

Yayın Geliş Tarihi: 21.10.2022
Yayına Kabul Tarihi: 28.11.2022
Online Yayın Tarihi: 26.12.2022
<http://dx.doi.org/10.16953/deusosbil.1192614>

Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi
Cilt: 24, Sayı: 4, Yıl: 2022, Sayfa: 1754-1770
E-ISSN: 1308-0911

Araştırma Makalesi

THE GOVERNANCE OF MIGRATION AND URBAN WITH MULTILEVEL ACTORS¹

Şeyma KARAMEŞE*

Abstract

Cities are centres of attraction where the population increases rapidly through migration. The urban context, in which social differences and cultural change are addressed, is not independent of governance discussions. It is undeniable that cities, being diverse entities, cannot be handled with a unified governmental strategy. In this respect, the host country's urban policymaking, which incorporates immigrants, introduces multilevel governance. To comprehend this, the factors that create the multiple migration governance from a sociological viewpoint will be reviewed first, followed by an in-depth examination of the numerous aspects of this management form. The challenges generated by the present theoretical framework will be reviewed in the last section, which is the most significant difference and contribution of the study. This part opens space to further researches and questions to clarify urban governance and migration. The role of civil society and NGOs, as well as city diplomacy and independence from central authority, will be highlighted. As a result, the study presents the findings that multiple actors have active functions not only at the national level but also at the international level.

Keywords: Multilevel Governance, Migration, Urban, City Diplomacy, NGOs.

KENT VE GÖÇÜN ÇOKLU AKTÖRLERLE YÖNETİŞİMİ

Öz

Kentler, göç yoluyla nüfusun hızla arttığı cazibe merkezleri haline gelmektedir. Toplumsal farklılıkların ve kültürel değişimin ele alındığı kentsel bağlam, nasıl yönetileceği tartışmalarından bağımsız değildir. Farklılıkların ve değişkenliğin mekânı olan şehirlerin tek yönlü bir yönetim anlayışıyla ele alınamayacağı açıktır ve bir sorun olarak halihazırda tartışılmaktadır. Bu bağlamda, ev sahibi ülkenin yerel halkı ile beraber göçmenlerini de içine alan kentsel politika süreci çok katmanlı bir bakış açısını zorunlu kılmaktadır. Bu makalede öncelikle sosyolojik bir bakış açısıyla çoklu göç yönetimini gerektiren faktörler gözden geçirilecek, ardından bu yönetim biçiminin çeşitli yönleri

Bu makale için önerilen kaynak gösterimi (APA 6. Sürüm):

Karameşe, Ş. (2022). The governance of migration and urban with multilevel actors. *Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 24 (4), 1754-1770.

¹ Bu makale için etik kurul raporu gerekmemektedir.

* Dr., Araştırma Görevlisi, Manisa Celal Bayar Üniversitesi, Sosyoloji Bölümü, ORCID: 0000-0003-4125-1175, seyma.karameşe@cbu.edu.tr.

derinlemesine incelenecektir. Çalışmanın en önemli farkı ve katkısı olan son bölümde ise mevcut teorik çerçeve olarak ele alınan çok aktörlü şehir yönetiminin yarattığı zorluklar gözden geçirilecek ve kent/göç çalışmalarında hangi yönlerin irdelenmesi gerektiği açıklanacaktır. Bu inceleme çok boyutlu şehir yönetiminin katkılarına ek olarak, üreteceği olası problemleri ele alarak gelecekteki çalışmalara katkıda bulunur. Bu noktada, şehir diplomasisinin etki alanı, merkezi otoriteden bağımsızlığın etkileri ve nihayetinde sivil toplum kuruluşlarının şehir yönetimindeki rolleri vurgulanacaktır. Sonuç olarak çalışma çoklu aktörlerin sadece ulusal düzeyde değil uluslararası düzeyde de aktif fonksiyonları olduğunu bulgu olarak sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çok Boyutlu Yönetişim, Göç, Kent, Şehir Diplomasisi, Sivil Toplum Kuruluşları.

