KING

Knowledge for INtegration Governance

Local policies as cultural integration and social cohesion policies

Patrycja Matusz-Protasiewicz

KING Project – Social Science Unit
Desk Research Paper n. 11/July 2014

HESSEN

"la Caixa" Foundation

fondazione
cariplo

KING - Knowledge for INtegration Governance

The KING project is co-funded by the European Commission, Directorate-General Home Affairs, under the Action HOME/2012-2013/EIFX/CA/CFP/4000004268. Start date: 15 September 2013; end date: 15 March 2015.

The KING project's objective is to elaborate a report on the **state of play** of migrant integration in Europe through an interdisciplinary approach and to provide decision- and policy-makers with **evidence-based recommendations** on the design of migrant integration-related policies and on the way they should be articulated between different policy-making levels of governance.

Migrant integration is a truly multi-faceted process. The contribution of the insights offered by different disciplines is thus essential in order better to grasp the various aspects of the presence of migrants in European societies. This is why **multidisciplinarity** is at the core of the KING research project, whose Advisory Board comprises experts of seven different disciplines:

EU Policy – Yves Pascouau
Political Science - Alberto Martinelli
Public Administration – Walter Kindermann
Social Science – Rinus Penninx
Applied Social Studies – Jenny Phillimore
Economics – Martin Kahanec & Alessandra Venturini
Demography – Gian Carlo Blangiardo

The project consists in the conduct of preliminary **Desk Research** to be followed by an empirical in-depth analysis of specific key topics identified within the desk research. To carry out these two tasks, each Advisory Board member chose and coordinated a team of two to five researchers, who have been assigned a range of topics to cover.

The present paper belongs to the series of contributions produced by the researchers of the "Social Science" team directed by Professor Rinus Penninx:

EU Policy	ADVISORY BOARD MEMBER	DESK RESEARCH PAPERS
Political Science		• "Immigrants' equal access and equal use: A review of local policies in the domains of health care, housing, education and the labour market" by Blanca Garcés-Mascareñas
Public Administration	RINUS PENNINX Overview Paper	• **"Local policies as cultural integration and social cohesion policies" by Patrycja Matusz-Protasiewicz**
Social Science		• " The legal and political dimension of local integration policies" by Tiziana Caponio
Applied Social Studies		
Economics		• "A Bibliography of Scientific Literature on Integration Policies of European Cities" by Hannah Schwarz
Demography		

The project is coordinated by the **ISMU Foundation**, based in Milan (Italy).

Contacts:

Guia Gilardoni, Project Coordinator – g.gilardoni@ismu.org
Daniela Carrillo, Project Co-Coordinator – d.carrillo@ismu.org
Marina D'Odorico, Project Co-Coordinator – m.dodorico@ismu.org

Website: www.king.ismu.org
Twitter: @KING_Project_EU

ISMU Foundation - Initiatives and Studies on Multiethnicity
www.ismu.org
Via Copernico 1
20125 Milano
Italy

Local policies as cultural integration and social cohesion policies

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper investigates the policies and practices of cultural integration and social cohesion at the level of European cities which have been confronted with the growing ethnic and cultural heterogeneity caused by the influx of immigrants from all around the world over the past decades. As statistical data shows the majority of some 47 million foreign-born residents of the European Union lives in cities. European cities have been thus put under pressure to produce and maintain effective governance regimes which would mitigate the potential disturbances ignited by the above-mentioned growing diversity of their populations (Eurostat 2011).

On the one hand many European cities have been able to minimize the negative effects of low birth rates and ageing population on their societal, demographic and economic sustainability thanks to growing number of immigrants. On the other hand the growing ethnic diversity put the cities in front of new governance challenges to develop and implement new policies able to reconstitute and regulate the social cohesion of their multiethnic and multicultural populations. Scientists have recently dedicated a lot of attention to the cultural integration of migrants, their relations with local communities and other social groups as well. As Van Crean, Vancluysen, Ackeart (2009) pointed out immigrants not only live in cities, but establish feeling of belonging with their neighbourhood and city much faster than with the receiving country.

For a long time cities have been perceived as agents which were limited in their governance activity to the simple implementation of immigration policies developed at the national level. However the burden of immigration and the difference in its recognition between national and local level have encouraged cities to reshape the national policies for the local purposes and produce other genuine tools and mechanisms to promote local integration strategies and policies in the area of cultural integration. The cultural dimension of immigrant integration seems to be most flexible area in which cities authorities have formulated and implemented their own strategies adapted to the specific local needs.

This paper is based on the analysis of empirical findings from main research projects and networks such as: CLIP, Eurocities, Intercultural cities, INTI-CITIES, the DIVE-project and the MIXTIES-project[1]. Empirical materials from those projects were complemented with data provided by the Open Society Institute Project *Muslims in Europe* which looks at the local integration policies targeted at Muslim communities. While analyzing the existing materials, this paper tries to use the multilevel governance model (MLG) taking into account the possibility of horizontal and vertical cooperation between the different governance levels as well as the perspective of policy transfers (Dolowitz & Marsh 2000) which provides the MLG with the

---

[1] CLIP Network was established as a European Network of Cities in 2006. The main idea of this initiatives was the exchange of good practices and strengthening of policy learning processes. The CLIP network cooperated strongly with the CLIP research group responsible for studies on local integration policies. All materials and case studies are available at http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/help/casestudies.htm?utm_source=website_rightcolumn&utm_medium=website&utm_campaign=allcases20130503; The Integrating Cities project started in 2006 as an initiative of Eurocities network. The main aim of the project was to promote dialogue between the Eurocities Network and the EU institutions (mainly the European Commission) on the effective governance in European cities. More information at www.integratingcities.eu. In order to strength the policy learning across the EU Eurocities has developed many EU financed projects, among others the INTI-project and the DIVE project.

possibility to reflect on the questions why, who and how utilize the cooperation across the various levels in terms of policy learning processes and exchange of good practices. In the MLG the decision making process is based on negotiation between different levels and takes a form of formal and informal consultations (Hooghe 2007). In the case of urban networks we should understand the vertical relations as relations between cities and the national and EU levels. The horizontal relations shall be then understood as relations between actors within the specific local level, but also as relations between various local levels when cities share policy experience with other cities (in the process of exchange of good practices). Moreover this paper takes the governance as a set of not only formal, but also informal institutions. The informal contacts and networks are recognized as very important at the local level where pragmatic solutions might become viable policy outcomes. Immigrant organizations and their crucial role in the negotiations and implementations of integration projects and initiatives is also highlighted as the necessary component on the local governance regimes. The cooperation between public and private institutions is a key element of MLG model and will be thus incorporated into the analytical approach used by this paper (Svedrup & Kux 1997).

This paper is a part of KING report on local integration policies, in which this area is subject to analysis in three dimensions: legal-political, socio-economic and cultural-religious. In the first dimension T. Caponio (2014:1): "investigates the policies and practices of the European cities to deal with issues of legal inclusion and participation in the public sphere, considering also the role assigned to immigrant associations in the decision making and implementation of local integration policies". In case of legal-political domain of integration the competence lies mainly at national level and the local authorities implement national policies. However, it happens more and more often that they try to develop local strategies promoting political participation. Socio-economic domain is similarly as legal-political one a matter of national policies but local authorities have developed their own strategies to complement national policies. B. Garcés-Mascareñas (2014:1) in the paper on socio-economic dimension "focuses [...] especially on policies fostering the socio-economic incorporation of immigrants in health care, housing, education and the labour market". This paper takes the cultural-religious dimension as focus point of local policies.

