

Beyond Migrant Integration Policies: Rethinking the Urban Governance of Migration-Related Diversity

*Peter Scholten**

UDK: 351.756:316.334.56
314.745.3-054.75.316.334.56
323.15: 316.334.56

Original scientific paper / izvorni znanstveni rad

Received / primljeno: 30. 11. 2017.

Accepted / prihvaćeno: 16. 3. 2018.

Bringing together literature from public administration and migration studies, this article makes the case for a reconceptualisation of urban governance of migration-related diversity. It shows that Europe is experiencing a transformation towards structurally high levels of mobility (with the recent refugee situation as only the most recent manifestation), contributing to a further increase in the complexity of diversity, i.e., superdiversity. The local level in particular seems to be facing these challenges most concretely. The article therefore calls for a local turn, not only in policies themselves, but also in the study of migration and diversity. Mainstreaming is identified in this article as a promising governance strategy for cities to devote greater structural attention to the issues of diversity and migration.

* Peter Scholten, Professor of Public Administration, Erasmus University Rotterdam, Netherlands (redoviti profesor Upravne znanosti na Sveučilištu Erasmus Rotterdam, Nizozemska, e-mail: p.w.a.scholten@fsw.eur.nl)

ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5745-9531>

It reflects the generalisation of migration as a phenomenon that influences all policies and institutions in a city, and calls for a generic rather than a specific approach.

Keywords: migration, integration, urban governance, mainstreaming, multi-level governance

1. Introduction

Migration is primarily an urban phenomenon. It is in the city where migrants arrive, where they settle, go to school, find jobs, and interact with others. Therefore, it is also in the cities where the increase of migration-related diversity is manifested first of all. In fact, there is a growing number of cities in Europe that can be defined as *superdiverse cities*, or cities where people with a migrant background make up such a substantial part of the city population and are so diverse that it becomes difficult to speak of distinct migrant minorities (Vertovec, 2007; Crul, 2016). The structural character of immigration to Europe, highlighted not only by the recent refugee situation, but also by the high levels of intra-EU mobility and the structurally high levels of labour, student, and family migration amongst others, suggests that a further increase in the number of superdiverse cities in Europe in the coming decade is to be expected.

This article discusses the implications that the changing nature of migration-related diversity holds for urban governance. Bringing together findings from several recent studies on cities of migration, it argues that a fundamental reconceptualisation is required regarding the governance of migration-related diversity. Firstly, it argues that rather than thinking of integration in the sense of coherent “national models of integration” (Bertossi, 2011), integration should be redefined as a local issue (Zapata Barrero, Caponio, & Scholten, 2017). If it is conceptualised as a local issue, how can proper relations between various levels of government be developed in order to prevent policy decoupling or policy contradictions?

Secondly, not only does this article argue that we should go through a local turn in our conceptualisation of the governance of migration-related diversity, it also pinpoints a specific direction in which local governance can develop: *mainstreaming*. Borrowing from the literature of gender, disability, and environmental mainstreaming (Walby, 2005; Verloo, 2005), it is argued that the structural character of migration-related diversity in contemporary cities requires a structural approach embedded in generic

policies. This means that rather than having an integration policy as a separate policy domain with specific target groups (minorities), migration-related diversity should be embedded in an integral approach encompassing generic policy areas such as housing, education, and labour (Scholten & Van Breugel, 2017).

Thirdly, the article discusses what this local turn and mainstreaming mean for relations between the local level and other levels of governance. Speaking to the literature on multi-level governance (Hooghe & Marks, 2001; Bache & Flinders, 2004; Scholten, 2015), this article discusses to what extent the local turn in the governance of migration-related diversity has led to effective coordination between governance levels or rather to evidence of what may be described as *decoupling* or *disjointed governance*.

The key question that will be addressed in this article is how migrant integration at the level of urban governance may be reconceptualised in the face of the changing nature of migration-related diversity. Besides a general theoretical reflection on how to reconceptualise urban governance of migration-related diversity, two recent case studies will be discussed: refugee integration and the governance of intra-EU mobility. The central question will be addressed based on an elaborate discussion of (recent) migration literature, as well as on three recent research projects that have dealt with this question: UPSTREAM on the mainstreaming of integration governance (Scholten & Van Breugel, 2017), IMAGINATION on urban governance of the consequences of intra-EU mobility (Scholten & Van Ostaijen, 2018), and a comparative project called *Policy Innovation in Refugee Integration* (Scholten et.al., 2017). This article can therefore be seen as a theoretical positioning of the findings from these projects and a shaping of a research agenda at the crossroads of migration studies and public administration.

2. Governance of Migration-Related Diversity

Taking stock of current literature on the governance of migration-related diversity, it becomes evident that a clear role is assumed for government, and in particular national government. A strong link is assumed between the issues of national identity, national cohesion, national welfare states, and migration-related diversity. Various scholars refer to this in terms of *methodological nationalism* (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002), or what is called *national models of integration* (Bertossi, 2011; Bertossi, Duyvendak, & Scholten, 2015). Such national models involve, first of all, policies

that are primarily oriented towards the nation. Bommers and Thränhardt (2010) argue that these paradigms are national “not just because of their context dependency and insufficient clarifications on the conditions of generalisability (..), they are national because the modes of presenting and questions are politically constituted by the nation – states for which migration becomes a problem or a challenge” (ibid: 10). Similarly, Favell (2003) shows that national models of integration are often the product of “exclusively internal national political dynamics” or the “self-sufficiency” of debates on immigrant integration in politics as well as in migration research. Secondly, national models of integration emphasize that agency and collective interests are marginal dimensions in institutional arrangements and in the structure of public debates (Brubaker 2001, pp. 13–16). Instead, normative and idealistic structures, idioms, or paradigms are seen as the primary driving force behind policies and practices related to identity, citizenship, immigration, religious diversity, and so on. Thirdly, models tend to oversimplify policies and overemphasize their alleged coherency and consistency (Bertossi, 2011). Policy practices tend to be far more resilient and diverse than most policy models would suggest.

