this deficiency the Romanian diaspora has concentrated its migratory resources on the virtual space (Nedelcu, 2002). Over the years, we can see a change in the use of terms to label the Romanian migrants which are closely linked to the socio-economic and political context. Thus, for the period of 2002-2006, formulas such as *Romanians living abroad*, *Romanians from abroad*, *căpşunari* (English "strawberry pickers"), *străineri* (English "foreigners") were employed, while the term *diaspora* was used more for other countries (Pricopie, 2019). Other forms such as *conaţionalii noştri* (English "our fellow nationals"), *Romanians who have left to work*, and *migrants* circulated in the national media (Beciu, 2012a). The term *Romanian diaspora* was used in a rather institutional and political context; it was introduced in 2009, at a time of cleavage, triggered by the intrusion of politics in the restructuring of the national public agenda and the activation of the national discourse on the Romanian diaspora which became a cliché of the national public agenda (Beciu, 2012a; Pricopie, 2019).

While the term *diaspora* was initially used in relation to spatially dispersed religious groups living as a minority among other people (Dufoix, 2003), over time, the theoretical approaches dealing with this subject have undergone a restructuring under the influence of the evolution of the migratory phenomenon. Although the theories that conceptualize the diaspora are not homogeneous, "different conceptualizations and empirical fields of research have a similar starting point: the diversification of transnational mobility forms in the context of economic and cultural globalization" (Beciu, 2012b, 14).

The theoretical anchoring of this research lies, on the one hand, in the theoretical approaches that deal with the relationship between the concept of diaspora and the diaspora as a social phenomenon and category of practices (Beciu, 2012b) and, on the other, on the theoretical foundations proposed by theories of representation. In this context, it is necessary first to put into perspective the research of diasporic communities, its communicational practices, as well as the interactions between actors within diasporic communities.

Second, it is a question of revisiting the theories of representations proposed by Moliner (1992), Abric (1996), Roussiau and Bonardi (2001), Orgad (2012), and Beciu (2016). As such in the current study we will take into consideration the representation, on the one hand, as "a grid of reading reality" (Moliner 1992) considered as "a construction, a selective and specific description of elements of reality that generates certain meanings while excluding others" (Orgad, 2012), and on the other, as "an organized and hierarchical set of judgments, attitudes and information that a given social group develops about an object" (Abric, 1996, 11), and as "a form of social thought giving rise to particular knowledge and with the function of guiding conduct at the same time as ensuring communication between individuals" (Roussiau and Bonardi, 2001, 17).

This research aims to analyse the representations of online and offline communication practices of the Romanian diaspora. Methodologically, it is based

on a survey conducted among 899 members of the Romanian diaspora from 43 countries around the world. The research goal from which we initiated the study was to identify the most used and unitary types of on- and offline communication developed by the Romanian diaspora in its areas of distribution. We were also interested in a second aspect, namely: What do these practices point to? The responses helped us to understand whether these practices support the preservation of Romanian cultural identity, on the one hand, and, on the other, if they serve the Romanians to integrate in the new communities of the host countries.

METHODOLOGICAL DISCUSSION

To study the online and offline communication practices of the Romanian diaspora, a quantitative methodology through a questionnaire-based survey was preferred. "The main interest of the questionnaire survey is to gather a large amount of both factual and subjective information from a significant number of individuals (Parizot 2012, 93). The questionnaire included 36 questions divided into three main parts: "Demographics", "Use of social networks," and "Integrating/preserving cultural identity". The questionnaire was administered by students in Communication at the West University of Timişoara, coordinated by Dr. Maria Micle, as a seminar project within the discipline *Methods and Methodologies of Research in Communication Sciences*.

The questionnaire was both administered and self-administered during the period May-October 2019. Initially, the questionnaire was administered in key locations for meeting members of the Romanian diaspora, such as road stations and the airport of Timişoara. Subsequently, the students – who were from various parts of the country – administered the questionnaire to members of the Romanian diaspora or their close entourage, face to face or, in other cases, by telephone. With respect to the self-administered survey, it was decided to offer an online self-administered questionnaire accessible via a link on Google Forms to make it easier for us to process the data. To structure the questionnaire in a balanced manner, three types of questions were used: closed questions, open-ended questions, and mixed questions. The information collected on the Romanian diaspora – gender, age, level of education, region of origin, host country, frequency of travel between the host country and Romania, occupation in the host country etc. – in the first part of the questionnaire entitled "Demographics", allowed for the understanding of the interactions between the actors and the online and offline communication practices identified in the second and the third part. To analyse the data, we used relative frequency.

