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1. Introduction

The phenomenon of migration towards Europe is a complex social process that European societies are endeavoring to govern at the international, European, national and local levels. Studies on the politics and governance of migration have widely used the multi-level governance (MLG) approach to comprehend the complex processes of policymaking around immigration (policies), namely admission and reception, management of diversity, and integration of immigrants (Zapata-Barrero et al. 2017). In contrast to the descriptive use of the notion to merely indicate the different actors involved in migration governance (Zincone and Caponio 2006), and to analyse the relations within EU national-states or federal states, recent research delves into the dynamics and scalar interactions within MLG. This aims to make sense of complex relations between different scales of governance, namely local, regional, national, European or global (vertical dimension), and between actors of different nature, that is those public and non-public (horizontal dimension) (Campomori and Caponio 2017). Actions, responsibilities and mandates of different actors across different levels may be characterized by difference or overlapping; their relationships may be harmonious or contentious, that is it can be about collaboration or contrast. In addition, MLG is criticized for providing little insights on the networks of different actors and the nature of their connections, as well as for putting too much emphasis on the outcomes of the governance processes and, thus, neglecting the processes that produce them (Caponio and Jones-Correa, 2018; Pettrachin 2020). Following the Work Package 6 of the Horizon 2020 MAGYC project, of which this review aims to provide a broad explorative literature study for understanding multi-scalar interactions of the immigration governance by civil society actors, transnational organizations, city-city collaborations and private sector.

The multi-scalar approach is found useful for challenging traditional conceptual frameworks that theorize migration with push-pull factors as well as the use of nation-state as a unit of analysis— by identifying issues of methodological nationalism common in migration research (Williamson 2015). Contemporary scholars of migration have argued that approaches to migration based only on the neoclassical economic analysis of ‘push and pull’ factors, or which regard migrants narrowly as rational economic actors have failed to explain “contemporary migration processes, which are increasingly temporary, non-linear and multi-sited and which
D6.1 Broad explorative literature study on the multi-scalar policy practices in relation to migration and integration within EU may implicate new forms of transnational and multiple belonging” (Williamson 2015:17; Castles et al., 2013).

Another theoretical contribution of multi-scalar approach to migration studies is the critique of the relationship between migration and the scale of the nation state (Williamson 2015). Methodological nationalism is defined as the bias towards privileging the nation-state as the ‘natural’ unit of society, and the most appropriate analytical lens for studying migration (Castles, 2007; Glick Schiller, 2010). According to Williamson (2015), such bias is common in migration studies as nation-based data and policy dominate the research with an assumption of a homogeneous national community tied to a bounded state territory where minority and migrant groups can be excluded as ‘others’. In order to go beyond the national scale, migration scholars suggest a new concept called ‘transnational social fields’ which take migrants’ multi-layered and multi-sited transnational networks as the lens for studying migration (Levitt and Glick Schiller, 2004).

In this deliverable, we conduct a literature review of studies that explain scalar interactions, multiplicity and heterogeneity of actors engaged in policy practices in migration governance. These studies are ranging from subfields of migration research such as border regime, refugee studies and migration industry to urban studies and social movements.

2. The multi-scalar approach in migration studies

Recent works on social transformation and migration studies have recognized the importance of multi-scalar approach in theorizing the interactions between different migration procedures, practices and actors at various spatial scales. The concept of scale has been introduced in social justice studies for reimagining the political space by going beyond the taken-for-granted frame of ‘national state’ (Fraser 2008). According to Fraser, equality and justice lose its meaning unless we question and examine the scale at which a question of justice is evaluated. This is particularly important for migration studies as framings of ‘rights’ and ‘wrongs’ at the national scale can deny representation to large groups of migrants, or justice claims on refugeehood can change at different points of history. There is emergent work on temporal scales connecting past and present through analyses of postcolonial continuities in migration control and humanitarianism showing some of today’s policy practices have
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historical roots in population control (Lemberg-Pedersen, 2019). Temporal scale has also been crucial in understanding the ‘crisis’ moments. For instance, we need to consider temporality in analyzing the European ‘refugee crisis’ in 2015 to understand whether or not short-lived mobilizations have long-term impacts regarding the policy practices.