Furthermore, these national models of integration reproduce the social construction of integration as a national policy problem. Favell (2003) defines this as the *integration paradigm*, or the idea that integration involves a variety of social, economic, and cultural “problems” related to the arrival of newcomers within existing (nation-state, welfare state) systems. It is this paradigm that generally provides that legitimation for nation-states to intervene in migrant integration and develop integration policies targeted specifically at migrants.

A key question in this article is whether this conceptual apparatus of national models and integration is still adequate in the light of the changing nature of migration-related diversity. Migration-related diversity is conceptualised as any form of diversity (ethnic, social, political, cultural, religious, or racial) related to first- or second-generation migrants. The focus of this article is not confined to a specific form of (migration-related) diversity, as it is an empirical question which forms of diversity emerge as relevant and pertinent in specific urban settings. In fact, migration literature has revealed important differences between countries in terms of defining diversity, such as the *race relations model* in the United Kingdom and the United States versus the more ethnic and cultural conceptions of diversity in many continental European countries, or the recent “religionisation” of diversity. I confine myself to first- and second-generation migrants because when more generations are taken into consideration, the

migration dimension of diversity becomes less clear (and it is very difficult to collate data on later generations).

Furthermore, this article is particularly interested in the governance of migration-related diversity. Focusing on government already assumes a broader lens than focusing on national government and national migrant integration policies alone. *Urban governance* is defined as an interactive process of problem definition, policy formulation, and problem solving between government and society at the urban level. This means that urban governance includes but is not limited to government policies; in fact, the governance of diversity often involves many different types of actors. It also can, but need not necessarily, involve *diversity policies* or *integration policies*. In fact, one of the key questions in the article is whether local governments should adopt specific policies targeted specifically at migrants, whether they should adopt a mainstream approach based on generic policies and service, or whether they should, in fact, do nothing and adopt a *laissez-faire* approach.

3. Methods

This article is conceptual in nature, exploring the need for a reconceptualisation of urban governance of migration-related diversity in the light of the changing nature of migration-related diversity. It does so by systematically bringing together public administration literature and recent migration studies literature, as well as bringing in empirical material from two recently completed European research projects on the governance of migration-related diversity. First of all, the article offers a review of recent studies on the changing nature of migration-related diversity and on recent developments in related policies. This literature will be juxtaposed with two specific bodies of literature from public administration (or governance) studies, literature on multi-level governance (in particular on local-national relations), and literature on mainstreaming (such as gender, disability, and environmental mainstreaming).

Secondly, the article builds on the findings from three empirical research projects that have recently been completed (and all have been coordinated by the author). The findings from these projects will be used to substantiate the positioning of the article in the abovementioned literature on migration studies, multi-level governance, and mainstreaming. The IMAGINATION project (funded by JPI Urban Europe) focused on urban governance of the consequences of intra-EU mobility. Focusing on

a variety of European cities, it provides unique and very recent material on how cities develop their own policy responses to migration-related diversity and how this relates to other governance levels. The UPSTREAM project (funded by the European Integration Fund) focuses on the mainstreaming of integration governance in a variety of European countries and cities. It also provides unique and recent material on how local governance responses seem to deviate increasingly from what have traditionally been conceptualised as national models of integration. The findings from both projects have recently been published in book form (Scholten & Van Ostaijen, 2018; Scholten & Van Breugel, 2017). Thirdly, there is the project *Policy Innovation in Refugee Integration* (Scholten et al., 2017), which involves a broad comparison of recent developments in refugee integration strategies at the local and national level in ten European countries. This also provides unique and recent material regarding the extent to which the recent refugee situation has represented a critical juncture in the governance of migration-related diversity in a more general sense.

3.1. The Changing Nature of Migration-Related Diversity in Cities

Two fundamental changes are currently taking place in the nature of migration-related diversity. One refers to the nature of migration, while the other refers to the nature of diversity that results from migration. The first transformation is that migration, or mobility in general, has become more structural to our postmodern lives; we live in an “age of migration” (Castles, Miller & De Haas, 2013). More people move, they do so more often, over larger distances, and for increasingly varying motives. The postmodern world is increasingly a world on the move. The current refugee crisis is therefore only the most recent manifestation of this trend towards greater mobility. The term *crisis* is confusing, as it is not something temporary, but rather something structural. Furthermore, migration increasingly manifests itself as mobility or *liquid mobility*, as some describe it (Engbersen, 2016). This means that migration can be permanent, in terms of the classical view of a migrant arriving, settling, and integrating, but it increasingly also seems to be temporary, with some migrants returning or moving on to other places. Especially in cities, there is evidence of a growing percentage of the urban population that is “floating”, involving a variety of different migrant types that do not intend to stay or do not end up staying in a city permanently. Needless to say, this raises a range of

questions regarding integration: how can migrants who are floating rather than settling be integrated into society?

Secondly, cities also face a *diversification of diversity* as the complexity of diversity within a city population increases. Many cities have witnessed an increase in the city population with a migrant background, but also an increase in the number of different groups, with different backgrounds and different migration motives, as well as significant differences between generations and in terms of mixing or “hybridisation” with other groups and other backgrounds. Some social scientists speak in this context of *superdiversity* (Vertovec, 2007; Crul, 2016). Superdiversity involves an increase in the scale of diversity, as well as its complexity in terms of so many dimensions (ethnicity, colour, culture, religion, but also other dimensions that are not directly related to migration) that one can no longer speak of distinct minority groups. An increasing number of European cities can even be defined as *majority-minority* cities, where more than half of the city’s population has a first- or second-generation migration background (Crul, 2016). This applies to a range of cities such as London, Brussels, Rotterdam, and Antwerp.

