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International migration into Europe has become not just a significant example of social mobility but a contentious subject of economic, social and political debate. The numbers involved are uncertain and disputed and there is little agreement on how to define migrants, or on who should be included, or excluded, but it was estimated in 2019 that around 275 million people live outside their home country: an increase of over 50 million in the last ten years (UN international Migrant Stock, 2019). As a proportion of the world’s population, the number of migrants has gone up steadily from 2.8% to more than 3.5% since the turn of the century. The largest number of international migrants reside in just a few countries with the USA, Saudi Arabia, Russia, the United Arab Emirates, Canada and Australia being among the leading locations. But Europe has become one of the major magnets for migrants with Germany having 13 million migrants amongst its total population of 83 million citizens, the UK having 10 million (of 66 million), France 8 million (of 67 million) and Italy 6 million (of 60 million). Indeed, almost every European country now has a significant population of migrants; often of over 10% of the total population.

Around half of all migrants are women and three-quarters of the total number are of working age. They come to another country looking for work, or hoping for work, or in order to take up work. It is this group’s impact on the labour market that is the subject that Sylwia Przytula and Łukasz Sułkowski have asked their distinguished contributors to discuss. Given that it is through work that migrants will make their biggest impact on a society and that it is through work that they can best integrate into society, understanding their integration into the European labour market is an important endeavour.

There are definitional problems. For many people the definitions are reflections of their prejudices (or, as they would probably say, ‘simple common sense’). Migrants are foreigners, often with a different skin colour or religion or different customs from ‘ours’, probably doing low level jobs, and trying to support, or to gain government support for their large families. (If we find foreigners who are more like us and doing high level jobs, we call them ‘expatriates’). There is some truth in these stereotypes, but a lot of untruths too. As scholars we have to go beyond these simplistic notions and ensure that we are discussing a coherent and differentiated category of people. The main difference between expatriates and migrants is that expatriates are in a country temporarily, migrants are there to settle: they are there long-term.

Migrants, then, come in all shapes and sizes. Some will be the people who fit the stereotype of being black- or brown-skinned, or a different religion, poor, lowly-educated and prepared to take almost any work. Others will be highly qualified, senior people at the top of their profession, lured to another country to take up a job that they have been recruited for. In between there will be people who have applied competitively for a job in another country, people whose transfer has been facilitated by agencies or middlemen, and people who arrive in a country hoping to find work. And then there are refugees: migrants who have been driven out of a country, rather than chosen to go, and are now in a place they would rather not be. We have to be careful not to confuse these groups; not all migrants
are the same. Whilst many of the chapters in Sylwia Przytuła and Łukasz Sułkowski’s book cover the lower status migrants, there is recognition of the other kinds of migration too.

There are specific issues in Europe. Much of the recent growth in the number of migrants has been of people from outside Europe coming into the continent. But Europe also has a particular, indeed unique, situation where people from any one of the European Union’s nation states have the right to get work in any other state – and as a consequence to settle down there, to buy property there, and to pay all the dues and receive all the benefits of any citizen of that state. Much intra-European migration is not even recorded.

The highly qualified experts that the editors have brought together in this text examine the situation in Europe in detail. They examine policy and practice, they examine the development of language skills and digital support and, taking a wide view of Europe, they examine some dozen or more countries. This is an important book, these are important subjects, and subjects that will have both immediate value and resonance for years to come.

Chris Brewster,
Professor of International Human Resource Management,
Henley Business School,
University of Reading, UK
April 2020
SECTION I

INTEGRATING MIGRANTS IN EUROPE
MULTIPLE FACES OF THE MIGRATION CRISIS

Patrycja Matusz, Eirini Aivaliotou and Sylwia Przytuła

ABSTRACT

In 2015, Europe faced an unprecedented inflow of refugees and migrants. Political instability at the continent’s peripheries contributed to an accumulative exodus. This resulted in large immigration waves fleeing mainly from Syria, Afghanistan and Iraq as well as from other North African countries. Europe was confronted with an increasing number of asylum applications and had to accommodate over a million people (Clayton, 2015). The crisis in Europe has been framed both as a migration crisis and as a crisis within the European Union (EU). The Dublin Regulation, of 2013, requires only one Member state to process the asylum applications. During the pressing period of 2015, the notion of responsibility sharing resulted in heated debates between South and Central and Eastern European states. Several countries like Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary expressed openly antimigrant opinions, which resulted in even more confusion and mismanagement of the migration crisis in the EU. Analyzing the crisis from the macro, meso and micro level, it was evident that the crisis was multifaceted.