INTRODUCTION

Since 2007, over one-half of the world's population has been residing in urban areas, and it is anticipated that this number will reach over two-thirds by the year 2050 (United Nations, 2015). The variety that is brought about by migration has been developing in cities, and there are an increasing number of places in which more than one-third or even more than half of the urban population has a migration history (Caponio et al., 2019, s. 1). According to a research that was published by the World Refugee Council in 2018, around sixty percent of all refugees and eighty percent of all persons who are internally displaced throughout the world already dwell in metropolitan areas. Even though the confluence of urbanization and migratory dynamics presents crucial questions for study and policy, there is not nearly enough extant research and theory that investigates this megatrend's junction. This is despite the fact that the intersection raises critical questions. Migration research and urban studies have developed into two distinct schools of study due to the fact that many academics focusing on migration-related issues in urban environments are only targeting one audience or the other. As a result, it is of the utmost importance to develop a cutting-edge interdisciplinary methodology that is capable of traversing the borders between different fields of study and adjusting to the ever-changing dynamics of urbanization and migration. In order to have a comprehensive understanding of the problem from a variety of vantage points, the discussion ought to center on the factors that underlie both domestic and international shifts. The rise in population and the diversity of its members may be traced back, first and foremost, to the migrations brought about by shifts in the natural environment and by globalization. Even though low-income countries and middle-income countries are both affected by voluntary and forced migration, migration is primarily to blame for the rapid population growth in urban areas, particularly among less developed nations. This is because urban areas in less developed countries tend to be more densely populated. This is particularly true in the context of nations where the average income per person is lower (Pradhan, 2004). Because of all of the possible dangers and issues that might arise

from migration, it is essential for there to be mobilities on both the national and international levels. In addition to the concerns of national governments about security, the administration of diversity management at the urban level requires additional attention from urban level governance. To understand migration and urban together, the majority of the literature has generally been discussing the issue through the lens of network analysis, which has been used extensively to study "how cities are administered," with an emphasis on network efficacy and administrative efficiency. This has been done in order to gain a better understanding of migration and urban together. On the other side, there are fewer research that investigate "how cities are governed," with a focus on systems are meant and democratic principles. These kinds of studies are rare (da Cruz et al., 2022). According to Rhodes (1997, s. 15) "governance refers to self-organising, inter-organisational networks characterised by interdependence, resource-exchange, rules of the game, and significant autonomy from the state". In this regard, governance refers to cooperation of interrelated actors. Complex construction of governance includes governmental policies and non-governmental actors (Colebatch, 2009). Therefore, governance is not the same thing as government. Collaboration is an essential component of effective migration management in urban settings, and this component must include not only international, national, and regional policies but also non-governmental organizations, associations, and members of civil society. This is due to the fact that the international community is aware that migration and displacement are closely tied to concerns, and that it can be difficult for representatives of states to develop solutions that are binding and that will persist for an extended period of time. (Stürner, 2020). In addition, agreements and implementations are not sufficient to solve urban problems all by itself; thus, there should also be means of urban diplomacy for the challenges of the future. When migration and municipal government are considered together, city diplomacy is an extremely important factor. Diplomacy of the next generation provides access to worldwide networks. In the place of the sizable collaborations of sister cities that existed in the 1990s, city networks may have begun to act independently as secretariats of international non-governmental organizations (NGO), orchestrating complex alliances between urban centers, private industry actors, states, and multilateral organizations. These alliances are intended to take the place of large sister city coalitions. These coalitions existed during that time period (Amiri and Sevin, 2020). Nonetheless, coordinating this cooperation is difficult. To comprehend multi-layered urban contexts and the significance of networks between different actors, it is necessary, in the first phase, to examine the meaning of migration in urban contexts from a sociological perspective in order to comprehend the significance of city government, followed by an examination of the requirement of governance of migrant groups in urban contexts from a multidimensional perspective. As the paper's primary contribution, the last section will examine the future-oriented implications of multilevel governance in urban environments.

HOW DOES SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE OPEN SPACE TO GOVERNANCE OF MIGRATION IN URBAN CONTEXT IN TERMS OF DIVERSITY?

Before addressing how migration would be regulated, the subject of how the massive population of the new industrial cities would affect the social order was problematized in response to the dramatic expansion in urbanization at the end of the nineteenth century. The central issue in this approach was the tension between city and community (Flanagan, 1993, s. 15). Tönnies's (1957) introduction of the difference between *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* paved the way for the early examination of that conflict. Relations within the *Gemeinschaft* were kept alive within the framework of personal feeling and allegiance. Nevertheless, in *Gesellschaft* societies of the modern age, interactions were more "rational" and founded on calculation. Tönnies believed that the formation of the contemporary world occurred through an evolutionary process, in which European civilizations that emerged from the Industrial Revolution of the nineteenth century became more rational and *Gesellschaft*-like, hence supplanting previous kinds of *Gemeinschaft* societies (Waters, 2016, s. 1). This distinction served to summarize the transition of understanding from rural society to urban society.

Durkheim is another scholar who discussed transformation in the new industrialized urban society. Although Tönnies and Durkheim's perspectives on social change are sometimes associated with one another, this is not always the case. This is because Tönnies and Durkheim concentrate on very different aspects of society as well as change in the established social order. Tönnies examines social institutions and how they evolved with the development of the new social order, whereas Durkheim focuses on the division of labor as the reason underlying change (TheSocdork, 2010). Durkheim (1893) used mechanical solidarity for pre-urban society and the organic solidarity of urban society to explain transformation from pre-urban to urban context. According to his perspective, the urban space allowed newly free, differentiated and individualistic relations. Both Durkheim and Tönnies, therefore, saw a shift from a shared moral order in pre-modern society to more instrumental and self-oriented relations in urban society.