Urban geography is another scholarship where multi-scalar approach is central. Urban geographers such as Purcell (2008) also used scale as a concept for questioning the rescaled relations of migration in urban spaces. Geographers coined the term ‘politics of scale’ and explain that construction of a scale is always a result of a political project. Scale represents a set of political, economic and social relations in a hierarchy (Harvey, 2006; Herod and Wright, 2002) and thus it can be dynamic and relational. While national scale was the hegemonic scale in the Fordist era, our present era represents the ‘de-hegemonizing’ of the national scale due to reorganization of the world economy where production, finance and information has been internationalized, and transnational communities are on the rise (Purcell 2003). Changing power relations between different entities can reinforce processes of rescaling and negotiation of ‘scale’ that they are defined in. For instance, local social movements can ‘jump-scale’ from local to global in order to increase their influence or migrants can act as ‘scale-makers’ and contribute to the global repositioning of cities – for example, through their participation in the labour force and as mediators in transnational associations (Williamson 2015, Caglar 2007).

Conflict can be another illustration of power relation. Ambrosini (2018) argues that local policies are considered to be the output of multi-scalar interactions of conflict and cooperation, alternative views and political actions, official policies and practical help, formal statements and informal practices. These dimensions are wrapped in the concept of ‘battleground’ an analytical tool to comprehend the conflicting relations embedded in the governance of migration (Campori and Ambrosini, 2020).

Multi-scalar approach also contributed to the rescaling of citizenship ideas. Transnational migration has created growing number of people who have multiple political loyalties and who do not settle in a single nation-state. Transnational migrants pose challenge to the narrow notion of citizenship that is defined by national borders. Such rescaling of citizenship becomes more visible in subnational scales including urban areas, neighborhoods and districts. According to Purcell (2003: 573), a new citizenship form link to cities rather than nation-states.
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is necessary as global cities are important hubs of expressions of the complex rescaling of the global economy and contain large concentrations of transnational migrants. In recent years, due to rise of municipal movements, urban citizens are increasingly mobilizing in order to extend local governance’s roles in defining policies that have direct impact on the production of urban space especially in transnational and multi-scalar issues such as climate change, environmental justice and refugee reception (Isla and Irgil 2018). Recent theories of globalization also contribute to new framings of ‘global’ and ‘local’ in order to better explain rescaling of communities by grounding the global and globalized the local through concepts such as ‘glocalization’ (Robertson, 2005). As Williamson (2015: 21) argues these new approaches help to “avoid the trap of framing the global as naturally more abstract, powerful and somehow ‘wider’ than other scales, or rendering the local as fixed, contained, small-scale and the primary site of human agency and resistance”.

3. Multi-scalar interactions at migration governance: Review of case studies in Europe

In a European context of growing politicization of migration and within increasingly polarized localities in relation to migration phenomenon, we focus on two main tendencies in the actions within local communities: from one side, migration scholars have highlighted how the local-level can be a ground for local policies of exclusion (Semprebon 2011; Ambrosini and Caneva 2012; Ambrosini 2013; 2018) and intolerant policies towards migrants, bringing new mechanisms of control into everyday spaces (Gilbert 2009; Lebhun 2013; Gargiulo 2017); on the other side, research on grass-roots initiatives brought to the fore the role of local actors in politically supporting migrants and refugees (Bazurli, Casula and Campomori, 2020; Karakayali and Kleist, 2016; Youkana and Sutter, 2017; Zamponi, 2017; Mayer, 2018; Raimondi 2019), as well as in improving their integration (Alexander 2007). Similarly, as in the past, works have recently suggested that several local governments take initiatives in favour of migrants and argue for inclusion (Bauder, 2017; Irgil 2016; Garcés-Mascareñas and Gebhardt, 2020; Oomen, 2019; Oomen and Leenders 2020). The role of migrants themselves is also considered.

The production of local borders has to be inscribed within wider global processes investing several spheres of the contemporary social life. The literature of critical border studies has stressed the proliferation of borders within the national territories, highlighting how
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Contemporary capitalism does not produce only physical and legal barriers between states, but also administrative borders within the territories that entail selective mechanisms among the people. These mechanisms of differential regulation are understood as the real function of borders, namely dynamic processes – rather than a fixed and material entity – functioning as “filters” for the access to territories and resources (Basaran 2010; Mezzadra and Neilson 2013; Kolossov and Scott 1985). In other words, contemporary migration policies become increasingly selective (De Haas, Natter and Vezzoli 2016; Ambrosini, Cinalli and Jacobson 2020).

Accordingly, a global stratification system is produced where the mobility of some people considered undesirable or a social threat – like migrants and refugees – is restricted: some authors talk about the creation of an “im/mobility regime” (Glick-Schiller and Salazar 2013). Freedom of movement became hence a scarce resource, being the national states the main actors in “the monopolization of the legitimate means of movement” (Torpey 2000) through a global system of passports and visas regulating the access to national territories.

