INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION WITH REFERENCE TO CROATIA: POSITION PAPER OF THE INSTITUTE FOR MIGRATION AND ETHNIC STUDIES

INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS – DEFINITION OF THE CONCEPT

Due to the increased migration and particularly refugee flows in 2015, the issue of integration imposes itself as key in all European countries, and particularly in those that have accepted the greatest number of immigrants.[1] Despite the fact that the prevailing perception in the majority of Western European countries is that they do not fall into the category of being immigration countries, the share of immigrants in the total population in some of them is even higher than their share in those that are regarded as classical cases of being immigration countries.[2] Therefore, apart from managing migration flows, growing emphasis is being placed on the **integration** of (im)migrant groups, which has recently been becoming a part of the public policy and strategic documents of the European Union.

Because of the ambiguous nature of the concept itself (**immigrant integration**) it has been causing differences of opinion among some theoreticians. Its meaning is strongly linked with the paradigmatic image of modern Western European societies.[3] That image is rooted in the idea of the 'nation state' in which society is comprehended as a connected, functional and structural entity, and all who do not belong there according to the judgement of the majority group in society are perceived as *Others*, that is, as *Strangers*. Until recent times in Europe, the most frequent type of Stranger was a migrant worker, a national of some third country,[4] along with his offspring.[5] With the emergence of mass refugee flows, that perception has changed and instead of the migrant worker the 'typical stranger' in Europe has become the refugee and/or forced migrant, a third country national. Although certain scholars[6] consider that more appropriate concepts for understanding the relations between immigrants and the host society are those based on globalisation trends and transnational relations and identifications, the term integration

---

[1] The document "Integration of Migrants in the European Union with Reference to Croatia: Position Paper of the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies" was written by Snježana Gregurović together with Drago Župarić-Iljić, Simona Kuti, Sanja Klempić Bogadi, Sonja Podgorelec, Dubravka Mlinarić and Margareta Gregurović. Transmission, copying or distribution of the information contained in this document is permitted with precise quotation of the reference as: Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies (2016), "Integration of Migrants in the European Union with Reference to Croatia: Position Paper of the Institute for Migration and Ethnic Studies", Institut za migracije i narodnosti, downloaded from: http://www.imin.hr/en/strateska-polazista (date of access).

[2] The classic immigration countries are thought of as being the United States, Canada and Australia.
 https://data.oecd.org/migration/foreign-born-population.htm#indicator-chart

[3] See: A. Favell (2010), Integration and nations: the nation-state and research on immigrants in Western Europe, in: M. Martiniello and J. Rath (eds.). *Selected Studies in International Migration and Immigrant Incorporation*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 371–405.

[4] Third-country nationals are foreigners who are not citizens of the European Economic Region (the European Union, Lichtenstein, the Kingdom of Norway and the Republic of Island) and the Swiss Confederation. http://www.mup.hr/47.aspx

[5] See: M. Alexander (2007), *Cities and Labour Immigration. Comparing Policy Responses in Amsterdam, Paris, Rome and Tel Aviv*. Aldershot: Ashgate.

[6] See: T. Faist (2010), Transnationalisation: Its Conceptual and Empirical Relevance, in: C. Audebert and M. K. Doraï (eds.). *Migration in a Globalised World: New Research Issues and Prospects*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 79–105; N. GlickSchiller, L. Basch and C. Szanton Blanc (1992), Towards a Transnational Perspective on Migration, *Annals of New York Academy of Sciences*, 645: 1–24.

stemming from the paradigm 'nation – state – society' continues to be dominant in the European public and scholarly discourse.

The integration of immigrants is a multi-dimensional process and, since this is a process of social change, it is difficult to define it unambiguously. There is often a failure to differentiate the term itself from terms such as incorporation, inclusion, adaptation, acculturation and accommodation, and sometimes from assimilation. However, they are barely suitable for replacing the term *integration*, the meaning of which is always linked with the ideal vision of (national) society viewed as a whole. That meaning also implies historical, political and social processes connected with the coming about of the nation-state and with national self-comprehension that influence how the immigrants are perceived, and thus the possibility of their integration.[7] Integration can be defined as a **process of inclusion and acceptance of immigrants in the main institutions, relations and positions in the host society, but also as a consequence of rational responses by actors on the social environment.**[8] What is in question is a two-way process of adaptation between the **immigrant and the host society,** even though the latest approaches suggest that the integration process should also include the **country of origin of the migrant** as the third party, so that integration becomes a **three-way process.**[9] In particular, it is important to point out that integration should be observed and researched in relation to the particular society and its characteristics.