The aim of this paper is the identification of common practices used by the cities in cultural integration policies. The paper is divided into five sections analyzing the following issues: framing and definitions of cultural integration and social cohesion at the city level, institutions responsible for the development and implementation of local integration policies, resources of the implemented actions, and the targets and tools used by cities in this particular area.

2. THE MEANING OF CULTURAL INTEGRATION AND SOCIAL COHESION: FRAMING AND DEFINITIONS

The following section discusses the plurality of theoretical concepts of the cultural integration and social cohesion. Because the literature on diversity and integration of immigrants involved different disciplines including anthropology, sociology, economics, political science, or history and psychology, it is difficult to find one commonly accepted definition of cultural integration or social cohesion. It is beyond the purpose of this paper to cover all existing literature. Therefore this paper concentrates only on the selected definitions which are suitable to its research purpose and resonates in the policies and practices employed by cities themselves.

Social cohesion has no universally accepted definition and is rather a contested concept. In most cases social cohesion is connected with the principles of solidarity, togetherness, sense of belonging to the local community, and the acceptance of common values. According to Demireva (2013:3) "*social disorder, or*

rather social disorganization is often thought to be the opposite of social cohesion. Frequently social cohesion is simply defined as 'solidarity' and somewhat interchangeably used together with the terms 'community cohesion'. As is the case with related concept of social capital, cohesion seems better identifiable through its possible outcomes". There has been scientific discussion about the concept of social cohesion, its definition and relations to other terms as immigration, diversity, social capital. One example is the special issue of journal *Ethnicities* (Holtung & Mason 2010). Many researchers have analyzed the impact of immigration and growing diversity on social cohesion using very diverse indicators (as ethnicity, religion, place of birth, nationality) which makes cross-national comparisons difficult. Some authors argue that a high degree of cultural, religious and linguistic diversity might have a negative effect on social cohesion and community trust (Alesina & La Ferrara 2005; Putnam 2007). This paper looks at cultural/religious integration through the lens of social cohesion. Cultural integration in this approach is supposed to lead to social cohesion in the local context.

Although the legal, socio-economic and political integration issues of immigration policies in the receiving countries have been developed on the national level and left not much space for the local authorities to manoeuvre, the reality of governance in the particular local levels shows that cities were nevertheless able to deal with policy transfers from the national level in an inventive manner. When contrasted with the practice of the national level cities seem to be skilfully *spontaneous*, *flexible* and capable to *easily targeting* the most acute issues in the process of immigration policy-making. Moreover cities do not implement the national policies as a final rule, but use them as a delineating framework which must be further modified, accommodated or renegotiated in the everyday governance practice with the other local stakeholders identified below in this paper.

Cities involved in the European city networks seem to understand the integration as a two-way process which fosters mutual understanding and respect for all groups living in the community. Cultural integration and social cohesion have been defined by the cities rather broadly covering in some cases issues that go beyond the cultural domain.

From the political perspective at the local level it is challenging to develop and implement policies which attempt to manage the cultural diversity in order to maximize social and economic benefits and reduce costs at the same time.

Based on the empirical materials from the projects mentioned in the introduction the activities undertaken by cities in the area of cultural integration, we might distinguish three way of framing the issue: firstly, cultural integration aiming at the economic growth; secondly at the avoidance of conflicts within community; and thirdly at the recognition of diversity.

2.1. Cultural integration aiming at economic growth

In local cultural policy documents, diversity may be perceived as a source of attractiveness, innovation and competiveness. Cultural integration is then developed as a cross-sectoral issue engaging different stakeholders such as public institutions, business organizations, media, NGOs, civil society organizations, immigrant organizations, churches and trade unions by managing diversity in the most effective way. In this perspective, Khovanova-Rubicondo and Pinelli (2012) claim that "*diversity is an asset, a source of dynamism, innovation, creativity and growth.*" Literature on the urban development has connected diversity with the growth of attractiveness for investments and innovations in the city (Sassen 2001).

According to the empirical research, cities are aware that local labour markets need immigrants. However, immigration might bring both benefits and costs. Immigrants are tax payers on the one hand; the

management of the highly diverse population demands higher costs on the other hand. The process of permanent negotiation which underpins the governance regimes is indeed costly in terms of time, finances, and manpower for its management. Nonetheless the social purpose of the policies employed in various European cities take the principle of interculturality which tries to turn the potential costs into real benefits. In the case of Stuttgart the municipal integration policy has been re-oriented towards such an explicit intercultural approach. The concept of integration is based on the *Pact for Integration*, a coalition between the public sector, the private sector and civil society organizations. Copenhagen's Integration Policy promotes the interculturality as social equity, it openly claims that the interaction of Copenhagen's citizens with different ethnic, cultural and religious backgrounds will facilitate the city with the linguistic and cultural skills needed to face the challenge posed by globalisation.

Immigration is in many cities seen as both economic and cultural challenge which can be dealt with reasonably only though the adoption of an intercultural approach to integration. This long-term systematic diversity-oriented approach assumes that culturally diverse community may contribute significantly to innovations and economic growth. The intercultural approach aims to strengthen the intercultural dialogue and cooperation in order to maximize economic benefits. The Intercultural Cities concept "*is based on the assumption that social exclusion has, at least partly, cultural causes. Cultural exclusion transforms into discrimination in the labour market and the workplace, in education, in the neighbourhoods, in public space, in the institutions of power*" (Wood 2009). This way of approaching integration shows that the constantly redefined concept of social cohesion and cultural integration is interdependent with the integration in the economic and political domains. This kind of governance employed by cities is flexible, cross-sectoral and engages various stakeholders in the negotiations about the final goals and tools of cultural integration.

2.2. Cultural integration aiming at avoiding conflict

Growing ethnic and cultural diversity can aggravate difficulties in the intergroup relations and hinder communication between immigrant groups and local population (Lücken-Klaβen & Heckmann 2010). The depiction of specific immigrant groups is easily manipulated, presenting Muslims as a threat to societal peace for example. In such a case cultural integration or diversity management aims at conflict avoidance and combating negative attitudes towards immigrants, xenophobia and racism. The coexistence of cultural, religious and linguistic diversity might lead to conflicts over values and competition for resources. Local authorities are aware of the potential sources of conflicts and try to prevent or manage the tensions. According to the AMICALL research findings, local authorities have used a range of activities as: "*tackling misinformation and misapprehensions (...), avoiding, mediating and defusing tensions and conflicts; creating understanding between different communities which share common places; and building a shared and inclusive local sense of belonging and identity of all citizens*" (Collett & Gidley 2012). There has been a whole variety of tools developed by cities in order to promote intercultural dialogue and intergroup relations within community such as educational campaigns, cultural events promoting diversity, information campaigns about equal treatment and non-discrimination. All this has been aimed at strengthening of common sense of belonging but also combating discrimination in both the hard domains (education, labour market, health care) and the private life.