Simmel (1905) extended this line of thinking with his essay, *The Metropolis and Mental Life*, wherein he focused on urban space in terms of social interaction, distance and boundaries, and discussed the social, physical and psychological transformations and experiences of individuals in order to explain alienating dynamics of the urban space. According to Simmel, the crowded nature of the urban environment means that people could afford to ignore a large proportion of the relations around them; indeed, it would be impossible to establish meaningful relations with this multiplicity. This forces people into more calculated and transactional relations. Simmel, therefore, saw urban life as bringing about more rationality and individuality in relations. Like Simmel, Wirth, in his famous

study *Urbanism as a way of life* (1938) emphasized alienation in the urban context and explored sociological explanations of urban interactions in order to try to produce a more holistic urban theory. He identified three crucial characteristics, namely numbers, density and heterogeneity. The first two of these produce the third, and this heterogeneity is the main reason for the transformation of social relations in urban contexts.

Although all these approaches expect more segregated and self-based constructions in urban life and focus on small social ties and the effect of environmental factors such as size or density, later studies recognized the possibility of establishing a strong sense of place in urban populations, with large social ties such as kinship groups (Gans, 1962), working class populations (Young and Willmott, 1957) and ethnic groups (Sutlles, 1968). As well as recognizing that community ties can work together with environmental factors such as size/density of social ties to enable a sense of place in urban settings, Gans (1962) also turned attention to the complexity of conditions in city life and categories of people attracted by urban life. Moreover, Gans' work helped turn scholars' attention towards the importance of relations and social contacts within and beyond residential neighbourhoods. For example, Fischer's (1975, 1995) "subcultural theory of urbanism" argues how individuals find other people who share similar ideas and lifestyles as themselves. In other words, even in settlements with very large populations, urbanities contain networks of friends, associates and family in smaller settlements. Furthermore, urban life provides opportunities to develop other private networks with people who share similar tastes and interests. These networks based on shared interests produce distinct norms, meanings and status systems which can be defined as the signs of subcultures. Fischer's theory was particularly important as it helped reconcile discrepancies in previous urban theories. For instance, Wirth (1938) thought of the city as a site of social isolation, which led to poor social control and a high likelihood of social pathology. He attributed these outcomes to the city. In addition, Gans (1962) argued that urban social relationships and behavioral patterns are entirely a result of the social economic features of their inhabitants. This means that the urban contexts themselves do not have any causal influence, as Gans believed that the socio-demographic characteristics of the inhabitants are the sole determinant of urban social relationships and behavioral patterns. Fischer's description takes from each, but it also includes a distinct component of the subculture.

Together, these discussions of the nature of urban community show the need for a broader understanding of relations in urban contexts that encompasses the totality of residents' social relationships within large, unconfined metropolitan areas. In this regard, the social networks approach is useful because it emphasizes how individuals are embedded in various social relations and inter-connected with different social ties, such as family, peers or more formal groups. Taking account of this complexity is also crucial for this article because that research is grounded

on the assumption that governance has to be understood alongside the complex relations of individuals with others. In other words, migrants have many networks in the city, and the quality and size of these networks depend on the urban places they live in. Sometimes they have more dense, closed and structured relations with governmental actors, but sometimes more open, dynamic and changeable ones with agents or civil society. If it is recognized that the dynamic effect of migration on urban areas need to be understood alongside the question of adaptation to the new space, it is clearer why social networks should be handled in urban governance discussion.

At the same time as urban studies scholars grew more interested in the value of social interactions, large urban centres have been a focal point for immigrants; as a result, the focus of study has switched to concentrate on new ethnic groups and the networks they have. Migration's influence on urban regions is now a popular issue in academic circles, and from a sociological perspective, the focus is mostly on the dynamic link between migration and urban location. This dynamic serves as the basis for a vast array of methods to the study of the interaction between migratory persons and urban environments. These talks, which are founded on the concurrent endeavor to comprehend the city and its growing population, also open the way to theorizing and governing migrations. Despite the economic and/or political perspectives to manage migration-based problems (Flanagan, 1993) in the beginning of migration discussions, today social, cultural, economic and political perspectives together are integrated (Gottdiener, 1985) into urban governance. By addressing the role of capitalism, international economic linkages, and governmental orders, economic and political perspectives understood the urbanization of migrants as an enclosed geographical region, distinct from other sections of the city, and a homogeneity of both migrant groups and locations where they locate. However, the new argument by adding socio-cultural perspectives into the economic and political dimension adds to the role of agencies, civil groups and heterogeneities in urban context. This multidimensional perspective opens gate to multilevel actors who are active into urban governance.

MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERSPECTIVES FOR THE GOVERNANCE OF CITIES

Even if there have been continuous discussions over the regulation of migration by states and cities, it is hard to appreciate the national context without taking either into consideration. This is the case since both are interconnected. Cities should not strive to assume the tasks of states but should instead concentrate on their particular local advantages due to their lack of sovereignty in migration policy. Using a "local lens" can result in innovative recommendations for modifying supranational migration policy. These assets include familiarity with local capabilities and limitations, closeness to the populace, and a degree of

pragmatism. Cities require access to active involvement in regional and global processes, as well as resources for implementation and recognition as equal-footing partners. (Stürner, 2020, s. 5).

Cities are where economic and demographic power is concentrated, where innovation is more likely to emerge, and where leadership has the capacity to discover answers to challenges involving international cooperation. Local politicians and local authorities are motivated to act and provide answers because they are the level of government that is most directly accountable to their residents. Governance at the municipal level, especially in bigger cities, has been more aggressive in developing their own distinctive methods to integration. Cities with very high rates of cultural and ethnic variety perceive this diversity favorably and use it as the foundation of their local policy. The localization of immigrant integration programs has a variety of repercussions for the vertical relationships between national and local governments. Specifically, under the centralist paradigm, local governments' obligations would be confined to the execution of national policy. Local integration programs differ from national plans in a variety of ways. For example, urban centers should increase their coordination with migration officials and other community actors. Due to the needs and expectations of migrants, cities may become more receptive to and supportive of the cultural and religious activities of minorities. In certain communities, this has resulted in a decoupling of national and local policy. This indicates that nationally political arguments can also have regional effects on performance. Nevertheless, despite localist or detached relationships, institutionalized interactions between national and local governments have evolved in a number of nations toward multi-level governance (Scholten and Penninx, 2016, pp. 95-98).

However, there is a lack of understanding of how policies develop at all levels of government - from the top down to the local and national level so it should be clarified. Both academic research and published works have a propensity to zero down on a single level rather than attempting to comprehend how several levels interact with one another. Multilevel governance literature covers several government systems. Scholten (2013) identifies four ideal government level relationships: top-down (central), bottom-up (localist), multilevel, and decoupled.

Within the structure of the centralist government are a number of unique levels and hierarchies. This necessitates a top-down interaction between the various levels of government, such as a pretty obvious fundamental definition of the division of labor and control mechanisms to ensure that local policy execution adheres to central regulations and reflects the central policy frame. Other examples of this type of interaction include a multi-tiered taxation system and the use of a unified currency. In order to coordinate this effectively, powerful national or European institutions are required. Centralists want policy convergence. This governance model corresponds to national migration or integration paradigms. The

second is bottom-up, localist multilevel government. Local governments develop policy, respond to local policy agendas, and horizontally share knowledge and information. Localists may produce policy difference, which may result in different integration issues than at the national level. Multilevel governance helps to coordinate government levels without dominating any of them. Policy coordination at several levels necessitates "vertical venues." Forums or networks link several levels of government. When multiple levels of government are "leveled," multilevel governance is most successful. Policy convergence is produced and maintained by this style of administration. Decoupled governmentality is the final kind. Interlevel policy cooperation is lacking. Different policies in any policy sector might be conflicting. This can cause policy conflicts between governments. It sends target groups conflicting messages, reducing policy effectiveness. National and local integration policies are outspread.

Many national governments now acknowledge the local characteristics and contributions of cities, which open the door to multilevel governance by exposing them to the world arena. Several national governments have issued public comments in support of cities' ability to "self-represent" on the international stage. This is due to cities' increasingly proactive and deliberate mobilization on key transnational policy concerns such as migration, as well as a rising realization that local expertise must feed global policymaking. Cities are provided more intentional and persistent assistance in their position as national governments' partners in forging new inter- and intra-national cooperation routes. For example, the Mayors Mechanism was founded inside the Global Forum on Migration and Development (GFMD) with the political backing of the governments of Canada, Ecuador, Germany, Morocco, and Switzerland. This support was necessary for the establishment of the Mayors Mechanism. During the GCM discussions, the Swiss federal government also suggested that local municipalities be represented by national delegates (Thouez, 2021). As cities demonstrate their skills and knowledge in policy on immigration as key communities by getting support of national governments, but also as global actors in their own right, they demand greater entity in trying to acquire resource management - independent of the national state - to carry out these new competencies. All of city vs. state debates demonstrate that migration governance necessitates the collaboration of national or regional actors, bringing the debate to an international level.