There is a growing awareness in the literature that these two transformations manifest themselves most clearly at the local level or in urban contexts in particular. Some speak of an emergent local turn in migration studies (Zapata Barrero, Caponio, & Scholten, 2017). Yet, there seems to be no “one size fits all”; as a result of different patterns of migration and a diversification of diversity, cities may face very different forms of migration-related diversity. Some cities such as New York and London may indeed be majority-minority cities, with the majority of the city’s population coming from very different migration backgrounds, with migrants taking many different (low-skilled as well as high-skilled) positions, and with significant ongoing migration into as well as out of the city. Others may, for instance, have a smaller migrant population with one particularly sizeable migrant group that settles permanently, such as the Turkish population in Berlin. Some cities may also have a large population from many different migration backgrounds, but mostly in low-skilled positions, such as labour migrants in Liverpool and Rotterdam who continue to immigrate but also emigrate out of the city once they have managed to enhance their socio-economic position. On the other hand, in other cities migration may be a more recent phenomenon, bringing in new migrant groups whose position in the city is uncertain and who themselves are not sure if they will settle permanently, return to their country of origin, or move on, such as recent refugee migration into cities such as Istanbul and Munich.

4. Mainstreaming Urban Governance of Migration-Related Diversity

The changing nature of migration-related diversity discussed above presents not only key policy challenges at the local level, but also a fundamental need to rethink the governance of migration-related diversity at a more conceptual level. Firstly, it challenges prevailing discourses on national models and integration. What does integration mean when societies have become superdiverse, who integrates into what, and what defines whether someone has or has not integrated into a superdiverse city? And what do national models mean when it is in fact at the local level that migration-related diversity becomes most manifest and, what is more, when there is so much variety in different local governance approaches?

In public administration literature, considerable attention has been given to the definition of policy target groups (Schneider & Ingram, 1997). In the context of traditional multicultural policies, it was assumed that policies could target distinct ethnic or cultural minority groups. However, the targeting of diversity governance becomes highly complex in the context of superdiversity (Vertovec, 2007). Superdiversity requires policies to move beyond the “ethnic lens”, as boundaries between groups have faded to such an extent that it has become hard to speak of groups in the first place. This applies in particular to migrant communities when viewed over several generations, where hybridisation takes place not only in a social sense, but also in economic, cultural, and political ways (s. also Crul, 2016).

Furthermore, the structural character of migration and the “deepening” of migration-related diversity challenge the idea that migrant integration should be a distinct institutionalised policy area. In this sense, it challenges the various ideal, typical policy models that have been developed in migration studies, including assimilationism, multiculturalism, universalism, and differentialism (Koopmans et al., 2005; Alexander, 2003; Castles, Miller & De Haas, 2013). In contemporary society migration-related diversity has become so structurally embedded in society at large that a more integral approach is required. In this sense, it has followed a path very similar to that of the policy issue of gender emancipation, but with a delayed policy path.

Here the notion of mainstreaming comes in as an alternative mode of governance of migration-related diversity. Mainstreaming refers to an amalgam of efforts to abandon target-group-specific policy measures and to coordinate integration measures as an integral part of generic policies in domains like education, housing, and employment. Mainstreaming

strategies involve intercultural policy approaches that speak to the entire diverse population and involve multiple policy stakeholders besides the nation-state, including NGOs and other levels of government. In relation to the literature on superdiversity, mainstreaming can be understood as a response to the impossibility of carving out target groups in a setting characterised by a diversification of diversity or superdiversity. Not only would there be so many migrant groups that selecting specific groups would become infeasible, the diversity within and between groups would increase and in some settings (especially urban ones) migrants would make up more than half of the population (thus no longer really being minorities).

Mainstreaming has been in use as a concept in gender studies since the early 2000s (Walby, 2005; Verloo, 2005) and later also began to be used in disability (Priestley & Roulstone, 2009; Seddon, Lang, & Daines, 2001) and environment studies (Dalal-Clayton & Bass 2009; Nunan, Campbell, & Foster, 2012). In these studies, several key aspects of mainstreaming are defined. First, there is the substantive aim of, as Verloo describes it for gender: “the incorporation of all gender and women’s concerns into general policymaking” (2005, p. 13). This implies that gender, disability, and environmental concerns would previously have been taken as overly specific concerns: specific to women, disabled people, and those directly involved in environmental policies. Various scholars point out this may have inadvertently contributed to stigmatisation or even forms of exclusion (especially of the disabled), as well as to ignorance of concerns about the environment amongst the broader population. In an effort to connect this to “mainstream” public administration theory, this dimension of mainstreaming (from specific to generic policies) speaks to the literature on target group constructions (Pierce, 2014; Schneider & Ingram, 1997). This literature draws attention to the implications of target group constructions for political decision-making and for policy design. Whereas for some groups there are political incentives for politicisation and the allocation of burdens (those seen as deviants) or benefits (dependents), for others there are incentives for depoliticisation and the allocation of burdens (advantaged) or benefits (contenders). Mainstreaming would then be about avoiding such effects of target group construction by targeting the whole of society rather than specific groups by particular policies. However, whether mainstreaming does indeed evade target group constructs altogether has not been studied thus far.

A second dimension of mainstreaming that can clearly be found in gender, disability, and environmental studies refers primarily to the governance of general awareness of issues like gender, disability, and environment. This

dimension is clearly manifested in the definition of gender mainstreaming used by many scholars (in fact, it is derived from a Council of Europe report from the late nineties): “the (re)organisation, improvement, development and evaluation of policy processes, so that a gender equality perspective is incorporated in all policies at all levels and at all stages, by the actors normally involved in policy-making” (Walby, 2005; Verloo, 2005). This refers to how mainstreaming involves a multiplicity of stakeholders across levels as well as between different organisations. This speaks to governance literature. In particular, it signals the relevance of concepts like *multi-level governance* (Hooghe & Marks, 2001; Bache & Flinders, 2004; Piattoni, 2010) and *poly-centric governance* (Rhodes, 2000) for the study of mainstreaming as a phenomenon that applies to various levels of government (vertically), as well as to various types of stakeholders in the policy process (horizontally). This literature describes a trend away from the state-centric ways of coordinating integration policies (horizontal concentration of competencies in one department and top-down coordination at the national level) towards more poly-centric ways of coordinating integration policies (horizontal fragmentation of competencies and a more multi-level governance approach). This aspect of multi-level or poly-centric governance will be discussed in greater depth in the following section.