Implementing policies aiming at avoiding intergroup tensions and the potential conflict are indeed strongly related not only to the domain of cultural integration, but also economic one. Failure to engage with the diversity management brings high social costs.

2.3. Cultural integration aiming at recognition of diversity

Integration policies developed in member states of European Union differ considerably due to differences in political systems, historical experiences in migration, ethnic structure of immigrant population and many other factors. According to the IDEA project we can distinguish three groups of countries in the EU: Western European countries (most advanced in integration policies), South European countries and Central Eastern European countries (being in the process of transformation from sending to receiving country). New member states (in majority from CEE region) have accessed EU in the specific moment when integration issues where highly on the political agenda at the national levels and EU level. The available financial sources for integration of third country nationals (European Integration Fund EIF) have influenced the development of first integration programs and strategies. Despite the still low number of immigrants in the new member states and low priority of the immigration issue on the political agenda, the availability of financial resources have constituted an important incentive in the learning processes and implementation of pilot integration programs. According to Pawlak (2013) the main role in the formulation and implementation of integration goals have been taken up by NGOs in Poland due to the lack of *explicitly* formulated governmental integration policies. These NGOs have played an important role in the negotiations with public institutions in the course of the development of the new Polish Migration Policy (Matusz Protasiewicz 2013a, 2013b). This is comparable with Germany before 2000 when NGOs, churches, trade unions played important role in the integration of foreign residents and were thus compensating the absence of governmental integration policies (Penninx 2014).

Having analyzed the materials from CLIP research in many cases of CEE cities the spirit of diversity has been invoked in the city promotions. In the case of the cities Wrocław and Lublin in Poland one may witness a set of promotional practices based on an appeal to their alleged multicultural and multi-religion heritage in order to attract investors and tourists (Matusz Protasiewicz 2013a). In this sense the promotion of diversity has been understood as strongly connected to the economic growth and as sign of Europeization.

In all the above-mentioned policies of cultural integration, local governance is not made by city administrations and imposed on immigrant groups. At the national level, it seems that state is imposer rather than negotiator, mediator and promoter who would reflect on the policy needs. In contrast the local authorities, seems to perform the exact role of negotiator, mediator and promoter who engages in the permanent discussion with the broad civil society and reflects thus on the inhabitants needs. City administrations constitute the most important and steering force in such governance regimes, but they are inevitably complemented by a huge amount of ethnic, religious and national organizations which tend to create coalitions in order to compel the city administration to act or create harmonious co-existence. The increasing role of immigrant organizations in the decision-making process will be explained later in this paper.

Apart from the three ways of framing cultural integration in local policies mentioned above, there are some other differences among cities across Europe in terms of defining and approaching cultural integration and social cohesion. Based on the empirical material, three models related to governance of policies – can be recognized. The first is the interventionist model, visible in Vienna and Bologna, which attempts to encompass all sectors of cultural, social, economic, religious, ethnic integration. The second is the regulatory model, visible in Copenhagen and Turku, which is selective and based on the active intervention to the social and economic sectors of integration, but indifferent or neutral to the cultural, ethnic, and religious sectors. In this sense, the second model promotes integration policies by using general institutional policies or relevant domains. The third can be coined as the passive model, visible in Porto and Dublin, which lacks of a proper infrastructure (Porto), or is characterized by general reluctance to invest into social cohesion measures (Dublin). The model presumes that immigrants speak already the local language, do not suffer from a language barrier and can thus integrated without any additional help.

In conclusion the analyzed examples of practices in cultural integration prove the diversity of approaches among European cities. Cities also create various governance regimes which gain their own characteristic features though the mediation and negotiation with the plurality of local actors in process of formulation and implementation of suitable cultural policy goals. In the case of lack of national integration policies, cities have developed their own strategies in the management of cultural diversity (Italy, and some cities from CEE region). As CLIP, AMICALL and DIVE research confirms local authorities feel much more legitimatized than national ones in ensuring equal access to public services and spaces for diversity for all residents.

3. INSTITUTIONS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF LOCAL CULTURAL INTEGRATION POLICIES

In cities involved in the European networks of cities mentioned in the introduction, the integration of immigrants has become an important duty for the local administration. While developing integration policies, cities establish normally one directing institution which is administering integration agenda. At the same time, a variety of other institutions like cultural offices or special funds emerge to complement those policies. In terms of formal institutions, many cities tend to *institutional isomorphism* - they create institutional frameworks which resemble each other across Europe. It seems that cultural integration in the cities has covered many areas of economic and social life and become thus a very cross-sectoral and cross-departmental issue.

3.1. Specific organisational embedding within the local administration

In the majority of cities where cultural integration policies have been formulated, special departments have been developed in order to coordinate the implementation. In some cities, e.g. Frankfurt, special departments dealing with integration have been given the same position in the administration structure as other departments. Frankfurt city has established a special Office for Multicultural Affairs which can communicate with other offices at the same hierarchical level. The name of the office indicates its approach to integration. The main question is no longer how migrants can be integrated into German society, but how the local administration can adapt to be more suitable for dealing with the demands of the heterogeneous, multicultural population. In other cases departments or sections dealing with integration issues and diversity management have got less independence. Departments and units responsible for the management of integration policies have moreover developed both formal and informal contacts with local actors involved in this public policy in order to formulate goals, learn immigrants needs and get support in the implementation process.

The table below presents some examples of institutions established in the European cities:

MAIN OFFICES: Office of Development, Intercultural Integration of Policies and the Third Sector (Bologna), Office for Integration (Dublin), Department of Integration - *Dezernat für Integration* (Frankfurt), Department for Integration Policy - *Stabsabteilung für Integrationspolitik* (Stuttgart), Immigration and Citizenship Department - *Consellería de Inmigración y Ciudadania* (Sevilla), Department for Promoting Human Rights, Gender Equality, Relations with National Minorities and Religious Communities and Civil Society Development - Mayor's Office (Zagreb), Department of Integration and Employment (headed by the Deputy Mayor Kent Andersson) + six employment and integration centres - *Arbets- och integrationscenter* (Malmö), Office for Integration - within

Department of Employment and Integration (Copenhagen), Department of Social Development - and the particular units: Education and Citizenship/Educatie en Inburgering, E&I + Diversity Unit/Unit Diversiteit + Platform Amsterdam Together/*Platform Amsterdam Samen*, PAS (Amsterdam), Municipal Department for Integration and Diversity Affairs - M17 (Vienna), Department of Citizenship and Civil Rights (Terrassa), Department of Social Affairs of the Lisbon (Lisbon), Department of Social Development (Breda).

3.2. Civil society organizations cooperating with public institution in the formulation of cultural integration policies

As mentioned above, the MLG involves a variety of actors which attempt to reshape the various decision-making processes. The emergence of the non-institutional actors, such as NGOs, results in the fact that more and more decisions are made with the participation of the public opinion using social consultation. The case of integration policy at the local level might be an good example of such practice. There is variety of forums or new advisory boards set up to increase participation of immigrant communities in the policy-making or in the policies as such. This is again an isomorphic feature across Europe. Apart from these *formal legal or visible institutions*, there is plenty of *informal invisible institutions* like personal networks among the city bureaucrats/and politicians and variety of community leaders, or visits of city politicians at the national/religious celebrations and festivals, respectively a tradition of some politicians to quote Koran (Breda) next to Bible in their speeches or publicly appreciate the presence of immigrant groups in the city (Vienna).