IMPLICATIONS OF MULTILEVEL MIGRATION GOVERNANCE IN THE CITIES

These ideas give rise to a consideration of urban government in three main areas. All three of the following points are critical for future study on migration governance in urban environments, in particular. To begin with, as a result of globalization, cities are subject to the laws and regulations established by their

national and/or supranational governments. Cities have traditionally played a minor role in international affairs. However, they are now directly or indirectly threatening national governments' functions by engaging in international operations without consulting or telling national governments. Cities, for example, participate in global governance of climate change, public health, and human migration through transnational city networks, so as part of city diplomacy, an increasing number of cities are engaging in international, bilateral, and multilateral relations with other cities and international organizations, particularly in the field of migration. Because city diplomacy and international relations are mostly unexplored ground in migration studies, there is an increasing demand for study into city networks and city alliances in migrant governance. According to Lecavalier and Gordon (2020), recent researches have investigated city networks in general as potential mechanisms for inter-city communication, learning, collaboration, and coordination. These studies have also tracked and explained the content and directionality of inter-city linkages as well as policy and information flows. The concept of city networks as forums and instruments for city diplomacy is becoming increasingly widespread. This perspective examines the activities and interactions of cities and other non-state actors, such as global corporations, finance companies, and non-governmental organizations, among others, with varying degrees of agency. The primary focus of this perspective is on cities. Other non-state actors include. The act that is referred to as "city diplomacy" occurs when regional governments from various regions of the world contact with one another and with international players such as international organizations, development banks, non-governmental organizations, and even foreign states. From this perspective, city diplomacy consists of a series of bilateral and multilateral interactions with the goal of advancing interests or promoting values (Grand, 2022).

Migration is a key concept during the discussion because it is accepted that migration shapes the cities and with each newcomers the identity of city and the sense of city has been shaped by them. Cities as historical layers produced by its residents whether they are natives or migrants so city making process is never ending process and understandable with its implications. In this sense, city diplomacy is more important today because it provides a response to the question, "*If migration changes cities, how does migration governance shape cities?*" adheres to the idea of city diplomacy. The formation of city diplomacy is primarily concerned with implementing policies of integration and finding solutions to the challenges faced by migrants in areas such as housing, education, employment opportunities, and communication, amongst other things. This suggests that players engaging in city diplomacy are not merely considered as significant stakeholders; rather, they are also seen as partners who have major obligations to welcome, engage, secure, and care for migrants and other vulnerable persons. It is essential for cities to offer assistance to one another in order for there to be worldwide

collaboration on the difficulties associated with migration. When it comes to resolving issues that are associated with migration, it is necessary to establish connections with one another and hold one other accountable for the commitments we make. Disparities across nations can be attributed to a number of variables, including differences in influence on the world stage, differences in geopolitical position, and differences in the availability of migratory resources. Cooperation on a worldwide scale is an essential step toward addressing these discrepancies, but at the same time, the importance of these distinctions cannot be emphasized. While global cooperation is an essential step toward resolving these divisions, To put it another way, despite the fact that people all around the world are working together on migration plans, those strategies still need to be based on the realities of specific places. Because of the significance of locational factors (Massey, 2005), the boundaries of city diplomacy are determined by space-based considerations. It seems to reason that natives' and newcomers' reactions to the same set of remedies would vary, given the diversity of the challenges they face.

The second dimension focuses on improving decentralization and autonomy from central authority by building new national-local relationships, which is crucial for urban government today. The power of higher levels limits the autonomy of city governments, hence city governments are restricted entities. However, municipal politics may be understood when viewed through the "lens of demarcation" offered by administrative and jurisdictional borders that are publicly recognized inside a city. They are growing increasingly independent, assuming a range of different duties, and formulating policy solutions to emerging urban concerns. They frequently discover more effective solutions to international problems than nation-states. In other words, the significance of cities in defining contemporary civilization is growing. Cities' heightened significance as hubs for collective decision making, social infrastructure and services requirement, sustainable growth, rapid response, and more aspirational climate policy is often an unintended consequence of institutional shifts towards the enabling state and welfare state retrenchment. But nations as institutions are not great at adapting to the opportunities and threats presented by urban areas. Since cities are often left to deal with these forces on their own, studying the new norms and priorities of urban administration is an important part of urban studies today (da Cruz et al., 2022). According to Barber (2013) many of the issues associated with nation-states, such as climate change and inequality, would supposedly disappear "if mayors ran the globe." We are unable to ignore the strength of the municipalities and the tension that exists between them and the nation-state, particularly because migration is involved with these factors. There has been a "decoupling" of national and municipal policies because superdiverse European cities like Barcelona, London, Berlin, and Rotterdam have pursued policy agendas significantly different from their national governments. The EU has created a number of soft governance initiatives to promote policy learning amongst local governments, despite the fact

that politics of migrant integration continues to dictate policies in many countries (Scholten and Penninx, 2016). In this regard, to overcome decoupling of nation state and cities, many world cities act individually or go to cooperation to find their own way. In that point, differences and similarities should be considered together because according to Bommes (2010), many migration scholars focus on generally applicable theoretical perspectives.