THE DIMENSIONS OF INTEGRATION

In researching integration and integration policies, and in the absence of a uniform definition of 'integration' and 'society', it is necessary to focus on the dimensions of integration. Although new research into integration largely takes three dimensions into account: the legal-political, the socio-economic and culture-religious,[10] apart from the structural dimensions (the legal-political and socio-economic) and cultural dimensions, interactional and identificational dimensions[11] also appear in some research. While the institutional and normative dimensions are emphasised in the first case, the accent in the latter is on the immigrant and his perception, that is, the subjectivisation of the integration process. However, both cases start out from the same assumptions, according to which immigrants participate only fragmentarily in the diverse social areas that are mutually independent and relatively autonomous. Such comprehension represents a swing away from the holistic approach, which places integration within the framework of the national community and its dominant culture, towards an approach that deconstructs and fragments it.

Right up until the 1990s, the gender aspect of migration was neglected in migration studies and, consequently, the theoretical perspectives based upon it. Depending on

[7] See: A. Geddes (2003), *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*. London – Thousand Oaks – New Delhi: Sage.

[8] See: H. Esser (2004), Does the "New" Immigration Require a "New" Theory of Intergenerational Integration?, *International Migration Review,* 38 (3): 1126–1159.

[9] http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/110720/1_en_act_part1_v10.pdf; http://www.interact-project.eu/docs/publications/Research%20Report/INTERACT-RR-2013-03.pdf; B. Garcés-Mascareñas and R. Penninx (2016), Introduction: Integration as a Three-Way Process Approach?, in: B. Garcés-Mascareñas and R. Penninx (eds.). *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe: Contexts, Levels and Actors*. IMISCOE –Springer, 1–10.

[10] See: R. Penninx (2004), Integration Processes of Migrants: Research Findings and Policy Challenges, *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 23 (1-2): 7–32.

[11] See: F. Heckmann and D. Schnapper (2003), *The Integration of Immigrants in European Societies. National Differences and Trends of Convergence*. Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

feminist and gender theory in research into migration and post-migration phenomena, one can perceive that the integration of immigrants is often gender-conditioned.[12]

The key question in the framework of the **legal-political dimension** of integration reads: are migrants members on an equal basis in the political community and, if so, to what extent? This dimension refers to the ways and possibilities of attaining resident rights, rights to family reunion, political participation and attaining the right to citizenship. Along with the foregoing, that dimension also encompasses informal possibilities for political participation among immigrants such as membership in various migrant advisory bodies, election rights at the local level, and the like. Integration of immigrants in the legal-political sense is conditioned by statutory provisions. If migrants have legally regulated their position then, from the legal-political perspective, they are integrated, while if their position is illegal, they are not. However, (non)regulation of immigrant positions is not necessarily linked with their integration in the context of the other dimensions: the socio-economic and the culture-religious.

Within the frame of the **socio-economic dimensions** of integration, it is important to investigate the position of immigrants on the labour market. The key question is: do the migrant workers and the members of their families have equal rights and possibilities on the labour market as domestic workers do? Do they, similarly to the latter, have guaranteed access to social rights and benefits such as the right to work, to health protection, and to education and housing?

The culture-religious dimension relates to cultural and religious rights of immigrants and particularly to their perceptions and the practice of difference (in the cultural ethnic and religious aspect) in the host society. The host country can accept to a greater or lesser degree the cultural and religious difference of the immigrant groups and create their policies in keeping with that.

INTEGRATION POLICIES

Viewed spatially and temporally, migration flows differ greatly, just as the countries receiving immigrants differ with respect to their socio-political organisation and historical and cultural characteristics. That is the reason for the existence of various models of immigrant integration.

Although efforts are being made to equalise and standardise to the greatest extent possible immigrant rights and their position in the European Union countries, there still exist considerable deviations among them in the formulation of the integration framework and the establishment of policies. Those diversities are usually based on three historical archetypes (ethnicity, the political community or immigration) by which belonging to the state-nation is defined.