Therefore, it is not the type of institutions per se which differentiates the cities from each other, it is the specific institutional mix that cities use in order to culturally and socially integrate immigrant communities. Some cities prefer complete institutionalization of relations with plenty of formal and informal institutions (Vienna), some cities prefer informal institutions (Turku), some cities do not develop almost any formal institutions (Lisbon) and give way to the activity of immigrant organizations. Having rather only informal institutions does not necessarily mean that the immigrant integration is underdeveloped (Copenhagen).

Immigrant organizations play a crucial part in the governance of local integration policies. Immigrant organizations form institutionalized voices of immigrant communities, thus they articulate needs and requirements of those groups. There are however more actors which try to actively shape the specific governance regimes than immigrant organizations. These can be also trade unions (Bologna), business associations (Vienna), foreign funds (Lisbon) beside immigrant organizations or city administration. The immigrant organizations hold nonetheless primacy in the field.

4. RESOURCES FOR CULTURAL INTEGRATION POLICIES IN CITIES

As the empirical materials mentioned in the introduction suggest, the majority of city integration activities is funded from the city budgets. The majority of immigrant organizations is funded or co-funded by the city administrations. National funds are also important, but it seems that they are not dominating. For immigrant organizations the European Fund for Integration of Third Country Nationals started to be an additional source of funding. In new member states this source was the only available and influenced the development of integration programs on the local and national level (Matusz Protasiewicz 2013a).

The funding techniques follow the rationale of specific governance characteristic models. Thus Vienna as a

representative of the interventionist model disposes of the Vienna Integration Fund which is a fully institutionalized fund with properly defined mission, established and professional personnel and stable financial resources. Copenhagen and Turku as a representatives of regulatory model have funded the integration activities indirectly through general cultural and socio-economic funds. Lisbon as a representative of passive model s basically without any institutionalized funding infrastructure. The local authority has been trying to use European funds for financing the integration activities.

The social purpose of funding is clear in all cases. Firstly, there are funded projects for language integration - providing language courses (Turku explicitly) or integration courses. Secondly, the majority of funding goes to "inter-projects" - interfaith, interethnic, intercultural. Thirdly, some cities like Frankfurt, Stuttgart and Amsterdam refuse to fund projects with religion (or inter-religious contexts) as explicit factor. Copenhagen and Turku go even further when they do not fund under explicitly interethnic or interfaith programmes. In this cities, projects must fit into existing general cultural and socio-economic schemes. In contrast, Kirklees's flagship project, based on the inter-faith fora, is based on religion as a dominating identity category. In some cities, like Antwerp, where the integration is understood as two way process, funded projects must promote relations between groups in general rather than between two specific groups, including both immigrant and local populations.

Finally, private funds shall not be excluded from the analysis. Private funding is indeed an important source for the realization of immigrant policies in Lisbon and Dublin. In Stuttgart, funds- like the Robert Bosch Foundation and others play also an important role. Therefore not only public, but also private funding makes cultural integration activities possible.

5. TARGET GROUPS AND TOOLS OF CULTURAL INTEGRATION IN CITIES

This section aims to defining the target groups and tools used by cities in local integration policies. Showing different examples this paper identify trends in approaching integration. In the implementation of diversity-oriented policies, city authorities have to stimulate cross-sectoral cooperation between different departments of local administration and collaboration with non-governmental organization as well as other institutions. Negotiation on the formulation of integration goals and cooperation in the implementation of integration programs with a variety of diverse actors require appropriate and properly institutionalised tools.

5.1. Target groups

Although the majority of integration plans (on the local level) is set in universal and general terms, these plans are implemented in cooperation with actors operating within the city and the realm of governance, *since we no longer talk about the system of government, but system of governance with plenty of actors in terms of integration policies*. By this logic, these policies will thus target the most active, most problematic or most demanding immigrant communities which are able to produce their own elites or leaders within the cities. Taken the above-mentioned into account, it is natural that Muslims become the targeted group number one. Muslims form one of the most active, visible and demanding immigrant groups in European cities. They also belong to the older immigrant groups in contrast to the internal movers from the CEE. They tend to create religious communities, build religious buildings and have a dress code which is being contested or have burial rituals different from the Christian ones.

5.1.1. The local community as a whole

In the majority of cities, integration policies are focused on the majority of immigrant populations - including not only TCNs, but also EU internal movers. This can be the case of Poles in Dublin, Breda or Bologna; or alternatively Romanians in Lisbon, Terrassa, Valencia or Bologna. At the same time, Ingrians (former ethnic Finns returning from Russian to the homeland) in Finish cities like Turku represent a special case of immigrants. It seems that cities promote strategies to create local identification which would be based on the diversity, but highlighting the identity category *us* - like "We Copenhageners" or "We Amsterdammers". As it was mentioned before the intercultural approach aims at the creation of common sense of belonging and a set of shared values. As empirical research shows, immigrants are more likely to develop sense of belonging to the local community than to receiving state (Van Crean, Vancluysen, Ackeart 2009).

5.1.2. Policies concerning relationships between ethnic and religious groups

There are no reliable data about Muslims in the European Union and any estimates in this field depends on definitions of the receiving countries. According to the European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights there are at least 13 millions of Muslims in the EU constituting of around 5 per cent of its total population (FRA 2006). Muslims as a group are very divers in terms of religion, language, ethnicity and they are perceived as a threat by native population. According to OSI research some of the prejudices that Muslims face are part of a "generic anti-immigrant" prejudice which is directed at Europe's postwar non-western immigrants. At the same time there is evidence that they also face "specific anti-Muslim" prejudices which have "*developed as a result of stereotype-generating process in the last couple of decades*"(OSI 2010).

Integration policies focus more on the non-European, non-Christian minorities. This is also the case, because the European minorities (mainly EU internal movers) are rather new without proper institutionalized organizations. They also do not tend to provoke as many conflicts, because they better fit into the host societies (it does not say they fit completely) in comparison with the immigrants coming from Africa, Maghreb, Arab countries, Turkey or Indian continent. In the case of EU internal movers the legal status and the equal access to all economic and social domains play an important role in their position in the receiving societies.

Despite the persistence in targeting of Muslim communities, the growing tendency is to support policies and strategies which try to impact on the relations among all ethnic, national, religious groups within the particular cities, not only between the host society and these groups. Not only the projects improving relations between host society and particular ethnic and religious societies are encouraged, but also between immigrant communities (Arabs and Jews, Turks and Kurds). At the same time, strategies do not focus only on ethnic categories, but also on gender, age, generation categories. Projects try to highlight women, focus on the immigrant youth, and the second immigrant generation at the same time, because these groups seem to represent the most endangered groups.

The concepts, strategies and policies promote both bonding and bridging relations at the same time. They promote financially and organizationally (giving training to employees and providing offices in many cases) the establishment of ethnic, religious and cultural organizations. They use them as a part of infrastructure in order to strengthen the cities' social cohesion. At the same time these ethnic, religious and cultural organizations are compelled to ally or unite with the organizations from the different ethnic, religious and cultural background. Or they are required to take part in the intercultural actives. In this way the policies promote bonding capital as a prerequisite for the expansion of bridging capital throughout the city.