A further aspect of multilevel governance is the participation of independent players and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) unaffiliated with official government. When state-led modernization paradigms predominated, both Marxist and liberal concepts of social change and development neglected civil society as a social change and development alternative. During the 1970s and 1980s, when state-driven development projects came under criticism, it was revived (Singh and Parthasarathy, 2010). According to Clark (1995), non-governmental groups function as intermediate entities between the state and the person, recognize societal needs, and provide open debate forums. These groups are emergency response systems. Parallel to these objectives, migrants, in conjunction with other actors under the auspices of NGOs, are continuously developing fresh answers to their needs and the challenges they encounter at the local and micro levels. Education centres, libraries, socializing spaces, and courses have been created in various parts of the city under the auspices of non-governmental organizations with the assistance of various players. In addition, poverty, psychological issues, and housing requirements are required to advance collaboration. When state authorities are not taking action or are sluggish to develop answers to the challenges of immigration, city administration must produce alternatives. In the new society, the absence of the state and the collapse of old networks have enhanced the roles of nongovernmental organizations. Nonetheless, these NGOs not only offer local solutions but also have the ability to establish international links (Karamese, 2022). In this way, they serve an inclusive function for both the present and the future by fostering partnerships between migrants and individuals from other nations who are striving towards a same goal. When their functions are studied, it has been determined that NGOs are not only crucial for integrating migrants into society and finding answers to their issues, but also for establishing a transnational network with other countries and individuals from various nations. These networks were built with the assistance of activities, regardless of whether the organizations were local or multinational. It develops transnational relationships between people from various countries. As representatives of organizations, NGOs were able to satisfy collective and individual motivations through fostering connection between individuals of other nationalities. Although NGOs are created on a local level, they maintain relationships with NGOs in other countries and collaborate to find global solutions to the challenges of migration.

To understand how NGOs provide solutions to the problems of immigrants through collaborations they have developed at the local level, it should be focused on their contribution to the reproduction and transformation of the spaces of the city. This is because these NGOs create a space in the city, how they create a new sense of place for immigrants and produce integration against the exclusionary discourses and policies in everyday life. I see these created places such as libraries, cafes, and training centres as the space of interaction that produce a new sense of city and migrant identity. This is because a the term'sense of place' refers to the vast range of relationships that form between people and places depending on a person's place meanings and attachment to a specific environment (Rajala et al., 2020, ss. 718-719).

NGOs are not only important in their own right but also because their local actors are important because of the worldwide links they have, both on an individual actor level and an organizational actor level. The most important participants take up the most of this section. At this juncture, with the help of further research, the question "How do urban actors have a role to develop international links across cities in terms of comparable migrants' problems?" should be answered. Given the importance of geography, do their links result in applications that are comparable to one another? How far is it feasible for people to work together?

As a consequence of this, multilevel governance is impossible without the engagement of independent players at the local level. Independent actors in cities, such as company owners and community organizers, are among those who come up with unique solutions to the challenges they confront on a daily basis without engaging the local administration. These ideas may be implemented in urban settings. Building a park, a library, or a community center can be required as part of the urban planning process in order to successfully integrate new residents into the neighborhood. Many individuals avoid participating governments because they fear the replies will be too delayed and ineffectual, yet this may lead to exciting new opportunities and novel approaches to old issues. With a transnational/urban diplomatic spin, this issue becomes more significant and provides a platform for cutting-edge research of current and ongoing phenomena, such as the growing popularity of do-it-yourself understanding of city governance via private groups' new community-developing structures. Cities can interact quickly and efficiently by using their relationships and capabilities while avoiding bureaucratic red tape. As previously said, NGOs not only give answers to issues but also contribute to the growth in transnational migrants by developing transnational links in education, trade, white-collar labor, and other areas. Immigrants become physically and intellectually mobile by developing various relationships not only with their nationality but also with other nations via the operations of NGOs. Instead of identifying the problem with the local/global dichotomy, these prospective