RESULTS

A. Demographics

The analysis of the question "*What is your gender?*" shows that 57.4% of the respondents were women, and 40.4% were men; 2.2% chose not to answer. It is worth noting that women were more receptive to the survey, their number as participants being higher than that of men.

The distribution of respondents by age group shows that half of the respondents (49,9%) were between 18 and 29 years old, 23.5% were aged between 30 and 39 years, 16.5% – between 40 and 49, 9.3% – between 50 and 69, and 0.8% were over 70 years old. Regarding the level of education (last degree acquired), 6.9% of respondents had a middle school degree, 53.3% of respondents had the Baccalaureate, 26.8% – a bachelor's degree, 9.5% – a master degree, 2.3% – a doctoral degree, and 1.2% had graduated from nursing schools and medical internship.

As a rule, the socio-occupational status in the country of adoption is an indicator of the level of integration. The responses to the question "*What is your status in the adoption country?*" showed that 15.7% of respondents had left the country for education, 65.3% were permanent employees, 7.2% were seasonal employees or worked without an employment contract. Fewer were unemployed (3.2%), retirees (2.2%) or housewives, women on maternity leave, and self-entrepreneurs (0.6%). The phenomenon of Romanian migration is very diverse; it involves both people who have a lower level of education and work in the fields of construction, tourism and hospitality, agriculture, housekeeping, help for the elderly, as well as people who have a higher level of education such as engineers, doctors, researchers etc.

As far as the geographical distribution is concerned, the map of the countries in which the Romanian diaspora has settled cover 43 countries from Europe, America, Australia, and Asia. The most representative countries, in terms of the number of responses, are: The United Kingdom, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, Austria, Denmark, Belgium, Norway, the United States of America, Canada, and the Czech Republic. In addition, responses were collected from migrants living in countries such as Australia, Algeria, China, Cyprus, Columbia, South Korea, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Denmark, Switzerland, Finland, Iran, Ireland, Greece, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Republic of Moldova, Holland, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Serbia, Scotland, Sweden, Russia, Thailand, Turkey, and Hungary. The ability to collect data from so many countries seemed essential because practices can change from one country to another.

Romanians from the diaspora have first- and second-degree relatives in the country: 74% of respondents answered that they did have their parents in Romania, 15% of them had children living in Romania, 12.9% had their spouses, while only 2.1% had siblings, cousins etc. As a result of the fact that the Romanian diaspora

has strong ties with the mother-country, through first- and second-degree relatives and friends, Romanians return to Romania as follows ("*How often do you come back to Romania?*"): once a month (11.9% of the respondents), 2–4 times/year (43.6%), once/year (31.8%), once every 2–3 years (8.4%), once every 4–5 years 2.9%), and once every 10 years (1.6%). It is obvious that the link with the country of origin had not been broken, the data show that a certain attachment to the country of origin was still present.

B.   Use of the social networks

The second part of the questionnaire concerns the online communication practices of the Romanian diaspora. As a communicative phenomenon, we intended to understand the extent to which Romanians in the diaspora have access to the communication facilities for the virtual environment. The data show that 99.3% of the respondents owned a mobile phone with Internet access, and that 97.1% of the respondents use social networks.

In the category of general social networks, *Facebook* ranked first (91.7%), followed by *Instagram*, *Google+*, and *Twitter* (8.3%). For the social networking category with mobile applications, *WhatsApp* was used by 72.7% of the respondents, followed by *Skype* (34.6%), *Snapchat* (22.2%), and *Viber* (11.6%). In the professional social networking category, *LinkedIn* ranked first (11.8%), followed by *Viadeo* (1.9%). Regarding social networks dedicated to videos, the most used ones were *YouTube* (70%) and *Vimeo* (5.5%).

Eighty-seven percent of the respondents (87%) use social networks to communicate with their families, 83% to communicate with their friends, 46.5% – for entertainment, 39.5% – to look for events taking place in their home country, 25.6% – to communicate with their professional environment, 19.5% – to look for career opportunities, 19.5% – to keep in touch with the group of the Romanian diaspora of which they are part, 14.3% – to look for other people, 12.4% – to look for work, 10.5% – to communicate with a local community in Romanian, and 8% - to look for scholarships, information about high schools, and universities. Other respondents added reasons such as for business, to look for new trends in fashion, to look for sex partners, to play computer games, etc.