It should be mentioned that no single country fully possesses a coherent model for including immigrants in society. At the state level, a highly fragmented frame of integration/inclusion of immigrants in society is usually put in place, while the dynamics of its enactment and implementation is far from uniform. Although the inclusion of

---

[12] Research into migration has shown that there are differences between men and women during the migration process as relates to the scale of rights and the ways of their implementation. Gender differences are obvious and as regards the three integration dimensions and/or in attaining the right to enter into a particular (destination) country and to settle in such country, inclusion on the labour market and the practice and reproduction of socio-cultural and religious norms and customs. See: M. Boyd and E. Grieco (2003), Women and Migration: Incorporating Gender into International Migration Theory, Migration Policy Institute, http://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/women-and-migration-incorporating-gender-international-migration-theory

migrants in the host society is the result of interaction between institutional structures and the migrants themselves, it would seem that the outcome of the integration process is still to a greater extent dependent on the institutional structure and the stance of the members of the host society towards the immigrants rather than vice-versa. The integration of immigrants in modern plural societies is not based on common values shared by all the members of society, but rather infer the adoption of a single 'common orientation', while in the Western democratic societies that relates to liberal civil rights. The key questions while setting the integration frame are: to what extent is integration policy open to a society of diversity? To what extent and in which manner is the right to being different coordinated with the need for a level of social cohesion? How do various political and social actors perceive the immigrants and how do they explain the existing phenomenon (settlement by immigrants)? Answers to those questions will have an effect on the setting of specific integration policies and the corresponding measures and their implementation.

It is important to define the way in which the host society perceives the immigrants: as a problem or as a potential? Diverse attitudes towards immigrants who spend a more prolonged time in the society can also be represented in the host society. They can be considered as foreigners, a temporary phenomenon (as temporary workers) or as permanent members of the society, with the intention being or not being to give them the same rights and responsibilities as enjoyed by citizens. The definition of the 'problem' is followed by the proposed solution, that is, the formulation of policy. In some cases, the state or the local community ignore the immigrants' presence and thus avoid taking responsibility for them. Nevertheless, cases of setting policies by which the migrants are recognised as having certain rights are more frequent – but under particular conditions. If the migrants are perceived as permanent residents, integration policies stimulate their inclusion in society. This can unfold in different ways depending on the dimension of integration, that is, in relation to the legal-political, socio-economic and cultural-religious aspects.

Integration policies can also differ according to the group to which they are orientated. They can be orientated towards particular migrant groups or towards migrants in general, regardless of their (ethnic/national) origin. In keeping with that, political rights can be granted to migrants on an individual basis or to migrant groups as a whole, while in that case the migrants have a representative body.

Public policies, of which integration is also a part, can be formulated so as to promote equal possibilities for all citizens, enabling everyone to have an equal approach to education, housing, health protection and the labour market, or certain social groups (immigrant groups, for example) can be treated differently with the intent that their integration be facilitated by targeted support programmes and benefits. The right to cultural diversity can also be promoted as an individual or collective right, with the latter usually inferring state support to immigrant organisations and institutions.

With minor exceptions, the majority of authors[13] share a similar classification of integration policies, dividing them into policies of *complete exclusion, differential exclusion, assimilation* and *pluralism.* Those policies and/or models are founded on belonging to the

---

[13] See: R. Brubaker (1992), *Citizenship and Nationhood in France and Germany*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press; S. Castles (1995). How Nation-States respond to immigration and ethnic diversity, *New Community*, 21 (3): 293–308; J. Hollifield (1997), Immigration and Integration in Western Europe: A Comparative Analysis, in: E. M. Uçarer and D. J. Puchala (eds.), *Immigration into Western Societies*. London: Pinter, 29–69; R. Penninx (2004), Integration of Migrants: Economic, Social, Cultural and Political Dimensions, Background Paper for the UNECE Conference *European Population Forum 2004: Population Challenges and Policy Responses*, 12. 01.2004.

state-nation on the basis of three criteria: ethnicity, the political community and immigration.