The various devices and techniques of management of migrants’ mobilities have been analysed in the border studies mostly referring to Foucauldian theory (Walters 2015). Some border practices and devices produce experiences of containment (Tazzioli 2018) and confinement (Rahola 2010; Picker and Vivaldi 2019) aiming to sort, rank, and block some categories of people on the move. Another typical governmental technique emerges from the classification of people on the move into categories – such as “economic migrants”, “asylum-seekers”, “refugees”, “illegal migrants”, etc. – enforcing hierarchies among them according to their legal statuses (Turner and Isin 2007; Rigo 2007, 2011; Anderson 2012; Green 2013; De Genova 2013). The legal status emerges as a crucial governmental tool through which selective mechanisms producing inequalities are deployed, by reducing and limiting access to several rights and social benefits within European societies (Faist 2013). At the beginning of 2000s, some research had stressed the creation of a “gradual system of rights” (Ong 2006) entailing to a “civic stratification” (Morris 2003), namely a hierarchy in the access to rights and welfare benefit according to the legal status. This reflects a sort of competition between a variety of structural constraints such as welfare resources, labour market management, and international obligations – like human rights conventions. Several actors – public and non-public – are involved in the management of migration and operate at the local level being direct agents in the production of borders. In the last years, empirical studies focusing on the local
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production of borders have set research fields in border places between national territories - for example Ventimiglia, at the border between Italy and France (Giliberti and Palmas, 2020), and Calais, at the border between France and UK (Agier et al. 2018; Sandri, 2018), as well as within national territories and even cities. The production of borders is a process that can be grasped in very visible and formal border places, as well as inside urban spaces through national and local policies, band through more invisible and indirect practices - like within local administration.

Indeed, empirical studies have highlighted the role of different actors in creating local borders by implementing restrictive policies directed against migrants and refugees. In the Italian academic debate the notion of “local policies of exclusion” (Ambrosini, 2013) has pointed to those “institutional obstacles to the of several minorities (civil, social) and to their freedom of expressing their cultural and religious identity” (ibid, 4). Local municipalities, hence, emerge as actors that either implement European and national policies in a restrictive way or even invent regulations against migrants by their own initiative, thus preventing refugees and migrants from integrating in the social structures of the arrival societies. In particular, it has been demonstrated how several mayors have deployed the instrument of municipal ordinances in order to restrict access for migrants and refugees to several rights. Such an administrative tool has been implemented at the local level, sometimes in contrast to the national laws in the name of emergency and urban security. By negating registration of migrants with the Registry Office (legal domicile), mayors could directly deny the access to several rights such as healthcare, political rights (possibility to vote at local elections), welfare benefits, and access to the school for the children (Gargiulo 2012). Other studies have highlighted the way in which local authorities have obstructed the access to housing and social rights through the implementation of restrictive administrative practices (Bolzoni, Gargiulo and Manocchi 2013). What emerges from these studies is a conflictual dynamic within the multi-level governance of asylums and immigration, stressing how a restrictive local implementation of national laws can create gaps between the legal provision and the effective exercise of social rights.

Some other research has shown how local bureaucratic offices produce hierarchies and stratification in the access to rights and welfare benefits by implementing restrictive national welfare policies and creating regulations hostile to migrants. This indicates that welfare policies
D6.1 Broad explorative literature study on the multi-scalar policy practices in relation to migration and integration within EU can be turned as tool for border control and management of human mobility (Lafleur and Mescoli 2018). Indeed, migration control practices and the connected legislative violations are mostly embedded in ordinary legal frameworks and are created by means of ordinary politics of borders (Basaran 2008; Tuastad 2017). National bureaucracies operate within the legal framework through an excess of administrative rules that became progressively institutionalised. In the management of migrants and refugees it is possible to grasp a trend of slow erosion of existing legal standards operated by local bureaucracies (Campesi 2014). Despite the fact that refugees are entitled to a series of rights and benefits in the host countries, when it comes to the local implementation of these rights, we find gaps between legal provisions and the effective exercise of migrant rights, as well as new restrictive measures planned by local actors. Empirical research in the Italian context shed light on how these administrative routines that produce restriction are produced by the expansion of bureaucratic practices already present in the national legal system, which turn into ordinary when transposed to migration governance at the local level (Gjergji 2016a; 2016b). Thus, a production of “administrative borders” emerges, namely bureaucratic barriers deployed to protect some spheres of local community life from “undesired” people (Gargiulo 2017). Recently, there have been evidences that municipalities have denied settled refugees to receive the residence card (Campomori and Ambrosini 2020). Similarly, research in the German context has highlighted the increasing active role of semi-public institutions and private actors in the management of borders at the local level, by monitoring migrants and refugees through their legal status. Many local institutions govern refugees’ and migrants’ everyday lives through their legal status: welfare agencies, municipal administrations, universities, public and private schools, health care providers, doctors, hospitals, housing agencies, bank and insurances. During the everyday lives of migrants and refugees such local state agencies and private service providers are systematically and consistently checking residents’ identification papers, and through these interactions local borders are produced (Lebuhn 2013).