The level of social media use also involves evaluating how much time was spent on browsing. Responses to the question "*How much time a day do you spend on social networks?*" show that 38.3% spent between 1-3 hours, 29.2% – between 30 minutes and 1 hour, 14.3% – between 3 and 5 hours, 10.7% – between 10 and 30 minutes, 4.9% – more than 5 hours, and 2.6% – less than 10 minutes.

As for the degree of interest for virtual communities formed and maintained by Romanians in the diaspora, thirty-six-point one percent of the respondents (36.1%) were members of one or more *Facebook* groups with a minimum of 10 members per country in the Romanian diaspora.

The data indicate that the most representative virtual communities in the Romanian diaspora can be found on *Facebook*.

With regard to registration on groups, most of the respondents who were members of a Facebook group were in the United Kingdom (113 people in three groups). France ranks second (87 people in three groups), followed by Germany (54 people in three groups) and Italy (46 people in three groups). Subsequently, the number of respondents in a group continued to decline: 28 for Spain, 21 for Austria, 16 for Denmark, 10 for Norway, 9 for Belgium, 5 for Canada – with people in three groups each, 3 for the Czech Republic (with people in two groups), and 2 for the USA (with people in a single group).

Among the reasons why Romanians in the diaspora "attend" these groups, we mention: to keep in touch with other members of the Romanian diaspora (56.2%), to be informed of what was happening in Romania (52.8%), to get information about people they knew (29.5%), and to look for work (22.8%). Other responses were "for fun", or "out of pure curiosity".

C. Integrating/ Preserving cultural identity

The data collected in the third part of the questionnaire entitled "Integrating/Preserving cultural identity" allowed for the interpretation of the offline practices of the Romanian diaspora. These are key data for understanding the integration process of respondents as well as cultural practices they adopted in the host country.

Regarding the integration of Romanians in the host country, a large majority of respondents declared they have managed to integrate: "very well" (37.5%), "well" (32.8%), and even "excellently" (23.7%). Only a minority declared they feel integrated "a little" (4.1%), "very little" (1.3%), "not at all" (0.3%).

Among the elements that helped the most in the integration process were: family, friends, relatives, co-workers, work, money, socialization, spouse, already knowing the language of the country, the entourage of friends already established in the country, friends in Romania, neighbours, colleagues at the university, and programs for foreign students. The support provided by the migration networks was significant especially in relation to find work or housing.

When self-assessing the level at which they considered themselves integrated in the host country, 60% of the Romanians surveyed mentioned they did not encounter difficulties in integrating. For the other 40%, the biggest difficulty was learning the language of the country (66.2% of the respondents); for 49.1% of the respondents, it was the lifestyle that caused them the most problems.

The majority of the respondents (92.9%) estimate that they now speak the language of the host country. However, there are still some difficulties in speaking and/or writing the language of the host country for some Romanian migrants. The field in which they work and the level of education can have an influence on the learning of the language. Language proficiency is a crucial element for the

integration of the individuals in a new society and can provide them with professional opportunities.

The responses to the open question "*What are the difficulties you still have?*" highlight the fact that the majority of respondents mentioned that they do not encounter or no longer encounter difficulties. Yet, the difficulties that stood out the most for a small part of the respondents were the lifestyle and the culture of the country, financial difficulties, speaking and/or writing the language, distance from family and friends, Romanian specific dishes, meeting with other Romanians. Racism, discrimination, loss of identity, not being able to advance in the profession were other difficulties that the respondents encountered.

Regarding the communication and social practices used in order to meet with other Romanians outside the virtual space offered by social networks, 59.4% of the respondents met other Romanians at home, 49.7% – at the workplace, 33.5% – in parks, 30.8% – in Romanian grocery stores, 21% – in church, 13.8% – in school, 5.3% – at the headquarters of associations, and 4.8% – in libraries/media. Other meeting places were very little represented: parties, anniversaries, clubs, bars, restaurants, football, fishing, and shopping malls. Several respondents did not meet other members of the Romanian diaspora. The fact that 59.4% of the Romanians preferred to meet other Romanians at home can be explained by the reality that they were more comfortable meeting them at home so that they can discuss in Romanian (as that speak the same language) and often share the same values and traditions. The fairly significant percentage of 21% of the respondents who met other Romanians in church is explained by the fact that the church, and in the case of Romania the Orthodox Church, fulfilled an essential role in the process of transmitting the national historical heritage, language, and culture. The church has played an important role in the transmission of a tradition, a community order that is sustainable in terms of identity (Bruneau, 2004). Furthermore, it is no surprising that 30.8% of respondents met in Romanian specific grocery stores. During the interviews carried out in this type of grocery stores, it was obvious that customers were more than 90% of the Romanian origin. By being quite traditionalists, they continued to prepare traditional Romanian dishes such as "sarmale" (English "cabbage leaves stuffed with minced meat, rice, and onion"), "mamaliga" (English "polenta"), "mici/mititei" (English "grilled small skinless sausages"), etc. The responses collected allowed to identify a percentage of the respondents who are still in the minority, who said they did not meet other Romanians. Other responses included "I do not meet other Romanians," "in the street," "in town," "on special occasions (birthdays, celebrations, etc.)" etc.