5. Between Multi-Level Governance and Decoupling

The local turn in migration studies and the emergence of mainstreaming as a governance strategy raises a range of questions regarding the relation between the local level and other levels of governance. The literature on governance in multi-level settings defines various ways of configuring relations between government levels. Scholten (2015) brings these different ways together in a typology that distinguishes between four ideal type configurations of relations between government levels: centralist (top-down and state-centric), localist (bottom-up, with local governments taking an entrepreneurial role in relation to other policy levels), multi-level governance (adequate vertical relations between various levels), and decoupled (policies at different levels that are barely mutually coordinated).

The local turn in migrant integration policies seems to have several implications in terms of vertical relations between national and local governments. Under the centralist model, local governments would play a role, but this would be confined primarily to policy implementation. Indeed,

in many countries we find top-down structures for policy coordination. In France, policy coordination is strongly state-centric and countries including Sweden, Denmark, and the Netherlands have long had strong national policy coordination frameworks. The way funds are distributed and allocated is often indicative of the division of labour between the national and the local level. Even in the UK, a country with relatively active local actors, significant funds are allocated from the national level (including funding for courses in English for speakers of other languages).

However, many studies suggest that the top-down or centralist model has become much less applicable to the practice of migrant integration policy-making in many European countries (s. also Entzinger & Scholten 2014). Local integration policies tend to differ from national policies in various respects. Caponio and Borkert (2010, p. 9) even speak of a distinctly “local dimension of migrant integration policies”. Some scholars argue that local policies are more likely to be accommodative of ethnic diversity and work together with migrant organisations, due in part to the practical need to manage ethnic differences in a city (Borkert & Bosswick, 2007; Vermeulen & Stotijn, 2010). Thus, in contrast to the often symbolic tendencies of national policies, local policies are driven by pragmatic problem-solving (Poppelaars & Scholten, 2008). For instance, cities might work more closely with migration representatives and organisations than would a national government. Cities may also be more inclined to accommodate and support cultural and religious activities of minorities in response to migrants’ needs and demands.

Others contend that, rather than being characteristically more accommodative, local policies are driven by specifically local factors in very different directions. Significant variation in local policies may therefore be expected. Mahnig (2004) concludes that local integration policies in Paris, Berlin, and Zurich have very much responded to local political circumstances, often in ad hoc ways and leading to accommodation in some instances and exclusion in others. According to Alexander (2003), differences in local social situations have triggered different policy responses, with some cities adopting more of a culturalist and others more of a socioeconomic approach. A recent study of integration policies in Amsterdam and Rotterdam has found that these two cities within the same country and with similar migrant populations produced very different policy outcomes in terms of migrant integration. Rotterdam stressed work and housing, whereas Amsterdam was much more oriented towards promoting intercultural relations (Scholten, 2015). In other studies (e.g., Garbaye, 2005), a key factor identified as a trigger of specifically local responses is the political mobilisation

of migrants at the local level. Garbaye (*ibid.*), for example, found more significant political mobilisation and ethnic elite formation in Birmingham than in Lille. This could not be explained only by the differences between the groups involved (mainly South Asians in Britain and North Africans in Lille). Another factor was the difference between the liberal British citizenship regime and the openness of the local labour party towards ethnic elite formation compared to the French citizenship regime, which had barred access to many Maghrebi, and the local socialist party, which had remained very restrictive in admitting migrants to local political elites.

Thus the local turn of integration policy holds a number of implications for multi-level governance. In some cities, it has led to what may be described as a decoupling of national and local policies. Policies at these levels were not mutually coordinated and sometimes sent very different policy messages to the same policy target groups. Poppelaars and Scholten (2008) speak, in this respect, of national and local policies being “worlds apart” in the Netherlands, because of their divergent logic regarding policy formulation (politicisation at the national level and pragmatic problem-solving at the local level). Similarly, Jürgensen (2012) observes a growing disconnect between national and local integration policies.

In other situations, more localist types of relations have emerged. Local governments have become increasingly active in what has been described as *vertical venue shopping* (Guiraudon, 1997). This refers to efforts by local governments to lobby for policy measures at the national (and increasingly also European) level. Scholten (2015) cites the example of the city of Rotterdam, which managed to get a special law passed at the national level, allowing it to adopt stricter policies aimed at spatial dispersal of migrants in the city. The city has also been active at the European level, lobbying for integration measures for intra-EU labour migrants. Establishment of networks among European cities has become a particularly powerful strategy for vertical venue shopping in the field of migrant integration.

In contrast to the examples above, which fit the localist or decoupled types of relations, institutionalised relations between national and local governments have evolved in several countries over the past decade towards our definition of multi-level governance. Germany, in particular, has established multi-level venues for the coordination of integration policies, with a key role for national integration conferences. These conferences bring together actors from various government levels as well as non-governmental actors to align efforts to promote integration. The UK’s tradition of coordinated vertical relations includes its delegation of policy coordination at the national level to the Department of Communities and

Local Government. Even France, a country known for its state-centric approach, has developed dedicated structures for organising relations with local governments. Although this is often not framed explicitly in terms of coordinating migrant integration policies (still reflecting the French colour-blind, republicanist approach), integration clearly plays a role in France's so-called Urban Social Cohesion Contracts and Educational Priority Zones. These allow the Parisian government to adopt a tailored, localised approach within the context of national policy. The government of the Netherlands has established a "common integration agenda" for national and local governments, though it appears to have been rendered hollow by a lack of central funding.

6. Refugee Integration

The refugee influx into many European cities in 2015 and 2016 posed a key challenge in terms of urban governance of migration-related diversity. What has been referred to in policy discourse as *the refugee crisis* is, in the light of superdiversity and liquid mobility, a crucial test of the trend towards mainstreaming integration governance in Europe. To what extent have countries embedded (refugee) integration into an integral and structural approach embedded in generic policy areas such as housing, education, and labour? Or has the refugee situation been a critical juncture, altering the path of development of the governance of migration-related diversity, for instance towards more group-specific and ad hoc measures? And to what extent has the refugee situation had a broader impact on the governance of migration-related diversity in more general terms, or should the governance of refugee integration be seen as a separate policy area of its own?