Finally, it must be highlighted that in most cases policies address all immigrants living in the cities. Thus

they involve both third countries national as well as the EU internal migrants, even if the EU documents on integration (financed from the EU sources) should target only TCNs and not EU internal movers and other categories as undocumented migrants or residents with immigration background.

5.2. Tools

Cities have institutionalized a diversity of tools. A categorization of these into three kinds tools according to their function is suggested: *platforms*, *channels*, *spaces*. In a strive to reconstitute, reconfigure or again to balance, negotiate, promote cultural integration and social cohesion, city administrations (but also immigrant organizations themselves independently) tend to create platforms, channels, spaces to promote *us-identities*.

5.2.1. Platforms

Platforms are created to promote different kinds of interreligious or interethnic fora, networks, associations, discussion or facilities where the different ethnicities, religions, or nations meet and discuss both conflicting topics and topics which can unite. These can also be dialogues between police and immigrant groups. These can be promotion of tolerance through common sport activities. There is a variety of such platforms.

One such platforms is the *Zonatelli Intercultural Center* situated in Bologna. The centre was established in 1999 with the aim to promote intercultural dialogue within the city. It has received a task to develop and sustain relations with ethnic or mixed associations and institutionalize thus the relations between the Bologna city administration and the individual organizations. Apart from this task, the Zonatelli centre focuses on the socio-cultural empowerment of the second immigrant generation. It has thus become an organizational centre for many intercultural projects financed not only by the city, but also by the national and EU level. Its intercultural orientation leads the centre to promote the original cultures of second immigrant generation only as a prerequisite to develop intercultural dialog and cultural exchange. A similar role was played by the independent and already abolished *International Meeting Point* in Turku. The platform was set up in 1989 as a meeting point for immigrants who wanted to establish immigrant organization. The International Meeting Point offered moreover courses and advices on how to properly register and establish the immigrant organizations. It was also providing legal help or language courses in Finnish and Arabic or teaching the Koran. Another example, Malmö has rebuilt the *Rosengard city district library* into a multifunctional meeting point. The library provides room for weekly lectures attended mainly by immigrant women and a separate room where the local immigrant men can congregate and play chess and cards. The library employs multilingual staff and offer book in 20 different languages. Also Stuttgart's *German-Turkish Forum* established in 1999, chaired by former city mayor, and financed by the Robert Bosh Foundation, promotes German-Turkish cooperation in education, parenting, art and culture, and science.

Valencia provides an interfaith example in the case of the *Chair of the Three Religions* at the University of Valencia which was established in 2000 to provide courses on Christianity, Judaism and Islam at the postgraduate and master level under different disciplinary perspectives. The *Chair* is a result of agreement among the main associations representing all three religions—Christianity, Islam, and Judaism—on the city and national level. Its activities are not limited to the teaching activities, but also include collaboration with the religious centres situated in the city.

Interfaith dialogue constitutes also the cornerstone of integration policies in Kirklees. The Kirklees city administration actively promotes the establishment of interfaith networks in order to involve the

representatives of all religious groups residing in the city into the governance process. The city administration has succeeded to receive a national grant for its project *Interfaith Kirklees* and established seven faith centers which provide reference points not only for the members of the particular religious groups, but all citizens who would like to learn about the everyday practices of religions present in the city. Especially school excursions are organized in the centers. Apart from these centers, the *Kirklees Faith Forum* exists with the aim to enhance the collaboration of all faiths against any sort of discrimination and injustice. A similar function plays the *Council of Religions* founded in 2009 in Frankfurt am Main or the *Roundtable of Religions* established in Stuttgart. Both try to reduce the chance of tensions and interreligious or intercultural conflicts, while promoting interreligious tolerance.

A different kind of platform is provided by the *Poldermoskee* project in Amsterdam. The *Poldermoskee* is supported by Amsterdam's communal politicians, although it is a strictly independent project of second generation Muslims who were unable to organize and gather on their own principles in the existing Muslim facilities controlled by the older first generation. The *Poldermoskee* provides space for all young Muslims which promotes their integration or at least stabilization within Dutch society. The center provides possibility to meet for all Muslims irrespective of their ethnic background. It conducts lectures and sermons in Dutch language and organizes weekly guided tours for visitors, invites people from the neighborhood and organizes meetings on taboo issues. The *Poldermoskee* functions therefore as a shelter for young generation of Dutch Muslims and also a liberal center which promotes coexistence with the Dutch society.

There is variety of other platforms. As it was mentioned above, these platforms can be represented by the organized communication between local police forces and representatives of the local communities. Vienna's Land Office of Criminal Investigation together with African migrant organizations organized for example a *Project Fair and Sensible* whose mission was to organize workshops in the police academy and establish advice center which would prevent any cultural misunderstandings between African citizens of Vienna and local police forces. Antwerp's police disposes of its own *Diversity Unit* which is active in the prosecution of anti-discrimination cases or in the mediation of conflicts between various ethnic groups. Completely different platforms can be formed on the basis of intercultural meetings through sport activities. Dublin for example, has co-funded the project *Count Us In* which is run by the Sport Against Racism Ireland established in 1997 as a direct response to the increase of racist attacks in Ireland. As such the project shall promote intercultural dialogue in the selected Dublin's schools. Although the described platforms have encompassed various sectors of societal activities, they have social purpose. They promote interfaith and intercultural values through the various way of social meetings among the broadest diversity of engaged citizens in the cities concerned.

5.2.2. Channels for political participation

Channels are fora and groups which try to channel opinions, needs and demands of immigrant groups to local policies and policy makers. These are initiated by the city councils themselves or initiated by the immigration communities. Integration funds can also constitute channels through which the city councils promote projects which best suit the their integration policies. Since projects are dependent on financial aid, the public institutions can steer integration policies and projects by channeling financial aid.

City administrations try to promote political participation of immigrant groups through the various advisory fora. In these fora immigrant organizations can gather and express their voices on the behalf of the ethnic or religious groups they represent. The forums are indeed a substitution for the voting rights which many of immigrants lack. Although they are purely advisory and sometimes rather dysfunctional, the advisory fora may provide a certain political inclusion of immigrant voices into the decision-making procedures employed by cities. Bologna established its *Council of Foreign and Stateless Citizens of the Province of Bologna* and *Neighbourhood Councils of Foreign Citizens* following the unsuccessful proposal in the administration to

grant foreign residents voting rights in local elections. Both regularly elected councils are consultative bodies which can suggest measures and programmes related to the integration policies. However, they have had a limited influence on the city policies so far. In Dublin the immigrant population has full voting rights in the local elections. Thus, the electoral process is a channel itself. The city of Dublin regularly has recently organized public campaigns in cooperation with the immigrant organizations to raise immigrants' awareness of their voting rights and invites the representatives of immigrant institutions to advise on the policy-making related to the integration issues. The citizens of Frankfurt am Main without voting rights can take part in elections for the *Foreigners' Council*. Almost every city disposes of advisory immigrant bodies. These vary in terms of representative potential and the level of institutionalization. *The Vienna Integration Conference* is a pure umbrella for immigrant organizations. Zagreb establishes special councils for its national minorities. Copenhagen's *Integration Council* comprises of representatives elected by non-Western population and appointed experts. In Valencia the *Alternative Forum for the Protection and Rights of the Social Integration of Immigrants* was founded by immigrant organization as a protest against the dysfunctional official forum.