As a manifestation of the interest to participate in such events organized in the locality or where they live, 70.9% of the respondents did not participate in cultural. The location of the respondents – rural or urban area – plays an important role in terms of access to cultural events. It was noticed that being in a more isolated rural area (as is the case, for example, of the Corsican diaspora) does not

allow access to the same types of events as those who live in a large city. Participation in the cultural life can be an essential component of integration in that country because integration also requires encounters and interactions with as well as knowledge of the culture of the people they meet in everyday life. Cultural practices include concerts, film and music festivals, dance performances, exhibitions, fairs, theatre, church events, and local and national festivals (such as cultural activities organised by Australian-Romanian Academy for Culture). The names of certain events are in the language of the host country of the migrants such as: Musikverein, Staatsoper, Konzerthaus, Holmenkolldages, The Book Festival, San Mateo, San Bernabé, Semana Santa, Coachela, Bavarian Festival Oktoberfest, Feria de Malanga, Fiesta, Bonfire Night, etc.

Regarding how the host country supports the Romanian diaspora to integrate, responses show that 46.1% of the respondents mentioned free language courses, 19.1% information centres/offices, 23.7% Sunday churches and schools, 9% public or cultural institutions, 4.6% libraries, and 22.1% say that there is no initiative to help the Romanian community integrate or to get together.

A problem usually faced by people who find themselves in the process of adapting to a new community is dealing with different forms of discrimination against newcomers. Depending on their personal experiences we wanted to know the opinion of the Romanians to the question: "*Have you faced discrimination because you are a Romanian?*" Fifty-five-point four percent of respondents (55.4%) stated that they did not face situations of discrimination.

As for the respondents who considered themselves discriminated, 63.1% felt that this happened because of the behaviour of other Romanians, 30.1% pointed to the administrative authorities, 23.3% blamed the employer, and 13.3% – their neighbours (the local community). At the European level, several documents attempt to implement equality by prohibiting discrimination and, in some cases, the European Court of Human Rights has condemned states for discrimination against individuals or groups of individuals. Other respondents invoked as sources of discriminations: "my boss," "payment with cheques," "people met occasionally," "prejudiced people," "schoolmates," "when trying to find accommodation or a school" etc.

DISCUSSION

The results of our analysis show that the percentage of women who leave Romania to migrate to other countries is higher than that of men. This phenomenon can cause a demographic imbalance in the country of origin and also various social problems such as declining birth rates, abandonment of family or children, and even long-term detachment from their place of origin (Quffa, 2015).

The OEDC statistics published in 2019[2] show the strong emigration tendencies of the Romanian population for the period 2009 and 2018. Thus, more than a quarter (26%) of Romanians living in Romania have expressed a desire to settle permanently abroad if they have the opportunity. Emigration intentions are particularly high among young people: almost half of the population of 15-24 years in Romania said they intended to emigrate. Our results confirm this trend of emigration of the young population. Therefore, we noticed a high percentage among young Romanian migrants (i.e., 49.9% in the 18-29 age group).

The level of education is quite heterogeneous from one country to another and/or from one region to another. According to OECD data, in 2015-2016, 23% of the Romanian emigrants aged 15 and over living in OECD countries had a high level of education. However, the educational achievement among Romanian emigrants varies by the country of residence. North American destinations had the highest proportion of higher-educated Romanian emigrants among the main destination countries: 54% in the United States and nearly 80% in Canada. Romanian emigrants in France and the United Kingdom also had, on average, a relatively high level of education: about 35% of them had attained higher education in 2015-2016 in both countries. The level of education was much lower in Italy, one of the main destination countries, with only 7% of the Romanian emigrants reporting a high level of education. Germany is the OECD's main destination country for highly skilled Romanian emigrants, with nearly one in five highly educated Romanian emigrants. Canada, the United States, and the United Kingdom are home to 13%, 11% and 10%, respectively, of the total number of highly skilled Romanian emigrants.