Keywords: Migration crisis; European Union; actors; refugees; responsibility sharing; humanitarian crisis

INTRODUCTION

State repression, inequalities and every day dissatisfaction with the living conditions in the Arab World led to a domino effect of uprisings and demonstrations against multiple governments across the Middle East and North Africa from 2010 and onwards. The aforementioned events were called the Arab Spring and brought about dramatic changes in the region (Kimball, 2013, p. 80). Chronic sociopolitical problems endangered public order and major political events like the Tunisian Revolution, which as one of many, had seriously disputed the regional order which had detrimental effects on the neighbouring states (Aras & Bülent, 2011). Syria had been heavily impacted by the revolutionary waves reaching its peak in the early 2015. This resulted in an internal political turmoil, known as the Syrian Civil War. The ongoing war has been declared the second deadliest war in the
twenty-first century (United Nations, 2018). This political instability and its consequences resulted in mass migration flows from the countries of the Middle East and North Africa towards Europe. The European Union (EU) was presumed to be the closest and safest location to migrate to (European Parliament, 2019b). Ultimately, in 2015, Europe received an unprecedented inflow of refugees and migrants. Due to the unexpectedly large size of the influx, the death tolls and the chaos spreading around the European continent until the middle of 2016, this phenomenon became known as the migration crisis (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2019).

The European border controls intensified in October 2015, the national land and port authorities were assisted by Frontex – that is the European Border and Coastal Guard Agency – in border patrols, controls and identification processes. More specifically, the role of the agency is to help the EU states with border patrols with an ultimate aim to secure various routes that migrants usually take in an attempt to enter Europe. The migratory routes and their diversity justify the complexity of the migration crisis. Each migratory route in Europe involves different nationalities of migrants and different ways of entry (Crawley & Hagen-Zanker, 2018). The Central Mediterranean route is used mainly by the North African migratory waves. The Eastern Mediterranean route deals with the flows from Turkey to Greece. The Western Balkan route is crossed mainly by nationals from the Middle Eastern countries towards Hungary and Central Europe. The Western Mediterranean route connects Morocco with Spain. Finally, the Central Mediterranean route links North Africa with Italy. Frontex reports that in 2015, during the refugee crisis, there were about 2 million illegal crossings, as a sum of the people crossing those routes (European Border and Coast Guard Agency, 2019). That triggers the core reasons behind heated discussions within Europe. The illegal crossings project one of the delicate issues of the phenomenon and feature as the backbone of the antimigration debates across Europe. The legal status of the migrants dominated the debates and that was the definition of a refugee, especially the eligibility and the legality of the refugees’ stay.

There are many controversies regarding the category of migrants in the scientific and public discourse about the migration crisis in the EU. Table 1 below defines the three main categories used in the debate: migrants, refugees and asylum seekers. According to the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC), the term mixed flows or mixed migrant are covering all categories of people moving to EU Member states (UNODC, 2020). Crawley, Duvell, Jones, McMahon, and Sigona (2017) use in their article the term ‘refugees and other migrants’ to reflect the nature of the movement of people between categories across time and space.

The categories of migrants changed as well as the profile of the migrants. Historically, the majority of migrants seeking an entry to Europe were single males. From 2015, at the beginning of the crisis, media showed male migrants on the move to Europe. However, looking at the available data, it is clear that families with children, single mothers with children as well as unaccompanied children had been making the journey. Both, women with children and unaccompanied children are classed as vulnerable as they face greater risks of physical assault and/or harm, exploitation, abuse, sexual assaults as well as human trafficking (UN Women, 2020).