The policy of **complete exclusion** is present more in theory than in practice. It largely prevents the entry of migrants to a particular country, which is extremely difficult to accomplish because of the globalisation processes that stimulate and facilitate migration. In this concept, the (im)migrant is defined as a foreigner, one who does not belong in that country/community. The forms and policy instruments based on this concept are largely '*ad hoc* responses to a concrete problem', so that here one does not have a policy, but rather the absence of one.[14]

The policy of **differential exclusion** takes its cue from the comprehension that (im)migrants are a temporary phenomenon, who have settled in the country because of labour market requirements. After the need in the country for foreign workers ceases, they will depart from it. According to the policy of differential exclusion, migrants are enabled participation in individual segments of society (for example, the labour market), but at the same time they are prevented from participating in others (political participation, being granted citizenship, approaches to education, social assistance, and the like). Such a policy is implemented through restrictive quotas in issuing residence and work permits, prevention of migrant family reunions, strict rules on granting citizenship, and the like. Consequently, the immigrants become a minority in the society in which they only partly participate. The role of immigrants is largely reduced to an economic role, in which they are perceived as workers and consumers, while they are excluded from participating in the cultural, political and social life of the community in which they have settled. Such a policy was most typical for the Western European countries at the middle and second half of the 20th century: Germany, Switzerland, Austria and Belgium, which pursued the 'guest worker' policy during that period. A similar policy was also partly implemented in France and the United States.

An **assimilation policy** usually implies inclusion of the immigrants in the host society by a unilateral process of 'adaptation'. Giving prominence to their cultural, linguistic and religious affiliation, that is, origin, is not expected of the immigrants, so as to merge them with the majority population as easily as possible. The state's role in that process is to create the best possible conditions for the transfer to the immigrants of the dominant culture and the values of the majority society. The main means of that 'transfer' are the official language and the education system, that is, its school programme that is also compulsory for children of migrant origin. The assimilation model prevailed at the beginning of the 20th century, and of the European countries was most highly represented in France. To a certain extent, that model was applied in all the highly developed immigration countries and, after the Second World War, it was implemented in Great Britain, Canada and Australia. However, since it did not produce the desired objective, that is, the merging of the immigrant groups with the dominant culture, it was gradually abandoned and replaced by the pluralistic model. The assimilation model is usually combined in practice with other models, so that each one regulates a particular segment of integration policy.

In the **pluralistic model** the migrant groups are understood as ethnic communities differing from the majority population in language, culture, customs and certain other features. According to this model, the members of the immigrant groups are supposed to accept the basic social values of the host society while at the same time retaining their right to be diverse. They are equalised by the law with the domestic population in all areas of

---

[14] See: R. Penninx (2007), Integration Processes of Migrants: Research Findings and Policy Challenges, *Migracijske i etničke teme*, 23 (1-2): 19.

social life. This model has two variants. The first relates to the *laissez-faire* approach, which tolerates diversity, but it is not supported at the state level. One finds a typical example of such policy in the United States. In the second variant, the policies in question are *multi-cultural* and are based on institutional support and acceptance of cultural diversities. Such policies are present in Canada, Australia and Sweden, although they are also implemented in other migration countries so as to regulate individual areas of integration policies.

In the majority of European immigration countries, integration policy is combined with assimilation and pluralistic models.

Over the last two decades, efforts have been increasingly made to locate integration policy outside of national frameworks, while their creation and development has been transferred to the regional and local level. A large number of European cities have been confronted in recent decades with a growth in migrant populations, so that the setting of integration policies has imposed itself as a necessity. Although they are mutually different, the majority of such policies are based on the multicultural model, although the assimilation model continues to dominate in some cases.

Local authorities are often left to their own devices in setting integration policies, adjusting or mitigating the lack of success of policies at the national level. However, lack of uniformity in practice is their main characteristic. Their inefficiency also contributes to the so-called structural institutional discrimination by state employees in implementing integration policies and measures towards immigrants on the local, regional and national level.[15]

IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION IN THE DOCUMENTS OF THE EUROPEAN UNION

When immigrant integration is in question, the objective of the European Union, at least declaratively, is to establish an even level of rights and obligations for all who are legally residing on the territory of the EU. Thus, the aspiration is for the rights of legal immigrants to be as similar as possible to those of EU nationals. However, the lower educational level of children of migrant origin, their earlier school-leaving than children of non-migrants, lower level of achievement in school and, generally, the higher risk of poverty and social exclusion of migrant families/households do support the fact that this has not been achieved yet.[16]

In connection with statutory regulations, it should be pointed out that immigrant integration is not mentioned in the basic founding treaties of the European Union. Only the *Treaty of Amsterdam*,[17] adopted in 1997 (that came into force in 1999), contains two provisions connected with integration, although the word *integration* is not specifically mentioned anywhere therein. In Article 73 of that Treaty, the Council is asked to adopt immigration policy measures that relate, among other, to the conditions of entry and residence of immigrants and to the standard procedures that the Member States must observe in connection with the visa regime, residence permits and family reunions. The Council was also requested to adopt measures that define the rights and obligations of third