In our research, we did not carry out an analysis of the level of education by country or region, so we can only identify a trend. This trend is consistent with OECD data as the results of our study show that 26.8% of the Romanian emigrants have a bachelor's degree level, 9.5% a master's degree level, 2.3% a doctor's degree level, and 1.2% a nursing school degree level.

We do not have statistical data on the use of social networks by the Romanian diaspora to compare our results. Nevertheless, from the data that exist on the use of social networks by the Romanian population, we can identify some trends in the use of social networks.

In Romania, social networks began to develop in 2011 and, at that time, there were more than 2 million Facebook accounts (Ionascu, 2015). It is the most popular network in Romania and the number of new members has increased significantly in recent years. A study published by Facebrands.ro shows that, in Romania, in 2015, the number of Facebook users was 7.6 million (Facebrands.ro 2015). In terms of the use of social networks, our analysis shows a fairly high rate

---

[2] OECD (2020). *Talent Abroad:* A Review of Romanian Emigrants. Retrieved September 20, from https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/fr/employment/talent-abroad-a-review-of-romanian-emigrants_27927b96-en

for the Romanian diaspora that is 97.1%. The results also show that this trend of Facebook use by the Romanian diaspora with a 91.7% of the respondents positions itself at the top of the list.

In terms of communication practices of social networks, we can notice that the main use is that of communicating with the family, while the second reason is to be informed of what happens in Romania. Moreover, Romanians in the diaspora are now an active and important component of the Romanian society, able to influence and alter the balance of political forces within the country: in the last three presidential elections, the votes of the Romanians from the diaspora and the influence they exerted on the country through members of families and friends contributed to the balance towards the candidates who won the presidential elections (Romascu and Micle, 2020).

The results on integrating/ preserving cultural identity allowed us:

- To establish a range of information on the integration of the Romanian diaspora into the host country. On the one hand, difficulties in learning the language, cultural differences, loneliness, lack of financial resources, racism, discrimination, loss of identity, and lack of ability to develop as a person can have an influence in this process. On the other hand, the most important elements positively affecting the integration process are family, friends, relatives, co-workers, money, socialization, spouse, already knowing the language of the country, the entourage of friends already established in the country, friends in Romania, neighbours, colleagues at university, and programs for foreign students. This is a significant support provided by the migration networks because new migrants receive help to find work or housing.
- To highlight attitudes and behaviours in interactions with other members of the Romanian diaspora.
- To learn about the cultural practices of the Romanian diaspora.
- To know how the majority community supports the Romanian community with the integration process.

CONCLUSIONS

First, this research allowed us to obtain a series of results on the main representation narratives. Second, the results of the analysis of the data on the use of social networks have enabled us to establish a hierarchical and organized set of information relating to the online communication practices of the Romanian diaspora. Third, the results of our study on integration and preservation of cultural identity have enabled us to obtain a set of information about attitudes and behaviours in relation to the process of integration in the host country and about the discrimination and the cultural practices of the Romanian diaspora.

We are aware of the limitations of our study. On the one hand, we do not have enough statistical data to be able to compare the results of the data obtained for the use of social networks as well as for the integration and preservation of cultural identity. On the other hand, we know that the results obtained during this research will mainly allow us to establish associations between the representations that we have been able to obtain through information, attitudes, behaviours, and meanings.

This study is therefore a step forward in a larger research project. In order to deepen the understanding of the practices of the Romanian diaspora in relation to the informational discourse circulating within diasporic groups, this research aims at pursuing its analysis through an online ethnographic observation of Facebook groups for a period of two years as well as by semi-directing interviews with the administrators of these groups.

We would like to make it clear that the ultimate goal of our research on online and offline communication practices was not to return statistical data, but rather to obtain a perspective of the Romanian diaspora at a global level, and to link the representations of practices we have identified in this study in the form of information, behaviours, attitudes, and certain meanings with other research results.

REFERENCES

ABRIC, J. C. (1996). De l'importance des représentations sociales dans les problèmes de l'exclusion sociale. In J.C. Abric (ed.). *Exclusion sociale, insertion et prévention*. Toulouse: ERES.