The international protection regulations do not cover economic factors; however, there is a high number of people trying to access Europe for financial reasons. And these people use the same routes as the ones fleeing conflict and violence. The legal channels are not accessible to the majority of the potential migrants. Moreover, due to the growing fear of migrants, viewed as a threat to the sovereignty, the EU Member states have implemented more restrictive regulations regarding access to their territories.
The Geneva Convention was ratified by 145 countries and the New York Protocol was a revision of it in 1967. The legal document provides a definition of refugees as a tool to separate refugees from other kinds of migrants. According to the Geneva Convention, a refugee is a person who flees persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality and political opinions (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2010). This provides a framework for the identification processes of migrants seeking for protection in Europe. However, according to the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR), an asylum seeker is someone who has requested sanctuary and is awaiting the decision regarding this request (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2019). As a result, in 2015 with the surge in migration to Europe, the asylum applications saw a significant rise. Meanwhile, as aforementioned, a handful of the Middle Eastern and North African states had been enduring years of political instability and turmoil; according to the Eurostat, in 2015, people from Syria, Eritrea, Iraq and Afghanistan were the nationals that were mainly granted protection by the EU (Eurostat, 2019a). By 2018, 68% resident permits in the EU were granted to Syrians for humanitarian reasons (Eurostat, 2019b).

The Dublin Regulation aims to eliminate multiple asylum applications. In cases of emergency and unexpected flows into Europe, the Dublin Regulation limit an individual from making multiple applications in different Member states which can be fuelled by, for example, hoping to have more chances of be legally accepted as a refugee. Therefore, in 2013, it was decided by the EU that the first state where migrants arrive will become responsible for processing these migrants’ asylum applications (European Commission, 2016a). In 2015, the unprecedented and, largely, surprising inflow of migrants has led the European Member states to question the effectiveness of the Dublin Regulation during such events. This pressured several Mediterranean states to lobby the EU for an immediate revision of the Dublin Regulation. However, the European Parliament discussed the topic of the Coalition of the Willing which reflects on the disproportionate burden taken from certain EU countries and the failure of others to comply and cooperate (European Parliament, 2019a). This led to a conflict between the countries geographically close to the Middle East, North Africa and Central and Easter European countries.

In 2016, the United Nations (UN) Summit focussed on refugees and migrants and the creation of the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. Several of the points

---

**Table 1. Key Definitions.**

| **Migrant:** | there is no legal definition of a migrant, but experts agree that international migrant is someone who changes his or her country of usual residence, irrespective of the reason for migration or legal status. Generally, a distinction is made between short-term or temporary migration, covering movements with a duration between 3 and 12 months, and long-term or permanent migration, referring to a change of country of residence for a duration of one year or more. Thus, it appears that ‘migrant’ is an umbrella term for all categories of people on the move, without information about their legal status, reason for migration and/or length of stay. |
| **Refugee:** | a refugee is an individual who is outside their country of origin for reasons of feared persecution, conflict, generalized violence or other circumstances that have seriously disturbed public order. The fear of being prosecuted might be based on religion, nationality or membership of a particular social group. The refugee definition can be found in the 1951 Convention and regional refugee instruments, as well as UNHCR’s Statute. According to the UNHCR, whole groups may be considered as *prima facie* refugees. |
| **Asylum Seeker:** | asylum seeker is an individual who seeks protection from prosecution or other harm in a country other than their own, awaits a decision on the application for refugee status according to international and national regulations. In case of a negative decision, this person must leave the country, unless they are granted protection based on humanitarian or other grounds. |

*Source: United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2016); United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (2019).*
reflect issues that unfold in the European continent and also project the macro, meso and micro level resolutions, as of this book’s main objective. Number 35 of the Declaration discusses the worrisome issue of the human trafficking and how can states prevent it. This issue applies to the macro level and the systematic border checks across Europe. Number 38 discusses the financing of humanitarian aid and initiatives undertaken to help migrants settle in a state as well as the financial aid provided to the host communities. This can be linked to the involvement of the private businesses and nongovernmental organizations with the support of the UN, considering the implementation of projects related to migrants as well as to host communities; addressing a meso level response and the intermingle of various actors within those projects. Finally, number 44 discusses the educational systems along with the unemployment as reasons for migration. Therefore, assistance at the countries of origin of the migrants may feature as a mechanism to prevent migration in the first place. As a tool to control the inflows, the UN suggests to reinforce educational systems and the economies in the countries of origin of the migrants by introducing bilateral agreements with several third-countries (United Nations, 2016). An example of that is the ‘EU emergency trust fund for Africa’, the support given to Libya illustrates a micro level resolution targeting to increase the living standards of third-country individuals (European Commission, 2016c).