The research project *Policy Innovation in Refugee Integration* shows that governments did revise their migrant integration strategies more broadly in response to the challenge of refugee integration (Scholten et al, 2007). However, they did so following somewhat different paths. There clearly is no single coherent innovative European strategy regarding refugee integration. Because of different problem situations (problem pressure or a sense of urgency), different problem perceptions (whether a country is a settlement or a transit state), as well as different policy traditions (such as countries with specific integration policies versus those with mainstreamed approaches), cities and countries responded differently. As a consequence, it seems that the refugee crisis has had a structural effect on the development of integration governance in European countries.

However, there is variation in terms of governance strategies adopted in the ten country cases we examined: specific measures (Germany, Austria), mainstreamed measures (almost all countries), laissez-faire (Italy and to some extent the UK), differentialism (Austria and to some extent Germany), and even no policy innovation (Italy and to some extent the UK). Nonetheless, there is evidence of a clear pattern. Almost all countries have primarily chosen a mainstreamed approach, adopting generic measures to achieve positive integration outcomes. This means that refugee integration was embedded in generic policy instruments such as language training, existing health services, access to regular education facilities, and access to existing housing stock. Putting this in perspective of (past) experiences with integration of other migrant categories, this marks a clear change. Rather than treating refugees (or Syrians, Eritreans, Afghans, and so forth) as a group or a distinct and separate category, this time refugees were approached more integrally.

However, in various cases this mainstreamed approach was combined with more ad hoc specific measures. Examples are intercultural teams in Austria that help schools to provide instruction in the immigrants' native languages in cases where this is really necessary, the MORE project to help refugees get access to higher education in Austria, and the *kommux* schools in Sweden that provide additional training for refugees to enable them to join regular education. Sometimes such measures are not ad hoc but structural, such as transition classes in the Netherlands. The project findings also suggest several explanations for the variation between the countries, or more specifically, for why a case country is more or less inclined to combine a mainstreamed approach with specific measures. The fact that especially countries like Sweden, Germany, and Austria opted for relatively many specific measures suggests that the more urgent the problem is, the more a country requires specific measures. Furthermore, the broader integration tradition of a country is relevant to whether or not specific measures are adopted. Finally, the degree of labour market regulation (and enforcement) correlates with the need for specific measures; the more highly regulated the labour market is, the more specific measures are required to make sure that refugees can actually access the labour market.

Speaking to the literature of multi-level governance, there seems to have been a strong move from the state-centric modes that would have traditionally typified migrant integration policies (Favell, 2003) to more obviously multi-level governance in which the local level acquires a much more prominent role (see also Zapata-Barrero, Caponio, & Scholten, 2017).

Moreover, innovative projects or “experiments” at the local level often make their way into national policies and thus promote policy change. This was clearly the case in Austria, where many promising practices were initiated in Vienna but also in the Netherlands, where many projects were initiated in larger cities such as Rotterdam, Utrecht, and Amsterdam. This local entrepreneurship seems to be a consequence of problem urgency in cities. It is primarily cities that face the challenge of integrating significant numbers of refugees; therefore, it is also at that level that the need to develop effective projects is felt most concretely. Also, the role of the local level is essential in the absence of a clearly articulated national strategy of refugee integration. This applies to Italy but also to some extent the UK, where most governance strategies of refugee integration concentrate on the local level, or even the community level.

However, in various cases we have also seen that local policy initiatives have not always fit within national policy frameworks, in some cases even leading to situations of decoupling between policy levels. In the Netherlands, for instance, city governments in particular have developed comprehensive programmes that include assistance to refugees in their civic and labour-market integration, while this is not in line with the official national philosophy that stresses individual responsibility. Dutch policies in these domains aim to encourage refugees’ self-reliance and participation, while officials at the local level claim that this is in most cases too unrealistic to demand of refugees in the first few months following their arrival. In most cases, however, it appears that national level governments accept local innovation, even when it contradicts official policy imperatives. Together with the fact that local governments are facing the refugee integration challenge more directly, this relative freedom to innovate has led to a diverse set of local approaches that in many cases form a substantial part of the integration measures of a country.

7. Intra-EU Mobility

Whereas attention is currently devoted mostly to refugee immigration, the most substantial migration type in Europe over the last decade has been intra-EU mobility. Coping with growing numbers of *mobile EU citizens* (especially those moving from Central and Eastern European countries like Poland, Bulgaria, and Romania to Western European countries such as Germany, France, the Netherlands, and the UK) was perhaps the key motive behind Brexit: the decision taken by the UK to leave the Europe-

an Union. Here too, we see one of the two fundamental transformations mentioned above (liquid mobility) clash with established institutions that have not sufficiently adapted to this transformation (lack of orientation towards the inclusion of mobile EU citizens). What implications has intra-EU mobility had for urban governance of migration-related diversity, both in terms of mainstreaming (or lack thereof) and (the presence or absence of) multi-level governance?

One of the cornerstones of the development of the European Union is the principle of free movement within the EU. The EU has created an unprecedented area in which not just capital, goods, and services, but also people can move around relatively freely. This freedom of movement is guaranteed by EU law and enshrined in the principles of the Lisbon Strategy, with the objective of creating “more and better jobs, by reducing obstacles to mobility”. Particularly following the EU enlargements of 2004 and 2011 with a number of Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries, the scale of EU mobility has grown significantly. Migration from EU member states in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) has evolved into one of the main migration flows within Europe (Black et al. 2010); more than 2.2 million people from Poland were engaged in international migration or mobility between 2004 and 2007 (Gorny et al., 2009). This contributed to a “new face” of East–West migration in Europe (Favell, 2008; Favell & Recchi, 2010).