[15] See: T. A. Van Dijk (2002). Discourse and Racism, in: D. Goldberg and J. Solomos (eds.). *The Blackwell Companion to Racial and Ethnic Studies*. Oxford: Blackwell, 145–159, http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/Discourse%20and%20racism.pdf

[16] *Komunikacija Komisije Europskom parlamentu, Vijeću, Europskom gospodarskom i socijalnom odboru i odboru regija. Provjera napretka strategije Europa 2020. za pametan, održiv i uključiv rast*. Bruxelles, 5.3.2014., COM(2014) 130 final, http://ec.europa.eu/europe2020/pdf/europe2020stocktaking_hr.pdf

[17] *Treaty of Amsterdam* (1997), http://europa.eu/eu-law/decision-making/treaties/pdf/treaty_of_amsterdam/treaty_of_amsterdam_en.pdf

country nationals, that is, that migrants with regularised sojourn in one of the EU Member States would have the right also to reside in other EU Member States.

At the European Council meeting at Tampere (in 1999), the leaders of the European Union extended a call for just treatment of third country nationals settled in the European Union and/or for more active promotion of a policy for preventing racism and xenophobia. It was agreed at the meeting that the objective of integration policies would be to close the gap between the rights and obligations of third country nationals with those of EU citizens.

In mid-2003, the integration issue appeared once again on the European Union agenda, with the issue of the *Communication on Integration, Immigration and Employment.*[18] That document, accepted at the Thessaloniki Conference in 2003, became the basis for further development of EU integration policies. It lists the features of the integration programmes and the types of integration measures and examines the possibilities for setting a common European (EU) integration framework. However, unlike migration policy, integration policy was not conceived as common to all EU Member States. A further step towards common integration policy was taken at the ministerial conference in November, 2004 when the eleven basic principles were accepted.[19] The *Handbook on Integration* was published in the same year.[20]

The Common Basic Principles were adopted in November, 2004 and represent the basic of future initiatives in the field of integration. They are formulated as follows:

1. Integration is a dynamic, two-way process of mutual accommodation by all immigrants and residents of Member States.

2. Integration implies respect for the basic values of the European Union.

3. Employment is a key part of the integration process and is central to the participation of immigrants, to the contributions immigrants make to the host society, and to making such contributions visible.

4. Basic knowledge of the host society's language, history, and institutions is indispensable to integration, enabling immigrants to acquire this basic knowledge is essential to successful integration.

5. Efforts in education are critical to preparing immigrants, and particularly their descendants, to be more successful and more active participants in society.

6. Access for immigrants to institutions, as well as to public and private goods and services, on a basis equal to national citizens and in a non-discriminatory way is a critical foundation for better integration.

7. Frequent interaction between immigrants and Member State citizens is a fundamental mechanism for integration. Share forums, intercultural dialogue, education about immigrants and immigrant cultures, and stimulating living conditions in urban environments enhance the interactions between immigrants and Member State citizens.

---

[18] *Communication on Immigration, Integration and Employment*, COM(2003) 336, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+REPORT+A5-2003-0445+0+DOC+XML+V0//EN&language=bg

[19] *The Common Basic Principles for Immigrant Integration Policy in the EU* (2004), http://www.eesc.europa.eu/resources/docs/common-basic-principles_en.pdf

[20] *Handbook on Integration for Policy Makers and Practitioners* (2004), http://www.integration.ie/website/omi/omiwebv6.nsf/page/managingdiversity-eudevelopmentsintegrationHandbooks-en

8. The practice of diverse cultures and religions is guaranteed the *Charter of Fundament Rights*[21] and must be safeguarded, unless practices conflict with other inviolable European rights or with national law.

9. The participation of immigrants in the democratic process and in the formulation of integration policies and measures, especially at the local level, supports their integration.

10. Mainstreaming integration policies and measures in all relevant policy portfolios and levels of government and public services is an important consideration in public policy formation and implementation.

11. Developing clear goals, indicators and evaluation mechanisms are necessary to adjust policy, evaluate progress on integration and to make the exchange of information more effective.