transnational players could be viewed as contributing to global and multilateral partnerships by learning how to be local inside the globe (Massey, 1995). So, how successful are these transnational actors in producing solutions for migrants by opening up the prospect of new cities with international networks in the future? In a nutshell, NGOs are crucial for the urban level regulation of migration in three dimensions. The first one focuses solely on local interactions and how non-state policies contribute to the construction of urban identity via NGOs. The second focuses on the actions of significant local players in various cities and the commonalities between these activities on a global scale. Understanding that NGOs are not only effective in constructing international cities, but also in producing transnational immigrants, the last question focuses on how these new immigrants are involved in establishing international cities and finding answers to urban problems. Therefore, according to Rezaee and her colleagues (2021), the formation of urban management at the municipal level project involving the role of non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and the participation of local communities, as well as multilevel and number of co governance. This is necessary in order for the structure of urban management to be in line with efficient and effective urban management, while simultaneously strengthening indices of good urban governance, such as participation, reliability, and accountability. It takes strong political will at the highest levels of government, which may be translated as their faith in this form of governance, in order to fight against a government-centered approach to urban management and create excellent urban governance. Overall, with the increased internationalization of cities, city diplomacy now has a central position in both urban and migration administration. While city diplomacy refers to bilateral and multilateral exchanges to address issues, its limitations remain vague, therefore collaboration should also include consideration of national-based divisions. In this respect, despite cooperation across many players at the global, national, and regional levels, contextual distinctions must be considered. Second, despite broadly applicable theoretical viewpoints, recognizing disparities between national and regional policies is critical in order to prevent decoupling of national and local policies. This is because strengthening decentralization and independence from central authority cannot be evaluated just by bolstering local governments through soft governance activities. In addition to global, national, and regional actors, civil society, local actors, and non-governmental organizations should be examined for their effect on the building of national and transnational networks covering the present and future of migration and urbanization.

CONCLUSION

Cities are inseparable part of contemporary society with its increasing number of populations. Migration is the most important reason behind this mobility. With the increase in population diversities and differences were firstly questioned from sociological perspective. Trying to understand the diversity within the city with sociological imagination also brought up a question about how to manage the immigrant community. Despite the economic and political dimensions, socio-cultural perspectives integrated into urban discussions to clarify heterogeneity. This opened a gate to understand governance issue with multilevel actors to include each difference within the context. In this respect, cities are developing more independence, assuming new responsibilities, and creating multiple policy answers to emerging problems in it. Heterogeneous city dynamics foster multilevel governance by incorporating global, local and national actors together. In addition to governmental level of urban, civil society and non-governmental organisations are inseparable parts of the interdependent cooperation. While there are four ideal government level relationships: central, localist, multilevel and decoupled, multilevel governance best fit in to diverse characteristics of urban. However, cooperation between all these dynamics is still ambiguous for effective governance of urban and migration. In addition to possible that different implications may produce decoupling of national and local governments, global cooperation may underestimate contextual differences when policy producers or mayors of superdiverse cities go into cooperation. By regarding all these problematic sides of multilevel governance, as the main contribution of the paper, three main dimensions have been clarified. Due to the rising internationalization of cities, urban and migration administrations now place city diplomacy at the center. Even though city diplomacy refers to bilateral and multilateral exchanges to address challenges, its constraints are ambiguous; consequently, collaboration should also include consideration of national-based divisions. In this regard, contextual distinctions must be taken into account notwithstanding the cooperation of numerous global, national, and regional actors. Second, despite widely applicable theoretical perspectives, it is crucial to recognize differences between national and regional policies to prevent the decoupling of national and local policies. This is because strengthening decentralization and independence from central authority cannot be evaluated merely by bolstering local governments through soft governance activities. In addition to global, national, and regional actors, civil society, local actors, and non-governmental organizations should be examined for their impact on the building of national and transnational networks covering the present and future of migration and urbanization.

REFERENCES

- Amiri, S., & Sevin, E. (2020). Introduction. In Amiri, S., Sevin, E. (eds) *City Diplomacy*. Palgrave Macmillan Series in Global Public Diplomacy. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-45615-3_1.
- Barber, B. R. (2013). If mayors ruled the world. In *If Mayors Ruled the World*. Yale University Press.
- Bommes, M. (2010). Migration research in Germany: The emergence of a generalised research field in a reluctant immigration country. *National paradigms of migration research*, 127-185.
- Caponio, T., Scholten, P. & Zapata-Barrero, R. (2019). *The Routledge handbook of the governance of migration and diversity in cities*. Routledge.
- Clark, A.M. (1995). Non-governmental organizations and their influence on international society. *Journal of International Affairs*, 48 (2), 507-525.
- Colebatch, H.K. (2009). Governance as a conceptual development in the analysis of policy. *Critical Policy Studies*, 3 (1), 58-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460170903158107>.
- da Cruz, N.F., Rode, P. McQuarrie, M., Nicole Badstuber, N. & Robin, E. (1997). *Networked urban governance: A socio-structural analysis of transport strategies in London and New York*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10780874221117463>.
- Durkheim, E. (1893). *The division of labor in society*. The Free Press.
- Fischer, C.S. (1975). The study of urban community and personality. *Annual Review of Sociology*, (1), 67-89.
- Fischer, C.S. (1995). The subcultural theory of urbanism: A twentieth-year assessment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101 (3), 543-577.
- Flanagan, R. (1993). *Risk management and construction*. Wiley, Blackwell Publishing.
- Gans, H. J (1962). *Urban villagers*. Free Press.
- Gottdiener, M. (1985). Hegemony and mass culture: A semiotic approach. *American Journal of Sociology*, 90(5), 979–1001. <https://doi.org/10.1086/228173>.
- Grand, L.K. (2022). *City Diplomacy: An Emerging Tool to Enhance Wellbeing in MENA Cities*. <https://www.iemed.org/publication/city-diplomacy-an-emerging-tool-to-enhance-wellbeing-in-mena-cities/>.
- Karameşe, Ş. (2022). *Negotiating spatiality in urban migration context: The case of Syrian students in Istanbul*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, Department of Sociology, University of Essex, UK.