The cases of Breda and Amsterdam deserve closer scrutiny. Aliens do in principle have voting rights in local elections, but the city of Breda does not have an immigrant council similar to other cities. The decision-making process in Breda is based on the bottom-up method of the soc-called *appreciative inquiry* which presupposes that the whole population will take part in the enactmen of city policies. Thus, the Breda's immigrant population is fully involved in the political participation.

Amsterdam has, on the other hand, indulged in the policy of *verbinding* (connecting). The policy is not aimed at the interethnic relations *per se*, but targets potential conflicts among all social groups. Yet, the practice of *verbinding* attempts to channel particular policies in order to mediate potential interethnic and intercultural conflicts. On the level of neighbourhoods, connection points have been identified which could promote social cohesion. Immigrant organizations have been stimulated to become more diverse in the scope of operation. The anti-radicalization policies were enacted to include potential radicals back into society. There were also attempts invoked by the city officials to use the religious infrastructure as a best platform for the regulation of immigrant integration.

Moreover, there has been another channel which was used by the city officials in order to articulate the city administrations' attempts on the interculturality towards the representatives of the immigrant groups. It is the institutionalized habit of the high city representatives quoting from the Koran during public speeches as a form of interreligious practice. The regular visits on *iftar*, a special dinner event which is organized at the end of Ramadan, have become an institutional practice as well. The high Viennese officials have started to attend the *iftars* since 2002. In Stuttgart, mayor has invited the Muslim representatives to celebrate *iftars* in the town hall. *Iftars* have been frequented by the high officials of the city administration or organized in the town halls also in the city of Breda.

Integration funds represent the most assertive channels through which the city administration can steer the integration processes. Since the immigrant organizations are highly dependent on the material capabilities provided by the city administration, cities can easily shape and condition the content of projects realized by the immigrant organizations. As such the city administrations can shape the internal mission of the immigrant organizations themselves to a certain degree. Thus where cities sponsored only under general labels and policies like in Copenhagen or Turku, this did not enhance a sound network of immigrant organizations. On the other hand where immigrant institutions became part of institutionalized financing and associational culture, a vibrant network of immigrant organizations has emerged which is prone to respond to the demands raised by the city administrations. The cities of Bologna, Frankfurt am Main, Stuttgart and Vienna are examples of such process.

5.2.3. Spaces

Spaces are socially produced. They may take the forms of multicultural spaces. Multicultural festivals, for example, are events during which the diversity is displayed in the streets and the intercultural spaces are being created. These can be intercultural events in libraries or galleries. These can also be office spaces offered to the immigrant organizations without the requirement to pay a rent. These can be spaces for the ethnic and religious minorities to celebrate their national holidays. These can be finally the spaces where the minorities can practice their religion, thus feeling in the city as home. It seems that the policies practiced by the city administrations tend to be underpinned by the principles based on the promotion of the sense of belonging to the city. The financed activities are aimed on trust building, sense of belonging, and community building rather than on any straightforward claims for integration. Thus, city administrations tend to promote the creation of platforms, channels and spaces which would empower the sense of belonging within their whole populations, domestic society and immigrant groups at the same time. Local policies are highly pragmatic and react on the concrete needs of their local populations.

Festivals have become the best practice to display the growing cultural diversity in the public space and promote the spirit of interculturality among the inhabitants of the city. Dublin has dedicated the majority of its integration efforts to the organization of cultural festivals. One example is a regular organization of the *Fusion Project* which celebrate cultural diversity. Similarly, Frankfurt am Main organizes a variety of festivals like *Frankfurt Stage* which is a well-attended cultural action featuring live music and extended opening hours in many of Frankfurt's museums with the aim to support cultural diversity of the city population. Festival *23 Nisan* has become one of the biggest events in Stuttgart. *23 Nisan* is a Turkish national day. The festival has taken place in the city since 2001 and is regularly visited by 10,000 and 20,000 people every year. Analogously, Malmö Museum has developed programs of exhibitions which attempt to promote cultural heritage, diversity, empowerment and human rights within a cosmopolitan perspective. Apart from the above mentioned examples, the spaces of interculturality are to be produced in the school curricula or local media. Exactly the social production of space and the contested nature of this production impels cities to be flexible and permanent negotiators which must interact with a variety of actors in order to reconstitute social cohesion which would be otherwise permanently eroded.

6. ROLE OF NETWORKS OF EUROPEAN CITIES FOR LOCAL INTEGRATION POLICIES

As mentioned above, the development of local integration policies is based on negotiations between plenty of actors within the MLG. In the MLG the horizontal and vertical cooperation between actors play a crucial role. One of the roles played by the European networks of cities is the creation of the *consensual knowledge* (Stone 2012). The perspective of policy transfers applied to the analysis of the DIVE, INTI-CITIES and MIXTIES reveals precisely how cities can gain from their activity, how they can create, share and further promote their experiences and find policy inspiration thanks to the established bureaucratic and expert networks. As Schultze (2003) claims cities have been liberated within the European MLG. They are no longer pure policy-takers, but can function effectively as policy-makers when connected into the EU networks of cities. As members of such networks, they can more easily shape policies in upstream policy-making and downstream policy delivery. Schultze (2003:135) summarises precisely the role of urban networks in the vertical and horizontal cooperation when he writes that "through networks cities can account for 'soft' outcomes such as shaping and setting important parameters for the debate between institutions and with the general public". He adds that cities can also "*exert joint control over policy outcomes through influencing the policy agenda, in particular through getting their policy proposals into key documents which serve as important references for decision-making and implementation*" thanks to

their engagement in the city networks.

The literature dealing with the policy transfers highlights several points which can be relevant for the analysis of the vertical and horizontal policy exchange of integration policies throughout the EU policy space. Thus Dolowitz and March (2000) identify several question in one of the essential texts related to policy transfers. Two of these questions ask why actors engage in policy transfers and who are the key actors in the practice of these transfers. They answer that the policy transfers will be enacted by the policy actors who feel the lack of domestic policy initiative in the particular policy domain. At the same time, they highlight epistemic communities and policy experts as the main facilitators of the successful policy transfers. Stone's (2012) contribution identifies sophisticated networks consisting of bureaucrats, policy transfer entrepreneurs, non-governmental organizations, policy experts as the main infrastructure for policy transfers. As she further claims, these networks can produce a *consensual knowledge* which can be then easily disseminated across governance levels involved. This knowledge will resemble soft transfers of norms and knowledge rather than ready-made hard policies, since while knowledge can be easily learnt, hard policy transfers will be implemented unevenly and will be never complete. Eberlein and Grande (2005) emphasize that the formal networks and institutional connections are complemented by informal networks and policy forums which bring beneficial effects on the socialization of the above-mentioned actors. Evans (2009) highlights among others the growing role of internet and electronic communication in the policy transfers.