The need for better coordination of national integrations policies and EU initiatives is particularly emphasised in *The Hague Programme* (2004 – 2008).[22] It mentions that the frame of those initiatives should be based on the Common Basic Principles which should provide the foundation for all future EU initiatives connected with integration.

In 2005 the European Commission presented *A Common Agenda for a Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union*[23] as a frame for the implementation of the *Common Basic Principles* of 2004. The common programme foresees a series of support mechanisms and instruments for promoting integration and facilitating exchange between actors in integration, such as the *European Web Site on Integration*[24] and the *European Integration Forum,* the name of which was changed in 2015 to the *European Migration Forum*.[25]

After adoption of the *Common Agenda for an Integration Framework . . .* in 2005, the social context in the EU countries changed, while integration measures from the *Agenda* adopted in 2005 did not produce the desired results. In order to reconcile the integration measures with the altered social circumstances in the EU countries, a new programme – *The Stockholm Programme* (2009 – 2014)[26] – was adopted. Its intention was to harmonise integration policy with other relevant areas such as, for example, education and the labour market, aimed at achieving as quickly and efficaciously as possible the social inclusion of Immigrants.

The *Europa 2020* strategy of the European Council was adopted in March, 2010, articulating a series of objectives at the EU level. Three of the five defined objectives were relevant for immigrant integration. The first refers to increasing the employment level of the population between the ages of 20 to 64 including, among other, better immigrant integration in the active working population. The second objective focuses on an increased degree of youth education, particularly migrant pupils, who leave the education system earlier than their non-migrant peers and have a lower level of education. The third

---

[21] *Povelja Europske unije o temeljnim pravima* (2010), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/TXT/?uri=celex%3A12007P

[22] The *Hague Programme: 10 Priorities for the Next Five Years* (2004), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=uriserv:l16002

[23] *A Common Agenda for An Integration Framework for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals in the European Union* (2005), http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=COM:2005:0389:FIN:EN:PDF

[24] *European Web Site on Integration*, https://ec.europa.eu/migrant-integration/home

[25] *European Migration Forum*, http://www.eesc.europa.eu/?i=portal.en.events-and-activities-european-migration-forum-1

[26] *The Stockholm Programme*, http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=URISERV%3Ajl0034

objective is orientated to reducing the number of persons at risk of poverty, while immigrants are those who take a considerable share in the total number of poverty-stricken persons in the EU.

In July, 2011 the Commission proposed a new *European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals*[27] focusing on measures whose objective was increase in the economic, social, cultural and political participation of immigrants, the accent being on activities at the local level. The role in the integration process of the countries of the immigrants' origin is particularly stressed in the *Agenda.* The chief integration challenges faced by immigrants in the host countries are listed in the document. One of the greatest is the largely low rate of migrant employment, particularly among female migrants. Mention is made of the growth in the unemployment level of immigrants, the problem of 'over-qualification' (the absence of alignment between the knowledge and skills of the migrants and the job) and the indifferent schooling achievement of migrant descendants that increases the risk of social exclusion.

In June, 2014 the European Council adopted the *Strategic Guidelines for Further Development of the Areas of Freedom, Security and Justice* (2014 – 2019).[28] The *Guidelines* were adopted at a time of gradual recovery and emergence from the economic crisis of the majority of Member States, although the recent social crisis has, nonetheless, left traces in the form of unemployment, deprivation and social vulnerability among individual groups, also including a rise in xenophobia.[29]

In order to ensure the positive effect of migration and mobility in the EU economy, the emphasis in the *Guidelines* is on strengthening measures for maximum utilisation of legal migrant potential in the Member States, bearing in mind the considerably lower rate of employment and higher social exclusion of immigrants in comparison with non-migrants.

In its Communication *An Open and Secure Europe: making it happen* (March 11, 2014),[30] it was emphasised that the Union had to support efforts of Member States invested in promoting integration policies that stimulate social cohesion and economic dynamism.