The EU’s most fundamental concern regarding this free movement is guaranteeing labour mobility, enhancing the flexibility of European labour markets, and strengthening the European Single Market by removing “barriers”, “obstacles” and “hindrances” that frustrate the flexibility of European labour markets (European Commission, 2002; 2004; 2007, p. 4). Removing these barriers also means that EU citizens are not perceived as migrants under EU law, but as *mobile workers* (Favell, 2008; Guild & Mantu, 2011). This implies that mandatory measures are perceived as illegitimate disturbances of the EU principle of free movement, in contrast with EU policies aimed at Third Country Nationals (TCNs), migrants from outside the European Union, who still need to meet specific requirements to get access to work and residency in the EU.

However, this “new face” has caused contestation, mainly related to the implications of free movement within Europe for both the destination area and the areas of origin. In France, the “Polish plumber” played a significant role in the rejection of the EU constitution in 2005, in Sweden there are fierce debates around “new” beggars and homeless people (Favell, 2008), and the Dutch vice prime-minister called for a “Code Orange” to

increase awareness of the “shady sides” of free movement (Scholten & Van Ostaijen, 2018). Contestation came in particular from the local level (ibid), where the integration consequences of intra-EU mobility became most manifest. For cities such as Rotterdam and London, the differences between intra-EU and TCN migration were considered slim in terms of social and economic inclusion.

In academic literature, contestation has emerged regarding the conceptualisation of free movement within the EU. From a political science perspective, EU mobility is the embodiment of the new political context created by the European Union, with mobile EU citizens as new Europeans (Boswell and Geddes, 2010). From an economic perspective, the importance of free movement for the functioning of the internal market is stressed. This involves issues such as dequalification, exploitation, and exclusion (Favell, 2008). From a sociological perspective, free movement within the EU is conceptualised as a specific form of migration, with a range of differences depending on settlement and attachment (Engbersen et al., 2013). This involves specific challenges for destination and origin areas as well as for the migrants themselves. Finally, from a governance perspective attention has been drawn to the complexities in the management of EU mobility, including the discrepancies in labour market regulations in different EU member states, as well as discrepancies between governance approaches between individual countries and between EU, national, and local levels of governance (Scholten et al, 2017).

Once again, the urban level plays a key role in this regard. The EU’s “obstacle-free” mobility perspective conflicts with the perception of local authorities in European municipalities and national ministries. Previous research has shown that, for instance, Dutch authorities positioned *labour mobility* by historical references as *labour migration* and European *mobile workers* as *labour migrants* (Van Ostaijen, 2017). This evolved into several policy actions of national ministers, requiring the attention of the European Commission because “this type of immigration burdens the host societies with considerable additional costs” (Mikl-Leitner et al., 2013). It shows a paradigm conflict between the European Commission versus its member states and local municipalities regarding free movement, or as European Commission Vice-President Viviane Reding acknowledged at the *Conference for Mayors on EU Mobility at Local Level* in Brussels (2014): “Your debates confirm that there is not just simply one single perspective on free movement. There are a variety of experiences. Depending on where you are, in which country, in which region, in which city, you face different needs. You face different challenges and different opportuni-

ties. Your experiences on the ground are diverse and so are your policies” (Scholten & Van Ostaijen, 2018, p. 128).

Consequently, here we see another sign of the failure of mainstreaming or structural adjustment of Europe’s institutions to the emergent reality of migration and diversity. The EU’s preoccupation with the free movement paradigm for economic reasons has led to a failure to connect with local (urban) concerns about the inclusion of mobile EU citizens. Interestingly, this did not only become a key concern in multi-level relations between cities, countries, and the EU (long before Brexit), but also plays pervasive role in our language regarding intra-EU mobile citizens. Are these mobile citizens or migrants; should there be only generic economic policies or also integration policies?

8. Conclusions

Bringing together literature from public administration and from migration studies, this article makes the case for a reconceptualisation of the governance of migration-related diversity. It shows how two fundamental transformations in the nature of migration and diversity are challenging urban governance in Europe. It shows that Europe is experiencing a transformation towards structurally high levels of mobility (with the recent refugee situation as only the most recent manifestation), contributing to a further increase in the complexity of diversity: superdiversity. Whereas the EU and national levels receive the greatest attention in terms of political debate, it seems to be the local (urban) level in particular that faces these challenges most concretely. The article therefore calls for a local turn not only in policies themselves, but also in the study of migration and diversity.

Mainstreaming is identified in this article as a promising governance strategy for cities to devote greater structural attention to issues of diversity and migration. It reflects the generalisation of migration as a phenomenon that influences all policies and institutions in a city, and calls for a generic rather than a specific approach. It is all about mobility and the diversity-proofing of generic policies and institutions.

However, two specific challenges studied in this paper (as cases) do not provide much proof that such a mainstreaming approach is being implemented effectively. The issue of refugee integration still receives far less attention than the regulation of refugee migration, and many of the integration measures for refugees seem to be ad hoc and temporary, as if

this does not involve a structural migration group. The issue of intra-EU mobility also shows some of the reluctance of governments to develop integrationist approaches and to respond to structural mobility within a complex multi-level setting, in which the EU holds on to free movement while cities are more concerned about social inclusion.

The discussion in this article makes it clear that much work is still needed for today's cities of migration to face the challenges and opportunities of migration and diversity. Mainstreaming as a governance strategy provides clear opportunities for doing so, but the political contestation of migration and the complexity of multi-level governance in this area are clear obstacles to such an approach. In the meantime, Europe's cities will remain vulnerable as they have inadequately adjusted to the emergent realities of liquid mobility and superdiversity.