In relation to these policies it is interesting to see the discursive strategies used by authorities to justify exclusion policies. As regard the Italian context, for instance, Marchetti (2020, p. 250-259) identifies six types of discursive strategies to refuse asylum seekers. First, nationalistic arguments refer to the juxtaposition between ‘us’ and ‘them’ and are used in relation to lack of job opportunities in local labour markets (i.e. ‘there is not work for everyone in this place’).
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Second, securitarian arguments relate to public order or health reasons as there can be “risks connected to the security and the possible spreading of diseases or plague”. Third, bureaucratic arguments regard application of the law when, for instance, reception facilities do not respect law requirements. Fourth, assumptive arguments are those strategies of legitimization connected to labelling of bogus asylum seekers, in the sense that mayors can oppose to the arrival of people seeking asylum without deserving it. Fifth, exclusion may be based on utilitarian arguments, that is mayors express worries about the negative consequences of the arrival of migrants in the local economy (i.e. the presence of migrants in touristic villages can damage the attractiveness of these places). The sixth discursive strategy is called paternalistic. It is the case when mayors emphasize the shortcomings of social services at the local level as a reason to deny reception, that is low quality (or even lack) of service would be damaging for migrants themselves. Although the focus of migration scholars on how local authorities are engaged in practices of bordering, some research has suggested that local governments promote initiatives and policies that favour integration for the benefit of immigrants (Marrow, 2012; Penninx et al., 2004; Van der Leun and Bouter, 2015). Recently, some scholars elaborated this thematic trend making reference to refuges and irregular migrants. In particular, it has been argued that many mayors and municipal councils have been also involved in practices that aim to break down existing borders. This is the case of ‘Cities of refuge’ (Oomen, 2019; Oomen and Leenders 2020), or, in the American literature, ‘Sanctuary Cities’ (Bauder 2017). In these cities, local governments develop an independent stance where the State remains undecided around or hostile to migration, promoting integration and inclusion. Such policies aiming to tackle global challenges may also contribute to the international development of refugee law and policy, as cities take part in networks and exchange views on asylum governance (Oomen, 2020).

One example to this is the ‘Ciutat Refugi Plan’ of municipality of Barcelona that has launched in 2015 as a response to the inaction of EU states in receiving refugees from Syria. The aim of the plan was to create an inter-municipal space by creating network of municipalities in order to provide assistance for the arrival and reception of refugees in Barcelona with bilateral and multilateral arrangements made with other municipalities in the network (Irgil 2016; Garcés-Mascareñas and Gebhardt 2020). According to Ciutat Refugi and its inter-city network there are four strategies – the reception model, care for refugees already in Barcelona, citizen
D6.1 Broad explorative literature study on the multi-scalar policy practices in relation to migration and integration within EU participation and information, and action abroad—through interaction and cooperation. The network involves the cities of Lesbos, Lampedusa, Athens, and Paris, Leipzig, Bristol, Wadowice and Slupsk, A Coruña, Madrid, and the autonomous governments of Generalitat Valenciana, the community of Navarra, and the Bask Country (Comas et al. 2016: 3), followed by more than fifty-five municipalities in Spain (Irgil 2016).

Another example regards the British movement of “solidarity cities” that promoted a “culture of welcome” towards asylum-seekers and refugees through various forms of practical assistance, material support, and legal advice provided to forced migrants by community-based initiatives. These practices contest the bordering processes and open up disputes over “rightful presence” (Squire and Darling 2013) and broader questions of justice. In addition, Kos and colleagues (2015) explored how Dutch municipalities developed practices to cope with exclusionary national asylum policies. As substantial number of asylum seekers failed to obtain regular status, local governments collaborated with NGOs to operate emergency reception and accommodation, thus creating tension between themselves and national actors. All in all, despite the fact that such research enables to deeply grasp the process of border production at the local level, and the dynamism of power relations, the dimensions of negotiation and conflict, and how local borders are challenged are sometimes under-developed in this literature. On the one hand, according to the street-level bureaucracy approach (Lipsky 1980), an in-depth understanding of migration management in arrival societies should also to look at those possibilities to negotiate borders embedded in the power relations between migrants and refugees, bureaucratic officers, and other actors of the civil society (Ellerman 2006). On the other hand, few research projects are focusing on the conflictual relations between bureaucrats, actors of the civil society, and migrants and refugees. Even though there are empirical evidences suggesting that pro-migrant actors may be engaged in “debordering” of policies of exclusion (Ambrosini 2013; 2018), other actors opposing migration (parties, movements) assume a role in the local ‘battleground’, thus contributing into bordering practices or mobilize to avoid pro-migrant local policies.