The robust increase in refugee and other migration flows in 2015[31] led to the European Commission's adoption of a new document aimed at improved management of irregular migration flows in the Euro-Mediterranean region; the *European Agenda on Migration*[32] was adopted in May, 2014. It presents a series of short-term and long-term measures for better management of irregular migration flows in the Mediterranean region, while issues connected with integration are largely reduced to the acceptance and distribution of refugees among the Member States.[33]

---

[27] *European Agenda for the Integration of Third-Country Nationals* (2011),
http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/news/intro/docs/110720/1_en_act_part1_v10.pdf
[28] *Strateške smjernice za daljnji razvoj područja slobode, sigurnosti i pravde* (2014),
http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-79-2014-INIT/hr/pdf
[29] See: *Put ka ostvarenju otvorene i sigurne Europe* (2014),
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0154
[30] See: *Put ka ostvarenju otvorene i sigurne Europe* (2014),
http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52014DC0154
[31] More on the policies of the EU that concern the refugee crisis in Europe and the flows of forced migrants are available in the document: *Tokovi prisilnih migracija i humanitarna kriza u Europi: strateška polazišta Instituta za migracije i narodnosti*, http://www.imin.hr/strateska-polazista.
[32] *European Agenda on Migration* (2015), http://ec.europa.eu/dgs/home-affairs/what-we-do/policies/european-agenda-migration/indeks_en.htm
[33] Countries that host refugees, but also those in which the refugees and migrants stay for only a short while on their way to their final destinations have at their disposal EU funds from the *Fund for Asylum, Migration*

INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS AND DEVELOPMENT OF INTEGRATION POLICIES IN CROATIA

The greatest contribution to the development of integration policies in Croatia came from the harmonization of Croatian laws with the *acquis* of the European Union during the process of Croatia's accession to the European Union. Croatia thus aligned its *Act on Foreigners*, *Act on Asylum* and *Act on Citizenship*[34] with the statutory *acquis* of the European Union and adopted the majority of the main international treaties on human rights. The Government also adopted the strategic documents with its *Migration Policy for the 2013 – 2015* period,[35] in which *Integration Policy* represented one of the chapters as well as the *Action Plan for Removal of Obstacles in Implementation of Individual Rights in the Area of Integration of Foreigners for the 2013 – 2015* period.[36] In April 2013, it also set up the Standing Committee for the Integration of Foreigners into Croatian Society. In both the *Action Plan* and in the activities of the Standing Committee, the accent was placed largely on the integration of asylum seekers and foreigners under subsidiary protection as the most vulnerable group of foreigners, while there were largely no measures foreseen for members of other migrant categories that also need help in integration. Despite the development of the legal and institutional framework, integration policy in Croatia, according to the results of MIPEX (2015) research,[37] is only half-way favourable, with an overall grade of 43/100, placing Croatia in the 30th place of 38 countries encompassed by the research. Research has shown that, although the statutory regulations in Croatia with accession to the European Union were reconciled with the legal *acquis* of the EU, their implementation is sometimes disrupted by the discretional power of authorised employees. For that reason, it is made difficult for immigrants to exercise certain rights such as the right to permanent residence, the right to acquire Croatian citizenship, the right to family reunion, and the like. Some of those shortcomings in integration policies in Croatia are the absence of targeted state support for immigrants aimed at making it easier for them to find employment, very few integration measures for migrant pupils in Croatian schools and the exclusion of immigrants from political life, that is, the withholding of the right to vote, even for those with the right to permanent residence.

The inefficiency of integration policies is also partly the result of poor inter-sector co-operation between the competent institutions and the local communities and civil society organisations, the academic community and, generally, professionals who are involved in integration. Although the Standing Committee can establish *ad hoc* working groups for solving individual problems linked with integration, and apart from experts from departmental bodies also include in such groups representatives of local and regional

---

and Integration, *EU Civil Protection Mechanism* (EUCPM), *European Regional Development Fund* (ERDF) and the –*European Social Fund* (ESF), which can be spent on managing refugee and other migration flows.

[34] *Zakon o strancima* (2013), http://www.zakon.hr/z/142/Zakon-o-strancima;
Zakon o hrvatskom državljanstvu (2011), http://www.zakon.hr/z/446/Zakon-o-hrvatskom-državljanstvu;
Zakon o azilu (2013), http://www.zakon.hr/z/314/Zakon-o-azilu i *Zakon o međunarodnoj i privremenoj zaštiti* (2015), http://www.zakon.hr/z/798/Zakon-o-međunarodnoj-i-privremenoj-zaštiti

[35] *Migracijska politika Republike Hrvatske za razdoblje 2013. – 2015.*,
http://www.mup.hr/UserDocsImages/minstarstvo/2013/MIGRACIJSKA%20POLITIKA%202013-2015.pdf