References

- Alexander, M. (2003). Local policies toward migrants as an expression of host-stranger relations: A proposed typology. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 29(3), 411–430.
- Bache, I., & Flinders, M. V. (2004). *Multi-Level governance*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Bertossi, C. (2011). National models of integration in Europe: A comparative and critical analysis. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(12), 1561–1580.
- Bertossi, C., Duyvendak, W. G. J., & Scholten, P. (2015). The coproduction of national models of integration: A view from France and the Netherlands. In P. Scholten, H. Entzinger, R. Penninx & S. Verbeek (Eds.), *Integrating Immigrants in Europe* (pp. 59–76). Dordrecht, Netherlands: Springer.
- Black, R., Engbersen, G., Okolski, M., & Pantiru, C. (Eds.). (2010). *A continent moving West? EU enlargement and labour migration from Central and Eastern Europe*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Bommes, M., & Thränhardt, D. (2010). Introduction: National paradigms of migration research. In M. Bommes & D. Thränhardt (Eds.), *National paradigms of migration research* (pp. 9–40). Osnabrück, Germany: V & R Unipress, Universitätsverlag Osnabrück.
- Borkert, M., & Bosswick, W. (2007). *Migration policy-making in Germany: Between national reluctance and local pragmatism?* (IMISCOE Working Paper No. 20). Amsterdam, Netherlands: IMISCOE.
- Boswell, C., & Geddes, A. (2010). *Migration and mobility in the European Union*. London, United Kingdom: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? Changing perspectives on immigration and its sequels in France, Germany, and the United States. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24(4), 531–548.

- Caponio, T., & Borkert, M. (Eds.). (2010). *The local dimension of migration policy-making*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Castles, S., Miller, M.J., & De Haas, H. (2003). *The age of migration: International population movements in the modern world*. New York, NY: The Guilford Press
- Crul, M. (2016). Super-diversity vs. assimilation: How complex diversity in majority-minority cities challenges the assumptions of assimilation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 42(1), 54–68.
- Dalal-Clayton, D. B., & Bass, S. (2009). *The challenges of environmental mainstreaming: Experience of integrating environment into development institutions and decisions*. London, UK: International Institute for Environment and Development (IIED) .
- Engbersen, G. (2016). Floating populations, civic stratification and solidarity: Comment on Will Kymlicka's article: "Solidarity in Diverse Societies". *Comparative Migration Studies*, 4(1), 1–4.
- Engbersen, G., Leerkes, A., Grabowska-Lusinska, I., Snel, E., & Burgers. J. (2013). On the differential attachments of migrants from Central and Eastern Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(6), pp. 959–981.
- Entzinger, H., & Scholten, P. (2014). Models of immigrant integration? Between national and local integration policies. In M. Martiniello and J. Rath (Eds.), *An introduction to immigrant incorporation studies: European Perspectives* (pp. 371–390). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- European Commission (2002). *Free movement of workers: Achieving the full benefits and potentials* [Communication]. COM 694. Retrieved from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=LEGISSUM:c10525>
- European Commission (2004). *Report on the implementation of the Commission's Action Plan for skills and mobility*. [Communication] COM 72. Retrieved from: https://pjp-eu.coe.int/documents/1017981/1668235/Com_Actionplan_Skills_Mobility.pdf/9af7ce5a-7161-43da-824f-5bc90117d550
- European Commission (2007). *Mobility: an instrument for more and better jobs: European Job Mobility Action Plan 2007–2010*. [Communication] COM 773. Retrieved from: <http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/ALL/?uri=LEGISSUM:c11805>
- Favell, A. (2003). Integration nations: The nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe. In M. Bommers & E. Morawska (Eds.), *International migration research: Constructions, omissions and the promises of interdisciplinarity* (pp. 13–42). Aldershot, United Kingdom: Ashgate.
- Favell, A. (2008). The new face of East–West migration in Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 34(5), 701–716.
- Favell, A., & Recchi, E. (Eds.) (2010). *Pioneers of European identity: Citizenship and mobility in the EU*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Garbaye, R. (2005). *Getting into local power: The politics of ethnic minorities in British and French cities*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Gorny, A., Grabowska-Lusińska, I., Lesinska, M., & Okólski, M. (2009). *Transformacja nieoczywista: Polska jako kraj imigracji* [Non-transparent transforma-

- tion: Poland as a country of immigration]. Warsava, Poland: Wydawnictwa Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego.
- Guild, E., & Mantu, S. (Eds.). (2011). *Constructing and imagining labour migration: Perspectives of control from five continents*. Surrey, United Kingdom: Ashgate.
- Guiraudon, V. (1997). *Policy change behind gilded doors: Explaining the evolution of aliens' rights in France, Germany and the Netherlands, 1974–94*. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation), Harvard University, USA.
- Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2001). *Multi-level governance and European integration*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Jürgensen, M.B. (2012). The diverging logics of integration policy making at national and city level. *International Migration Review*, 46(1), 244–278.
- Koopmans, R., Statham, P., Giugni, M., & Passy, F. (2005). *Contested citizenship: Immigration and cultural diversity in Europe*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Mahnig, H. (2004). The politics of minority–majority relations: How immigrant policies developed in Paris, Berlin and Zurich. In P. Penninx, K. Kraal, M. Martiniello & S. Vertovec (Eds.), *Citizenship in European cities: Immigrants, local politics and integration policies* (pp. 17–37). Farnham, United Kingdom: Ashgate.
- Mikl-Leitner, J., Friedrich, H. P., Teeven, F., & May, T. (2013). *Letter to Alan Shatter, Presidency of European Council* [Official letter]. Retrieved from: http://docs.dpaq.de/3604-130415_letter_to_presidency_final_1_2.pdf
- Nunan, F., Campbell, A., & Foster, E. (2012). Environmental mainstreaming: The organisational challenges of policy integration. *Public Administration and Development*, 32(3), 262–277.
- Piattoni, S. (2010). *The theory of multi-level governance: Conceptual, empirical, and normative challenges*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Pierce, J. (2014). Social construction and policy design: A review of past applications. *Policy Studies Journal*, 42(1), 1–29.
- Poppelaars, C., & Scholten, P. (2008). Two worlds apart: The divergence of national and local immigrant policies in the Netherlands. *Administration & Society*, 40(4), 335–357.
- Priestley, M., & Roulstone, A. (2009). *Targeting and mainstreaming disability in the 2008–2010 national reform programmes for growth and jobs*. Leeds, United Kingdom: Academic Network of European Disability Experts.
- Rhodes, R. A. (2000). Governance and public administration. In J. Pierre (Ed.), *Debating governance: Authority, steering and democracy* (pp. 54–90). Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Schneider, A. L., & Ingram, H. M. (1997). *Policy design for democracy*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.
- Scholten, P. (2015). Between national models and multi-level decoupling: The pursuit of multi-level governance in UK and Dutch policies towards migrant incorporation. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*. Published online first, 18 June 2015. Retrieved from: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s12134-015-0438-9>