The INTI-CITIES (Catsaras & Kirchberger 2009), DIVE (Moloney & Kirchberger 2010) and MIXTIES (MIXTIES 2013) projects were initiated thanks to the EUROCITIES, one of the oldest city networks in the EU multilevel governance, and certain policy expert networks, concretely the Migration Policy Group, which felt that the governance of immigration produced on the national levels is inefficient and does not reflect the integration needs of the local level. The projects strived to create a *consensual knowledge* which would be applicable regardless of its specific context. The projects used the benchmarking method among the participating cities and theoretical knowledge to provide a "standard, which moves away from context-specific local knowledge and produces de-contextualised knowledge that can be applied in other places" (Moloney & Kirchberger 2010: 4). The result was the creation of the EUROCITIES Charter on the Integrating Cities and a contribution to the database of good practices on integration policies organized by the European Commission. The EU resources played the crucial role, because the projects were co-financed by the EU funds including the Fund for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals. The projects allowed the development of formal and informal expert and bureaucratic networks which were further consolidated during the organization of several conferences where the actors could meet directly and a socialization process could be easily provided. The consensual knowledge created within the project has been moreover promoted though internet webpages, and it is thus accessible to a wide-spread audience. The crucial role of various networks is thus the management of policy exchange horizontally and vertically across the European MLG.

7. CONCLUSIONS

In the case of cultural integration policies in European cities we have distinguished three way of framing: cultural integration aiming at economic growth, cultural integration aiming at avoiding conflict, cultural integration aiming at recognition of diversity. In terms of governance of these policies, there is as a set of rules, practices, formal and informal institutions, multiple personal networks which tend to take part in development of local cultural integration and social cohesion policies. In terms of framing and defining cultural dimenison of integration and social cohesion we have observed as well a range of approaches with diverse targeted groups and tools used for practical action. While looking at the question convergence, it is

important to understand that European cities all act in very different historical, political, economic and societal contexts, and their role and competences differ. However, it is important to stress that in cultural domain local authorities have found more space for independent acting than in socio-economic and political domain where cities depend more on national legislation. For many years this specific area of integration was not seen as an important asset, but it has recently become one of the main policy-making domains. According to the evidence from the research material, cultural integration policies produced by the local governance regimes try to encourage the sense of belonging and shared values, avoid conflicts in the ethnically and culturally diverse populations and introduce recognition for the immigrant diverse cultures. Thus policies and public services are being adapted to the needs of multicultural populations and the participation of immigrants in public life is promoted.

As it was pointed out the cities authorities have within the governance implemented multiple concepts and strategies using very cross-sectoral approach in terms of framing and targeting cultural policies. All the strategies have covered very diverse field of activities in some cases overlapping the hard domains of integration analyzed in our research by Caponio and Garcés-Mascareñas (diversity in access to housing, diversity and equality in jobs and service provision and diversity in education).

When we look at cultural integration as impulse for economic growth, some cities have introduced the *Intercultural Approach*, which looks at diversity as a source of innovation, creativity and entrepreneurship. In this sense the successful management of diversity which highlights the importance of immigrants as a source of new linguistic and cultural assets might influence the attractiveness and economic and social potential of the particular city. In this approach the city administrations try to strengthen the intercultural dialogue and steer it into the maximalization of economic benefits.

Some cities (Amsterdam, Breda, L'Hospitalet, Terrassa from CLIP research) have defined their approach as diversity policies focusing on cultures of their residents. In this case emphasis is not on individuals but rather on the needs of particular groups living in the community. The development of positive intergroup relations is a central element of social cohesion approach. In this approach cities look at diversity as an asset and fully accept cultural and religious diversity of its residents. It is the way of recognition of diversity, acceptance of different groups with divers culture. This process of recognition should lead to social cohesion understood as a process of bringing people together in the local context.

In terms of targeting groups and issues for the cultural integration the cities authorities have proven to be more flexible and pragmatic than the national level. As the examples show the local integration policies and policies aiming at the social cohesion have targeted the TCNs, internal movers, and residents with the foreign background (second and third generation). The social purpose of the policies was impregnated with the principles of interculturality. Trying to focus on social cohesion in the community and peaceful intergroup relations many cities have been focusing on Muslim community not only as most numerous but also most diverse in terms of culture and ethnicity (OSI, CLIP). Religion plays moreover a very important role for Muslim community what impels city administration to invent new measures and policies which would cater for Muslims' religious needs. In the policies and programs targeted at Muslim communities cities have included many issues as religious practices, buildings, burials, education, food and dress code to mention only a few. All these issues might be very sensitive in the relations between Muslims and local community taken into account that Islam is a highly politicized issue in European societies. On the one hand cities authorities have been trying to avoid conflict based on the religious and cultural differences, on the other hand they have been trying to fulfil the needs of new residents and respect their rights.

Finally, indeed changes in governance of local integration policies have take place. In the very beginning of their development the integration policies became embedded in the existing institutional context. While integration of immigrants has become high priority for local authorities in many European cities, a variety of special departments within administration structure has been developed getting high competences. For

those departments or units the cooperation with local actors as immigrants organizations, NGOs, churches, media, and policy experts has become an everyday practice. According to CLIP findings "*a relationship between the council and migrants groups can be realised by having migrant representatives in the council, or by creating of a consultative body. The proportion of persons with a migration background in elected positions, however, is rather low or non-existent in most cases*"(Lüken-Klassen & Heckmann:51). The low number of people with immigrant background in city councils is connected with the lack of voting rights (analyzed precisely by Caponio). In the process of setting goals for cultural integration policies as well as in the implementation of it, local authorities have used extensive consultative bodies of immigrants, immigrant organizations and other actors involved in these issue. As it was already mentioned in the field of cultural integration the cities authorities have gained more space for manoeuvre and it is why the horizontal cooperation with local actors have been strongly developed in almost all cities. Many cities from CLIP and Intercultural cities have reported the institutionalized consultative bodies representing migrants organizations and NGOs (e.g. Amsterdam, Antwerp, Athens, Bologna, Copenhagen, Frankfurt, Lisbon, Luxembourg, Stuttgart, Tallinn, Terrassa, Zurich etc). Even if this kind of bodies has been established in many cities, the actual relations with integration departments or units with this council is based on formal as well as informal contact which might be initiated from both sides. Formal and informal contacts depend strongly on the kind of issue which must be solved. City authorities have been using different tools of governance as consultation, public debates, or evaluation of migrants organizations projects in order to include immigrants in decision making process. Immigrant organization have been involved both in the defining of main issues, demands and interest and after in implementing policy goals through projects mainly financed form local authority resources.

Because integration of immigrants is not only high on the agenda of local authorities but also at the top of EU agenda there have been many measures introduced to support multilevel governance of integration. Many tools such as the Handbook of Integration, the Web Site on Integration and the European Integration Forum have aimed at providing best practices and stimulate exchange of good practices among all levels involved (EU, national and local level). In all documents the EC stressed the important role of local authorities in immigrants integration policies. The support of urban networks from EU funds has undoubtedly improved the position of cities playing now as a collective actor in the decision making process, collaborating in the vertical dimension with national and EU actors.

Based on the examples of the cities participating in the city networks mentioned in the introduction we can say that all the tools, actors and ways of creating integration policies at the local level perfectly fit in to the MLG. According to Schmitter (20040) the MLG should be understood as a policy-making process engaging actors representing different levels of power but aiming at the same goals. Thus the examined governance model should be considered primarily from the perspective of the role and participation of actors (in case of this paper the role of the city administration). In the development of integration policies the European Commission plays a key role in stimulating local actors for the bottom-up initiatives and taking part in formulation of common goals. City authorities have been indeed involved in governance networks trying to establish different coalitions in order to achieve common goals in order to create common integration goals and policy frameworks.