ANGHEL, R.G., HORVÁTH, I. (Eds.). (2009). *Sociologia migratiei. Teorii şi studii de caz româneşti*. (Sociologie. Antropologie). Iaşi: Polirom.

BECIU, C. (2012a). Diaspora şi experienţa transnaţională. Practici de mediatizare în presa românească. In *Revista română de sociologie*. Serie nouă, XXIII, No. 1–2, 49–66.

BECIU, C. (2012b). Qui fait la diaspora? Le problème de l'identité dans les recherches sur les diasporas. In *Revista română de comunicare şi relaţii publice*. No. 27, 13–28.

BECIU, C. (2016). Reprezentarea mediatică a diasporei în context electoral: identităţi discursive şi forme de angajament. In *Revista română de sociologie*. Serie nouă, XXVII, no. 3–4, 243–260.

BRUNEAU, M. (2004). *Diaspora et Espaces Transnationaux*. Paris: Economica.

DĂNĂCICĂ, D. (2010). Caracteristici ale migraţiei în România. In *Analele Universităţii "Constantin Brâncuşi" din Târgu Jiu*. Seria Economie, no. 2, 189–200.

DIMINESCU, D. (2009). Exerciţiul dificil al liberei circulaţii: o introducere în istoria migraţiei recente a românilor. In ANGHEL, R.G., HORVÁTH, I. (Eds.). (2009). *Sociologia migratiei. Teorii si studii de caz româneşti*. (Sociologie. Antropologie). Iaşi: Polirom, 45-62.

DUFOIX, S. (2003). *Les diasoras*, (Que-sais-je?). Paris: PUF.

FACEBRANDS.RO. (2015). *FaceBrands Reports: Comunicate, analize şi statistici despre Facebook, noutati,* Retrieved January 14 from http://www.facebrands.ro/blog/2015/01/7-6-m-conturi-utilizatori-facebook-romania.

IONASCU, C. (2021). Campania electorală social media – *un must* nu un moft. In *Romanian Copywriter*, 2015, February 15. Retrieved January 14 from –.

MOLINER, P. (1992). *Les représentations sociales comme grille de lecture*. Aix en Provence: Presses Universitaires de Provence.

NEDELCU, M. (2002). *E-stratégie migratoire et communautaire : le cas de roumains à Toronto*, (Hommes et migrations). no. 1240, 42–52.

NEDELCU, M. (2010). Les migrants roumains online: identités, habitus transnationaux et nouveaux modèles du lien social à l'ère du numérique. In *Revue d'études comparatives Est-Ouest*. no. 4, 49–72.

OECD. (2020). *Talent Abroad:* A Review of Romanian Emigrants. Retrieved September 20, from https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/fr/employment/talent-abroad-a-review-of-romanian-emigrants_27927b96-en.

ONU (2017). *International Migration Report*. Retrieved 2020, July 18 from http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/migrationreport/docs/MigrationReport2017_Highlights.pdf.

ORGAD, S. (2012). *Media Representation and the Global Imigration*. Cambridge: Polity.

PARIZOT, I. (2012). L'enquête par questionnaire. In Paugam, S. (ed.). *L'enquête sociologique*. Paris: PUF, 93–113.

PRELIPCEANU, R. (2008). The New Migration Patterns of Educated Romanians to the EU: What Challenges for Individuals and for the Nation-State. In *Romanian Journal of European Affairs*. Vol. 8, no. 4 (December), 75–87.

PRICOPIE, V. (2019). Minorités sociales visibles de l'agenda public en Roumaine. Perspectives du discours médiatique. In *Journée d'étude "Minorités, médias et nouveaux médias: enjeux, réalités et perspectives"*. 22 Novembre, Università di Corsica Pasquale Paoli.

QUFFA, W. (2015). *Imigratia Romanilor în Anglia*. Craiova: Sitech.

ROMASCU, E.A., MICLE, M. (2020). Mobilization of the Romanian Diaspora: An Overview of a Transnational Community Connected During the [2014] Presidential Elections in Romania. In *Innovative instruments for community development in communication and education*. Budapest: Trivent.

ROUSSIAU, N., BONARDI, Ch. (2001). *Les représentations sociales. Etat de lieux et perspectives*. Bruxelles: Mardaga.

SANDU, D. (2018). Drumurile noilor diaspora romananeşti între aici şi acolo. In *Conferinţa interdisciplinară "Romania Mare 2.0, De la insulă de latinitate la arhipelagul global"*. November, 23–24.