- Scholten, P., & Van Breugel, I. (Eds.). (2017). *Beyond migrant integration: Mainstreaming integration governance*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Scholten, P., & Van Ostaijen, M. (Eds.). (2018). *Between migration and mobility: The urban consequences of intra-EU movement*. Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Scholten, P., Baggerman, F., Dellouche, L., Kampen, V., Wolf, J., & Ypma, R. (2017). *Policy innovation in refugee integration?* (Report). Rotterdam, Netherlands: Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Seddon, D., Lang, R., & Daines, V. (2001). *Mainstreaming disability issues into development studies: In theory and practice*. Paper presented at the 14th Annual meeting of the disability studies association, Winnipeg, Canada.
- Van Ostaijen, M. (2017). Between migration and mobility discourses: The performative potential within “intra-European movement”. *Critical Policy Studies, 11(2)*, 166–190.
- Verloo, M. (2005). Mainstreaming gender equality in Europe: A critical frame analysis approach. *The Greek Review of Social Research, 117*, 11–34.
- Vermeulen, F., & Stotijn, R. (2010). Local policies concerning unemployment among immigrant youth in Amsterdam and in Berlin: Towards strategic replacement and pragmatic accommodation. In T. Caponio & M. Borkert (Eds.), *The local dimension of migration policymaking* (pp. 109–134). Amsterdam, Netherlands: Amsterdam University Press.
- Vertovec, S. (2007). Super-diversity and its implications. *Ethnic and Racial Studies, 30(6)*, 1024–1054.
- Walby, S. (2005). Gender mainstreaming: Productive tensions in theory and practice. *Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society, 12(3)*, 321–343.
- Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation–state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks 2(4)*, 301–334.
- Zapata Barrero, R., Caponio, T., & Scholten, P. (in press). Theorizing the local turn in the governance of immigrant policies: A multi-level approach. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*.

BEYOND MIGRANT INTEGRATION POLICIES: RETHINKING URBAN GOVERNANCE OF MIGRATION-RELATED DIVERSITY

Summary

The key question addressed in this article is how to reconceptualise migrant integration at the level of urban governance in the face of the changing nature of migration-related diversity. There is a growing number of cities in Europe that can be defined as superdiverse cities, or cities where people with a migration background make up such a substantial part of the city population and are so diverse that it becomes difficult to speak of distinct migrant minorities. This article discusses the implications the changing nature of migration-related diversity has for urban governance. First, it argues that rather than thinking of integration in the sense of coherent national models of integration, integration should be redefined as a local issue. If it is conceptualised as a local issue, how should proper relations be developed between various levels of government in order to prevent policy decoupling or policy contradictions? Secondly, not only does this article argue that we should go through a local turn in our conceptualisation of the governance of migration-related diversity, it also pinpoints a specific direction in which local governance can develop: mainstreaming. Borrowing from the literatures of gender, disability, and environmental mainstreaming, it is argued that the structural character of migration-related diversity in contemporary cities requires a structural approach embedded in generic policies. Thirdly, the article discusses what this local turn and mainstreaming mean for relations between the local level and other levels of governance. Speaking to the literature on multi-level governance, it discusses to what extent the local turn in the governance of migration-related diversity has led to effective coordination between governance levels, or rather to evidence of what may be described as decoupling or disjointed governance.

Keywords: migration, integration, urban governance, mainstreaming, multi-level governance

KORAK DALJE U POLITIKAMA INTEGRACIJE MIGRANATA: REKONCEPTUALIZACIJA RAZLIČITOSTI POVEZANIH S MIGRACIJOM KOD UPRAVLJANJA GRADOVIMA

Sažetak

U radu se istražuju mogućnosti rekonceptualizacije pitanja integracije migranata na razini upravljanja gradovima uzевši u obzir promjene u području različitosti povezanih s migracijom. Sve je više europskih gradova koji odgovaraju definiciji „super-različitih“, tj. radi se o gradovima gdje migrantska populacija čini znatan postotak ukupnog broja stanovnika i toliko je raznovrsna da se sve teže mogu razlikovati individualne migrantske skupine. U radu se razmatra kako različitosti povezane s migracijom utječu na upravljanje gradovima. Iznosi se teza da integracija ne bi trebala predstavljati cjelovite nacionalne integracijske modele, već da bi se trebala definirati kao lokalno pitanje. Tu se nameće pitanje kako urediti odnose između različitih razina upravljanja kako bi se izbjeglo razdvajanje politike (policy decoupling) te nastajanje proturječne politike. Nadalje, osim što se autor zalaže za konceptualizaciju upravljanja različitostima povezanih s migracijom kao lokalnog pitanja, u radu se predlaže smjer kojim bi lokalna vladavina mogla krenuti. Po uzoru na literaturu koja govori o ravnopravnosti (mainstreaming) u temama rodne različitosti, invaliditeta i zaštite okoliša, u radu se iznosi teza da struktura priroda različitosti povezanih s migracijom u suvremenim gradovima zahtijeva strukturni pristup ugrađen u generičke politike. Također se govori o mogućem utjecaju lokalne definicije integracije na odnose između lokalne razine i ostalih razina upravljanja. S osvrtom na literaturu iz područja višerazinskog upravljanja govori se o mjeri u kojoj je lokalna definicija integracije dovela do učinkovite koordinacije između različitih razina upravljanja, tj. o primjerima onoga što se može nazvati razdvajanje politike ili neuslađenosti u upravljanju.

Ključne riječi: migracija, integracija, upravljanje gradovima, mainstreaming, višerazinsko upravljanje