All networks in which European cities were involved (CLIP, Eurocities, Intercultural cities) have used different tools in their horizontal and vertical cooperation. Firstly cooperation within networks aimed at exchange of good practices and strengthening transfer of knowledge among participants involved. In terms of dissemination of knowledge in both the horizontal and vertical dimension, the urban networks have organized workshops, conferences and consultations with national and EU institutions. Cities focus on policies addressing cultural issues, mutual understanding and anti-discrimination in all public domains. In all this, the cities are much more independent from the national legislation and try to use cooperation within networks to transfer policies and good practices. According to Martinelli (2014) "*EU governance is also multistakeholder network governance*". In the creation of adequate goals and measures in cultural

integration, diversity policy and intercultural policies the city authorities have used both the new opportunities (within and beyond networks), tools, exchange of good practices, benchmarking, peer reviews, city-to-city mentoring, research and cooperation with experts, dissemination of knowledge (publishing documents, reports, organizing conference, workshop, training) in order to play an important role as collective actors which are able to more actively participate in the creation of new policies on the European level.

REFERENCES

Alesina, A., & La Ferrara, E. (2005), *Ethnic diversity and economic performance,* "Journal of Economic Literature" 43 (2005): 762-800.

Caponio, T.(2014), *The legal and political dimension of local integration policy,* KING research paper series.

Catsaras Z. & Kirchberger A. (2009), *Benchmarking Integration Governance in Europe's Cities lessons from the INTI-cities project*, http://nws.eurocities.eu/MediaShell/media/Inticities_english.pdf

Collett, E. & Gidley, B. (2012), *AMICALL final transnational report*, ESRC Centre on Migration, Policy and Society (COMPAS), University of Oxford. http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Publications/Reports/Amicall_Report_ENG_v3_single_WEB_READY.pdf

Demireva, N. (2013), *Briefing. Immigration, Diversity and Social Cohesion,* The Migration Observatory at the University of Oxford, 14/08/2013.

Dolowitz, D.P. & Marsh, D. (2000), *Learning from abroad: the role of policy transfer in contemporary policy-making,* "Governance: An International Journal of Policy and Administration", Vol. 13, No. 1, pp. 5–24.

Eberlein B. & Grande E. (2005), *Beyond delegation: transnational regulatory regimes and the EU regulatory state*, "Journal of European Public Policy" 12, No. 1 (2005): 89-112.

Eurofound (2010), *Intercultural Policies in European Cities. Good Practice Guide*. http://www.eurofound.europa.eu/publications/htmlfiles/ef1033.htm

European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (2006), *Annual Activity Report 2006,* Brussels.

Eurostat, *Migrants in Europe. A statistical portrait of the first and second generation,* Eurostat Statistical Books 2011.

Evans, M. (2009), *Policy transfer in critical perspective*, "Policy Studies" 30, No. 3 (2009): 243-268.

Garcés-Mascareñas, B. (2014), *Immigrants' equal access and equal use. A review of local policies in the dmain of health care, housing, education and the labour market,* KING research paper series.

Holtung, N. & Mason A.(2010), *Introduction: Immigration, diversity and social cohesion*, "Ethnicities" 10, No.4 (2010): 407-414.

Hooghe, M. (2007), *Social capital and diversity generalized trust, social cohesion and regimes of diversity,* "Canadian Journal of Political Science", 40(3), 709.

http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_14618_58185092.pdf
Khovanova-Rubicondo, K. & Pinelli, D. (2012), *Evidence of the Economic and Social Advantages of Intercultural Cities Approach,* Council of Europe.

Lüken-Klassen, D. & Heckmann, F. (2010), *Intercultural policies in European cities.* Council of Europe Strasbourg.

Martinelli, A. (2014), *The mutilevel governance of immigrants' integration in the European Union.* (*Overview*

paper of the Political Science Group), KING research paper series.

Matusz Protasiewicz, P. (2013a), *Rosnąca rola poziomu lokalnego w kształtowaniu polityki integracji imigrantów w Unii Europejskiej*, „Central and Eastern European Migration Review, University of Warsaw", Vol.2, No.2 December 2013, str. 28.

Matusz-Protasiewicz P. (2013b), *Wielopoziomowe zarządzanie migracjami. Rola Europejskiego Funduszu na rzecz Integracji Obywateli Państw Trzecich w kształtowaniu polityki integracyjnej w Polsce,* Wrocław: E-wydawnictwo Wydziału Prawa, Administracji i Ekonomii Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.

Mayo, M. & Rooke, A. (2012), *AMICALL final evaluation report*, Centre for Urban and Community Research, Goldsmiths.
http://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/fileadmin/files/Publications/Research_projects/Urban_change_settlement/AMICALL/AMICALL_FINAL_EVALUATION_REPORT_1_.pdf

MIXTIES (2013), *Cities and migrants: Implementing the EUROCITIES Integrating Cities Charter*, http://nws.eurocities.eu/MediaShell/media/IntegratingCitiesReport_Cities%20and%20migrants_%20-final.pdf

Moloney T. & Kirchberger A. (2010), *Cities Accommodating Diversity: Findings and recommendations from the peer review project "Diversity and Equality in European Cities*, http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_12215_401815095.pdf

Open Society Institute (2010), *Muslims in Europe. A Report on 11 EU Cities. London*, OSI.

Pawlak, M. (2013), *Imitacja przy tworzeniu polskiej polityki integracji cudzoziemców*, „Studia Migracyjne – Przegląd Polonijny", 39(3): 97-121.

Penninx, R.(2014) *European Cities and their Migrant Integration Policies, A State-of-the-Art study for the Knowledge for Integration Governance (KING) project*, KING research paper series.

Putnam, R. (2007), *E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty- First Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture,* "Scandinavian Political Studies, 30, No. 2 (2007): 137-174.

Sassen, S.(2001), *The Global City. New York, London, Tokyo,* Princeton University Press.

Schmitter, P.(2004), *Neo-functionalism*, [in:] A. Wiener and T. Diez (eds.), *European Integration Theory*, Oxford University Press, pp. 45-74.

Schultze C. J. (2003), *Cities and EU governance: Policy-Takers or policy-makers?*, "Regional & Federal Studies" 13, No. 1 (2003): 121-147.

Stone, D. (2012), *Transfer and Translation of Policy*, "*Policy Studies",* 33.4 (2012): 1-17.

Svedrup, U., & Kux, S.(1997) *Balancing Effectiveness and legitimacy in European Integration*, "ARENA Working Paper", WP 97/31, s.1.

UNESCO & UN-HABITAT (2010), *Creating better cities for migrants. Urban policies and practices to build more inclusive cities.*

Van Crean, M. Vancluysen, V., Ackaert, J. (2009), *Gekleurde steden. Autochtonen en allochtonen over samenleven,* Vanden Broele.

Wood, P. (Ed.) (2009), *Intercultural Cities: towards a model for intercultural integration,*: Council of Europe
http://www.coe.int/t/dg4/cultureheritage/culture/cities/ICCModelPubl_en.pdf