Parallel to this, in 2015, the EU put in place its first responses to the migration crisis. The Council of the European Union by calling the issues in the Mediterranean as a ‘tragedy’ set some goals which are ‘to strengthen the presence at sea, fight traffickers, prevent illegal migratory flows, and reinforce internal solidarity and responsibility’ (Council of the European Union, 2019). From this EU Press Release, the core points seem to be a collective response based on the values of solidarity among the Members. Poland and the Czech Republic openly expressed that they are not willing to receive migrants from the Middle East and North Africa. Orbán opposed and still opposes common EU migration policies. Additionally, he was against the cooperation between the EU and the Arab League which was aimed to facilitate the relations of the EU mainly with Egypt and strengthening the relations of the two. Orbán opposed the suggestion because migration was part of the agreement, illustrating that the topic of migration can feature as a burden in all kinds of unanimous EU agreements (Meier, 2019).

The phenomenon of the crisis stems a situation in which the states and the EU institutions are expected to develop quick regulations. Contrary to migrants and/or refugees who play a passive role in a crisis-management process, institutional actors play an active role in this process. Both drivers and consequences of the phenomenon shape the political and public debates about the weaknesses of the European migration governance. The migration crisis was characterized by a number of features. Firstly, the practical challenge of the sheer volume and diversity of people seeking protection in the EU. Secondly, the complexity and dynamic of the inflow simply overwhelmed the asylum system in the EU and impacted mostly the countries on the frontline that received most migration waves. During this migration crisis, it had become very difficult to identify ‘forced’ and ‘voluntary’ migrants. International Protection procedure, particularly when experiencing a high number of applicants, puts significant pressure on resources, and it is also important to consider the long-term costs of migrant integration.

The mass inflow of migrants to the EU described as a migration crisis was in fact the crisis of European migration governance, solidarity and integration. There are many values which were impacted by the dynamic events related to the mass migration of 2015. One of the most important effects of the migration crisis was ‘debordering’ and the tensions on the internal borders between France–Italy and Germany–Austria, as well as on
the Slovenian–Austrian border. This was the symbolic crisis of the very fundamental and practical achievement of the integration process, the free movement of people within Schengen area. Another effect of the migration crisis stemmed from the declaration of the German Federal Office for Migration and Refugees, in which it is clearly stated that the office would not follow the so-called Dublin procedures in the case of refugees from Syria. Chancellor Angela Merkel noted that the Dublin Regulation could not cope with the mass inflow of refugees. Merkel’s policy of open doors has had profound consequences on internal politics (polarization of positions) in Germany as well as on the relations between other Member states (Connolly, 2015).

The new Member states (Central Europe) opposed the idea of solidarity in managing the crisis and distributing the refugees among all Member states. These multiple tensions and diverse interests of the Member states, in terms of migration governance, have strengthened the idea of strong national migration policies, instead of the Europeanization of this area, and has reinforced political and economic division between Member states. The Central European Member states have rejected the Relocation Plan, which aimed for the EU-wide response to the crisis.

MIGRATION CRISIS AND THE EUROPEAN UNION

Migration to the European continent had not suddenly erupted in 2015. After the Cold War and the fall of the Iron Curtain, a massive movement of populations started from the East to the West of Europe (Okólski & Salt, 2014). From the early 2000s, the Central Mediterranean route had become the main path for irregular migrants moving around Europe. The flows of migrants had been steadily increasing over the years (Pastore, 2016). Crawley et al. (2017), while discussing the migration crisis, make a similar point, noting that migrants in Europe had been present for a long time; however, the manner in which the 2015 migration waves unfolded was the root cause of its differentiation with previous migratory flows and hence for the attention it received globally. In the late summer of 2015, up to 10,000 migrants per day had been arriving at the Greek islands (Redmond Ron, 2015). In Greece, in 2015, 7,475 people applied for asylum, in Italy 30,755 and in Hungary 98,072 (European Commission, 2019a). The inhumane conditions at the sea and at other European shores as well as the large number of people who drowned alarmed the EU and prompted a set of policy responses. This resulted in a decision to take a number of vital steps.