**Rescaling responsibilities of the state: The role of civil society in**
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*Migration governance*

The local turn in migration refers to a shift of responsibilities from the state to the local level (Bendel, Schammann, Heimann, & Strüner, 2019; Glorius & Doomernik, 2016; Haselbacher, 2019; Zapata-Barrero, Caponio, & Scholten, 2017; Glick-Schiller and Cağlar 2010; Campoori and Caponio 2017). During the 2015 summer of migration a shift of responsibilities can be observed not only from the national level to the local level but also from the public sector to the private sector (Caponio & Jones-Correa, 2018), leaving a large role for civil society in the reception of asylum seekers. Civil society actors have always played a role in the asylum seeker reception yet their role was extended and adapted in this period (Larruina, Boersma, & Ponzoni, 2019). Voluntary organizations and initiatives for example proved able to respond quicker and more adequately to changing local needs while governmental actors and established NGOs where held back by ‘limited resources and unclear policies’ (De Jong & Ataç, 2017: 28), also characterized as forms of emergency governance rather than coherent and strategic asylum governance (Panizzon & van Riemsdijk, 2019; Simsa, 2017). While NGOs and faith-based organizations, mainly churches, take over most responsibilities of governments, these tendencies are certainly also present among other civil society actors like social movements and grassroots citizen initiatives. Moreover even activist networks partly changed their action repertoire to include helping and taking care of migrants next to their practices of political contention (Belloni, 2016; Sandri, 2018; Zamponi, 2017).

During, and after, the 2015 migration ‘crisis’ or ‘long summer of migration’ (Hess et al., 2017), as state systems were failing to adequately handle the larger numbers of arriving migrants in European countries (Simsa, 2017) civil society organizations played an important role in the governance of new arrivals, namely in the reception of asylum seekers (Haselbacher, 2019). Civil society organizations can be broadly defined as all formal and informal social institutions between the state, the economy and the private sphere (Odmalm, 2004; Putnam, 1993; Simsa, 2017: 78-79). There is a variety of civil society actors involved in the reception and integration processes of migrants: non-governmental organizations (NGOs), nonprofit organizations (npo’s) as well as grassroots initiatives (Simsa, 2017; Togral Koca, 2019; Tsavdaroglou et al., 2019), spontaneously mobilized citizens (Ambrosini 2019), and refugees themselves (Hinger et al., 2016; Belloni 2016; Raimondi, 2019; Pogliano and Ponzo, 2019). These civil society actors
all played a part in the reception of asylum seekers; NGOs became key players in the organization of migrant reception, and the provision of basic care (Haselbacher, 2019; Pries, 2019); grassroots initiatives of ordinary citizens welcomed migrants at train stations (Boersma, Kraiukhina, Larruina, Lehota, & Nury, 2019; Sinatti 2019), donated food and clothes (Zamponi, 2017); or organized language classes (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016); and activists provided shelter in squats (Belloni, 2016; Raimondi, 2019). Within the literature regarding this variety of civil society actors and their responses to the large scale arrival of asylum seekers, many authors dealt with civil society actors taking over responsibilities of the state, whereas there is a growing bulk of literature in relation to the emergence of grassroots initiatives in the ‘summer of welcome’ and the question of whether or not these forms of help should be interpreted as forms of political action (Sinatti, 2019). Last but not least, attention also turn to those civil society actors opposing migration and how they may challenge governance.