[36] *Akcijski plan za uklanjanje prepreka u ostvarivanju pojedinih prava u području integracije stranaca za razdoblje 2013. – 2015.* is an integral part of the document *Migracijska politika Republike Hrvatske za razdoblje 2013. – 2015.*

[37] The Migrant Integration Policy Index (MIPEX) is a reference guide and a fully interactive tool for the assessment, comparison and advancement of integration policies. It measures the state of development of integration policies, thus providing a review of integration policies in various countries. Applying 148 indicators, MIPEX establishes the degree of implementation of equal rights and obligations of the inhabitants of a particular country and the support directed to their specific needs in order to achieve equal possibilities (see more on: www.mipex.eu).

self-government and civil society organisations, it has not yet taken advantage of that possibility.

The refugee crisis that has engulfed numerous European countries, and has not circumvented Croatia, has prompted numerous discussions about migration, refugees, integration and similar themes. Discussions that relate to the settlement of migrants in Croatian society usually deal with three areas – the economic situation, the demographic change and national identity. From the economic aspect, Croatian society is among the weakest in Europe, while it is extremely homogenous nationally and has an aged population. According to the share of old people (65 years and older) in the total population, Croatia is among the oldest countries in Europe,[38] while with the size of its deficit with a share in GDP of -5.7% in 2014, it is counted as being one of the four most unfavourably positioned Member States of the EU.[39] The situation is similarly unfavourable with its public debt, whose growth dynamic on an annual basis is among the three fastest in the EU.[40] As regards ethnic structure, Croatia is a nationally extremely homogenous country since, according to the last Population Census (in 2011), 90% of its population are Croatian, with a small share of members of other nations.[41] These three foregoing facts should be taken into account in creating Croatia's new migration and integration policies. Given the economic situation in Croatia, all labour-capable migrants should be included in the labour market, taking advantage of the possibilities that stem from their human, cultural and social capital. Although immigration cannot be expected to eliminate the negative demographic trends, it could at least alleviate them. And finally, with their cultural, linguistic and socio-economic features and potential, immigrants could contribute to the enrichment of Croatian society in the socio-cultural sense and make it multi-cultural to a greater extent.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF INTEGRATION POLICIES AND MEASURES IN THE REPUBLIC OF CROATIA

For further development of integration policies and measures in the Republic of Croatia the following recommendations are proposed:

- compile an informative flyer on immigrant integration in Croatia concerning rights and obligations and institutional support to immigrants in the Republic of Croatia (an institutional guide for integration)

- revise and adapt integration conditions for attaining the right to permanent residence

- equalise the criteria for granting Croatian citizenship for all categories of foreigners who live, work and are being educated in the Republic of Croatia

- advance the scheme of integration courses for foreigners

- include more inter-cultural content in the *National Framework Curriculum for Pre-school Upbringing and Education and General and High School Education* and place greater emphasis on the strengthening the competence and capacity of civil society

---

[38] According to EUROSTAT data of 2014, with 18.4% of its inhabitants aged 65+. Croatia is in ninth place among the EU countries, while according to the median age of 42.6 years of age it is in seventh place.
[39] http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/6796757/2-21042015-AP-EN.pdf/
[40] https://www.hgk.hr/sektor-centar/centar-makroekonomija/nastavak-rasta-javnog-duga-na-godisnjoj-razini
[41] http://www.dzs.hr/Hrv_Eng/publication/2012/SI-1469.pdf

- enable free attendance at language courses to persons under international protection as a particularly vulnerable group of foreigners with the purpose of facilitating their coping in society and inclusion on the labour market

- enable a more adequate approach to professional training and scholarships to third countries nationals

- enable a greater political participation of immigrants, particularly third country nationals, and expansion of the right to vote on the local level to permanent residents

- ensure a broader scale of rights to health protection for particularly vulnerable groups among irregular migrants and asylum seekers

- financial and strategic support to the activities of immigrant associations

- advance the national plan and the measures for combating discrimination, xenophobia and racism and promote tolerance, solidarity and humaneness through public policy and the media

- develop cultural and gender-specific integration measures

- regularly carry out analysis, evaluation and revision of integration measures, also including recommendations for other relevant areas of public policies (particularly regarding population, the economy, migration, asylum and the policy of spatial development)

- stimulate and develop intra-departmental and inter-departmental co-operation between the competent institutions with the local communities and civil society organisations, the academic community and migrant representatives with the aim of advancing immigrant integration.