Lecavalier, E., & Gordon, D. J. (2020). Beyond networking? The agency of city network secretariats in the realm of city diplomacy. In *Palgrave Macmillan Series in Global Public Diplomacy* (pp. 13–36). doi:10.1007/978-3-030-45615-3_2

Massey, D. (1995). *Space, place, and gender*. University of Minnesota Press.

Massey, D. (2005). *Space*. Routledge.

Pradhan, P.K. (2004). Population Growth, Migration and Urbanisation. Environmental Consequences in Kathmandu Valley, Nepal. In Unruh, J.D., Krol, M.S., Kliot, N. (eds) *Environmental Change and its Implications for Population Migration*. *Advances in Global Change Research*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-2877-9_9.

Rajala, K., Sorice, M.G., & Thomas, V.A. (2020). The meaning(s) of place: Identifying the structure of sense of place across a social–ecological landscape. *People and Nature*, 2(3), 718–733. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10112>.

Rezaee, F., Jamile Tavakolinia, J. & Sarrafi, M. (2021). Examining the role of non-government organizations (NGOs) in realizing good urban governance(Case study: Tehran metropolitan city). *Journal of Geography and Urban Planning*, 25 (77),113-130. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22034/gp.2020.41750.2712>.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1997). *Understanding Governance*. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Scholten, P. (2013). The multilevel governance of migrant integration: a multilevel governance perspective on Dutch migrant integration policies. In *The discourses and politics of migration in Europe* (pp. 151-169). Palgrave Macmillan, New York.

Scholten, P., & Penninx, R. (2016). The multilevel governance of migration and integration. In *IMISCOE Research Series* (pp. 91–108). doi:10.1007/978-3-319-21674-4_6

Simmel, G. (1905). A contribution to the sociology of religion. *American Journal of Sociology*, 11(3), 359-376.

Singh, B. & Parthasarathy, D. (2010). Civil society organisation partnerships in urban governance: An appraisal of the mumbai experience. *Sociological Bulletin*, 59 (1), 92-110. Sage Publications, Inc. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/23620847>.

Stürmer, J. (2020). *A new role for cities in global and regional migration governance?* Robert Bosch Foundation. https://www.boschstiftung.de/sites/default/files/publications/pdf/2020-09/Study_Cities_Migration_2020.pdf.

Sutlles, G.D. (1968). *The social order of the slum. Ethnicity and territory in the inner city.*

TheSocdork (2010). *Tonnies vs. Durkheim.* Retrieved July 10, 2022, from www.sociologyonline/studies.com.
<https://www.studocu.com/enus/document/cuyahoga-community-college/introduction-to-urban-studies/the-soc-dork-tonnies-vs-durkheim/12780032>.

Thouez, C. (2021). *Cities and migration governance.* Retrieved September 10, 2022 from <https://nvv.nl/cities-and-migration-governance>.

United Nations, 2015. *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development.* Retrieved July 10, 2022, from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/21252030%20Agenda%20for%20Sustainable%20Development%20web.pdf>.

Waters, T. (2016). *Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft societies.* The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Sociology. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781405165518.wbeos0770>.

Wirth, L. (1938). Urbanism as a way of life. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 44 (1), 1-24.

World Refugee Council Report (2018). *Transforming the global refugee system: Solidarity, humanity and accountability.* Retrieved May 13, 2022, from www.sociologyonline/studies.com.

<https://www.cigionline.org/publications/transforming-global-refugee-system-solidarity-humanity-and-accountability/>.

Young, M., & Willmott, P. (1957). *Family and kinship in East London.* Routledge and Kegan.

Tönnies, F. (1957). *Community & society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft).* Transaction Publishers.

Yazar Katkı Oranları ve Çıkar Çatışması Beyanı

Makale tek yazarlı olup yazar katkı oranı yüzde yüzdür. Herhangi bir çıkar çatışması bulunmamaktadır.