All these different actors have filled the gap left by the government in different areas, most notably: medical care, social assistance, housing, and integration. Firstly, NGOs became the primary healthcare providers for migrants outside the reception centres, and volunteer work by healthcare professionals became a key non-monetary input to enable health care services to migrants (Bozorgmehr et al., 2019). Secondly, volunteers have occupied themselves with the social assistance of migrants. Bonizzoni (2019) for example describes how in Italy the ‘Zampa law’ introduced the figure of the ‘volunteering guardian’, a volunteer that legally represents, and safeguards the interests of an unaccompanied minor on Italian territory. This has been considered a way to protect them more efficiently. Previously, this was the responsibility of the municipality, the mayor and social workers (Bonizzoni, 2019). Next to this, Schweitzer (2018) highlights how, in Barcelona and London, NGOs play a relevant role in granting irregular migrants the access to (public) services to which they are formally entitled, by assisting them through the bureaucratic procedures (Schweitzer, 2018). Thirdly, the housing of refugees is mostly a responsibility of the state. However, during the large influx of migrants, states have called on collaboration with civil society actors to organize housing of refugees. As Hinger and Schaefer (2019) describe in the case of the decentralized housing plans of Leipzig and Osnabrück (Germany) this included both church organizations (Caritas, the Johanniter, Malteser), NGOs (Red Cross, Outlaw), as well as the army and private security companies (Hinger & Schaefer, 2019). Moreover, squatting and informal settlements have become a way
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for migrants in Europe to live outside formal reception centres, while excluded (formally or informally) from the housing market. In these squats and camps social movements, squatter’s movements and activists play a key role (Belloni, 2016; Grazioli, 2017; Raimondi, 2019; Sandri, 2018; Pogliano and Ponzo, 2019). Fourthly, besides the more basic provision of help, civil society actors play a role in the integration of migrants in the new societies in various ways. This can be observed in the organization of language classes by NGOs, social movements, as well as grassroots initiatives (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016). Or, in the efforts of grassroots initiatives who organize meetings between citizens and migrants on the level of the neighbourhood (see below). But for example NGOs can be seen as part of the process of helping migrants with the formal integration programs, as is the case of the Dutch Refugee council (Van Heelsum, 2017: 2143). Moreover, supporting migrants to participate politically and make claims to rights could be seen as a part of becoming integrated (Nicholls, 2013; Nordling, Sager, & Söderman, 2017; Sandri, 2018; Sinatti, 2019; Vandevoordt, 2019). What is often lacking in terms of multi-level governance is the type of interaction between these non-governmental actors and governmental actors, and how (and if) non-governmental actors precisely challenge policies decided in a higher level of governance or determine outcomes in terms of immigration governance (Marzorati, Semprebon and Bonizzoni 2017).

Besides organizations that were already organized and committed to the cause of refugee reception, it is worthy giving particular emphasis on the rise in grassroots citizen initiatives that started to organize and played a role in the reception of asylum seekers. In the German literature this has been referred to as the German ‘summer of welcome’ or ‘welcome culture’ (Fleischmann, 2017; Fleischmann & Steinhilper, 2017; Hamann & Karakayali, 2016). These authors describe a variety of loosely institutionalized and self-organized initiatives, made up out of volunteers who often did not commit themselves to refugees before as well as groups who traditionally committed themselves to the cause of refugees like the radical left, antiracist, and religious groups. These initiatives coordinate a variety of support activities; often around a specific issue, for example language courses or leisure activities, for asylum seekers within their local communities. These activities often encouraged and enabled social contact between asylum seekers and citizens (Fleischmann & Steinhilper, 2017: 17-18; Hamann & Karakayali, 2016; Larruina et al., 2019).
Grassroots initiatives, as well as other forms of pro-migrant volunteering, can be a response to right-wing anti-migrant sentiments and discourses in society (Hamann & Karakayali, 2016), or as a way to express frustrations towards the governments’ approach to asylum seeker reception (Koca, 2016). However, at the same time those participating in help to migrants often tend to frame this help in explicit a-political terms, as purely humanitarian acts (Fleischmann & Steinhilper, 2017; Sinatti, 2019). Conversely, it can be observed that traditional political actors, like social movements and activist networks, shift their activities towards help to migrants. Belloni (2016) for example writes about how migrant squats become places for forms of ‘welfare from below’, as squats provide shelter as well as forms of social security (Belloni, 2016). Zamponi (2017: 97) describes this as within a trend of ‘direct social action over protest’, defining direct social action as ‘actions that do not primarily focus upon claiming something from the state or other power-holders but that instead focus upon directly transforming some specific aspects of society by means of the action itself’. Similarly, Sandri (2018) writes about ‘volunteer humanitarianism’ to indicate the connection between humanitarianism and open forms of protest against institutional border securitization practices (Sandri, 2018) emphasizing the political meaning of this offer of services in the so-called Jungle of Calais.

Augustin and Jorgensen (2019)’s book on solidarity and refugee crisis in Europe gave a detailed account of solidarity networks in Europe in the aftermath of refugee crisis. They argue that vertical state-centered strategies often come with depoliticized narratives of crisis which reproduce depoliticized strategies of management and control which conceal what was happening. To counteract, civic and institutional solidarity movements emerge from already existing local organizations. They gave the example of municipal action ‘Barcelona as Refugee City’ as an example of institutional solidarity and the case of the Danish network ‘Venligboerne’ (‘friendly neighbors’) as civic solidarity. Civic solidarity is articulated by “the ability to create a position of belonging to an inclusive community erasing distinction between those who have papers and those who do not” (Ibid:84).