The first step was naturally focussing on the rescue of migrants and their safety first while simultaneously the border patrols and controls worked as a mechanism for a rapid containment of upcoming irregular inflows. The European Border and Coast Guard Agency (Frontex) recruited 650 officers in Greece and 1,400 around Europe. According to the European Commission, it has saved 760,000 lives since the beginning of the crisis (European Commission, 2016d). A second response by the EU was to eliminate human traffickers and subsequently prevent illegal migration. With the creation of five hotspots in Greece and Italy, it was aimed by the EU to provide shelter for the refugees and migrants as well as places of for fingerprinting and identification processes (European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, 2016). In 2016, the EU–Turkey agreement reflected this need to better regulate the migratory flows. The agreement clearly lays out plans to remove illegal migrants from the Greek island back to Turkey, it entails a mutual consensus between EU and Turkey considering irregular migrants, who will be returned from the Greek island (European Commission, 2018). Finally, focus was placed on the internal
solidarity having as a result a period full of discussions within the bloc. The European Council introduced the European Agenda on Migration, which refers in May 2015 to the Article 78(3) about the relocation scheme, which is a temporary redistribution scheme that aims to ease the burden taken by Greece and Italy by distributing a number of migrants to other Member states. The scheme in other words wished for the balanced participation of all Members States, according to several criteria like those of GDP, size of population, unemployment rate and past numbers of asylum seekers and of resettled refugees (European Commission, 2015b).

In order to ensure efficiency and positive results, the Council set up the Integrated Political Crisis Response (IPCR) as a joint response to the migration crisis. The objectives of the IPCR are to monitor the flows, provide support for the decision-making processes and control the agreed measures and their implementation by the Member states (Council of the European Union, 2015b). The reassurance of a united direction for a common cause took a big part of the migration crisis resolution’s aims.

However, the EU proposals crumbled as different European states had been dealing with different flows and had different views on management of migration crisis. Frontex, as already mentioned, assisted national authorities in patrolling the sea borders, especially in Greece and Italy. Parallel to this, in July 2015, Viktor Orbán had started building a fence blocking the newcomers from crossing the border and reaching Western Europe (Nasralla, 2015). Moreover, Beata Szydło, the Prime Minister of Poland from 2015 to 2017, said that Poland will not be ‘blackmailed’ by other EU states to cut the EU funds for the country due to Poland’s denial to work with the relocation scheme and be forced to take asylum seekers into the country, specifically she mentioned that ‘We cannot be blackmailed by the threat that part of our EU funds will be cut off as punishment, because we don’t agree to the forced relocation of migrants from North Africa and the Middle East’ (Euractiv, 2017). Moreover, even though the 1951 Geneva Convention provides a definition of, and a framework for classifying, refugees, Viktor Orbán’s take on the migrants during the migration crisis was such that, in his view, most of the migrants were simply people who wished to live in better conditions and not ‘real’ refugees fleeing war and persecution (The Economist, 2015).

The political debates on how to handle the incoming migration inflows would not, in themselves, cause many worries within the EU, if Hungary and Poland were not in a wider spectrum of collaborations. However, the Visegrad Group (V4) as an informal regional format of cooperation between the four Central European countries: Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia and Hungary was founded in 1991. It mainly facilitates the discussions between these four countries, which share similar cultures and historic pasts (Ministry of Foreign Affairs Republic of Poland, 2020). The group’s collaboration got strengthened during the migration crisis as the relocation scheme offered an opportunity to ease the European South European by transferring migrants from one EU state to another and applied to the ‘good will’ of the rest European states to receive third-country nationals and process their asylum applications in their own countries. This, however, did not seem appealing to the V4 countries, which actually opposed this suggestion. In 2017, the Czech Republic, Poland and Hungary were referred to the EU Court of Justice considering the positioning of the V4 countries about the topic of migration. Although the action of the EU to do so was, in fact, a warning, the three countries did not shift their positions (European Commission, 2017).

The first report from the relocation scheme from the European Commission shows that the relocation system was to effectively relocate 63,302 people from Greece. In March 2016, examining the V4 countries’ reaction, Poland pledged to receive 65 people out of the