One observation regarding the literature on civil society responses to the large influx of migrants after 2015, is that this literature tends to focus on the ‘positive’ responses to migrants and on the ways in which civil society helps migrants. While at the same time, this is only part
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of the response towards migrants that could have been observed in this period. That is, one can observe how the welcoming initiatives, providing help and promoting tolerance, from a broad alliance of civil society actors, take place in contexts where public opinion often expresses resentment towards asylum seekers (Haselbacher & Rosenberger, 2018). Anti-migrant mobilisations have been described in terms of the rise of European right-wing groups and movements, both in terms of on the ground mobilizations and protests (Castelli Gattinara, 2017; Rucht, 2018), and as a digital phenomenon (Ekman, 2018; Kopytowska, Grabowski, & Wozniak, 2017).

However, in terms of negative civil society attitudes towards migrants the literature is largely silent. In particular, there have been different levels of engagement towards immigrant integration and reception, that is some civil society actors have not responded in solely positive ways towards migrants: for example labour unions that have been faced with the dilemma of different interests of migrant-workers and native-workers (Marino, Penninx, & Roosblad, 2017). But also some churches have uttered anti-migrant sentiments. Narkowicz (2018) provides a description of a highly divided catholic church in Poland, where the general stance of the catholic church on welcoming refugees is contrasted with ‘right-wing Catholicism’, and strong anti-migrant and islamophobic sentiments (Narkowicz, 2018). Another example is the case of Norway, where in the beginning of the ‘refugee crisis’ churches played an active role in the reception of refugees; yet were increasingly confronted with a ‘fear of the faith of others’. The (perceived) anxiety of parts of the population on whether the influx of, mostly Muslim, migrants in an increasingly secularizing country, and this new plurality of faiths, would undermine social and political cohesion (Stålsett, 2018: 113-114). In the Italian case, it has been argued that relation between politics and civil societies has been often characterised by contrast, as mobilizations from below, local authorities and right-wing movements have mobilized to avoid the establishment and functioning of reception centers (Ambrosini 2018; Campomori and Ambrosini 2020) and squats for asylum-seeking persons (Pogliano and Ponzo, 2019). Once again, either talking about initiative in favour or against migrants, little is known about the interaction (conflict or cooperation) of these actors with public actors or existence of networks and dialogue between them (for an exception see Larruina et al. 2019).
Transnational and local scalar interactions: the role of migrants and refugees in migration governance

Although often overlooked in many studies, some empirical results suggest that immigrant movements and associations and migrant and refugees themselves may have a role in influencing the scalar interactions in migration governance (Hinger et al., 2016; Fontanari, 2018; Fontanari and Ambrosini, 2018). Hinger and colleagues (2016: 51), for instance, argued that coalitions between asylum-seeking persons and support groups have resulted in influencing accommodation practices and decisions in German municipalities. Moreover, migrant social movements, of refugees and/or undocumented migrants for example, all over Europe have aimed to influence politics to improve their situation (e.g.: Ataç, 2016; Ataç, Rygiel, & Stierl, 2016; Cappiali, 2016; Chimienti, 2011; Monforte & Dufour, 2011; Raimondi, 2019). Bazurli (2019) for example describes how social movements by and for migrants specifically aimed to influence the city-governments of Milan and Barcelona, in hopes to improve the way in which these local governments handle the arrival and transit of migrants (Bazurli, 2019). Similar research conducted in the Italian context suggests that migrants and refugees collaborate with native people in squatting practices for the common aim to carve out housing solution (Belloni 2016; Grazioli 2017). Generally, empirical research across the global context (Nyers and Rygiel 2012; Marciniak and Tyler 2014) has highlighted the active role of migrants and refugees in protesting against a regime of restrictive mobility where security measures are deployed in order to block them. Some of these experiences have been understood as aware political practices being part of organized political protests, while others have been understood as forms of everyday resistance (Scott 1985) despite participating at political protests (Fontanari and Ambrosini, 2018). Finally, struggles for citizenship from below, for recognition, for human rights enacted by those subjects who are directly affected by restrictive migration policies need to be taken into consideration in the analysis of multi-level governance. Migrants and refugees often interact with support groups of civil society as well as with the border controllers and policy makers, contributing to that conflictual and dynamic process we call “battleground” of migration governance.
Private sector and economic multi-scalar interactions in migration governance

Apart from local governing bodies, civil society and migrants, economic networks and groups have also been increasingly influential in migration governance, through contracts with national governments or supranational entities for the supplying of equipment like drones, fences, aircraft, helicopters, vessels, visa systems, biometric technology and the like (Andersson 2016; Lemberg-Pedersen 2018; Sánchez-Barrueco 2018). A recent report on the political economy of entry governance shows multi-scalar interactions between public and private actors by detailing the influence of both national and commercial interests on the development, adoption and implementation of EU policy priorities, funding instruments and technological measures related to entry policies in the EU (Lemberg-Pedersen et al. 2020). According to the report, EU policy-making must be understood as also partly formulated at the scale of large European and transnational conglomerates from the sectors of security, defence, aerospace and IT and biometrics.

Through lobbyists active in the European Parliament, the European Commission and other networks, the demand for costly technological border infrastructures for the EU migration governance is shaped by market actors competing to formulate and win contracts. Increasingly, EU Member States respond to this lobbyism by procurement at a pre-commercial stage, effectively prioritizing certain national industries through border control contracts. Yet, despite the scale of the transnational market for EU border control (Lemberg-Pedersen et al., 2020: 16), the influence yielded by these companies and associated actors remains opaque for and unaccountable to European civil society and democratic bodies in the EU.

In a related, recent development, the political economy of many complex displacement contexts which encompass humanitarian actors and commercial and financial companies and organizations have begun to exhibit similar dynamics (cf. Tazzioli, 2019). Linking up local, transnational and global scales, humanitarian organizations like the UNHCR enter into partnerships with governments, alongside actors like the World Bank Group, the Cairo Amman Bank and companies like Iris Guard and Accenture for providing biometric technologies. Partnerships between the humanitarian sector, and the financial, developmental and IT/biometrics sectors are on the increase (Rahman, Verhaert and Nyst 2018) and recasts
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humanitarian organizations as gatekeepers profiting from allowing commercial actors expand the reach of their financial and technological products to “the unbanked” populations of the world, such as asylum seekers and refugees, effectively commodifying displacement as a profitable new financial frontier (Lemberg-Pedersen and Haioty, 2020: 7).

4. Conclusion

Our literature review confirms the increasing importance of multi-scalar interactions in defining migration policies and the significant role of different non-governmental actors in the migration and asylum governance (Garkisch, et al. 2017; Ambrosini 2018; Spencer 2018; Campomori and Ambrosini 2020). Although we focus on studies that go beyond the national scale, it is also clear that national scale remains a hegemonic order in migration governance despite the increasing importance of local and transnational actors.

Having looked at different case studies on different scalar interactions and actors’ engagement in migration governance, we state that emphasis should be given not only to the vertical scalar interactions in terms of cooperation and coordination among actors, but also to the horizontal dimension, namely the relationship between public and non-public actors, and how their actions and interaction influence or shape policies in relation to migration governance. Given the increasingly significant engagement of actors in favour of migration and the emergence of ‘Cities of refuge’ (Oomen, 2019; Oomen and Leenders, 2020) on the one hand, and the involvement of civil society actors opposing migration as well as private economic actors influence migration policies on the other, we found out that there is not enough literature that shows contradictions and conflicts between actors of different nature; those may influence the implementation of policies, as well as the production of borders and the discussions, struggles, and resistance practices against such borders. In this context, mobilizing role of refugees and their own networks should not be neglected as they have often had a leading role in influencing policies. This is to say that actual governance of migrants seems to be also the product of conflicting processes in which different actors (pro- and anti-immigrant organizations/groups and the immigrant organizations themselves) have a crucial role. The concept of battleground (Ambrosini 2018; Campomori and Ambrosini 2020) is used in the literature to comprehend the conflictual field where several actors and subjects interact – in a cooperative and/or conflictual way – for the management of migration processes.
D6.1 Broad explorative literature study on the multi-scalar policy practices in relation to migration and integration within EU

Temporal scale is also an important element in multi-scalar analysis of migration governance. There is a limited number of studies that use temporal scale as a tool to reflect short and long-term effects of ‘refugee crisis’ and how such momentums can be maintained. Emerging postcolonial turn in migration studies as well as diaspora studies provide promising analyses from a temporal perspective by connecting past and present practices of migration regimes as well as understanding migrant communities and their political belongings across generations.

Future research on multi-scalar approach in migration studies needs to put more emphasis on investigating the actual dynamics of interaction between actors of different nature and at different scales, and how these can shape migration governance. Attention should be paid also to role of networks between such actors, as well as to policy outcomes, namely if and how policies can be challenged from below.
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