

**Free movement of workers in the European Union
Obstacles to EU labor mobility and possibilities to overcome
them**

By
Joanna Smigiel

*Submitted to
Central European University
Department of Public Policy*

in partial fulfillment for the degree of Master of Arts in Public Policy

Supervisor: Professor Uwe Puetter

Budapest, Hungary

2010

Executive summary

Free movement of workers, as a significant element of the *acquis* of the freedom of movement for persons next to the free movement of goods, services and capital, is one of the four main economic freedoms of the European Union (EU). The right to move freely is linked to both market integration and to the rights represented by the status of EU citizenship. The main puzzle in the field of free movement of workers in the EU and the research question of this thesis is why, despite the fact that there has been significant progress in overall political integration of the EU and the development of legal framework guaranteeing free movement of workers, overall intra-European mobility is still low? Existence of number of legal, administrative, cultural and behavioral barriers to labor mobility which make the personal decision to move abroad difficult for EU citizens and therefore limit EU mobility are the core findings of this thesis. Furthermore, these obstacles lead to limitations in exercising rights guaranteed by the European citizenship. Contribution of my research is presenting innovative mobility instrument called “one-stop mobility shop” for migrants which by significantly improving the situation of EU labor migrants in their host community can overcome certain barriers to mobility and consequently help enhancing labor mobility among EU citizens.

Table of Contents

Executive summary	i
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Different scholarly perspectives on labor mobility	5
1.1 The importance of labor mobility	5
1.2 Economic theories of migration and neofunctional theory of EU integration...	7
1.3 Methodology	10
Chapter 2: Development of EU free movement of workers' rights	12
2.1 Historical and legal development of EU freedom of movement for workers..	12
2.2 Why is the EU mobility an issue? Economic and political advantages of free movement of workers in the EU	16
Chapter 3: Main obstacles to European labor mobility	19
3.1 Public opinion on free movement in the EU	19
3.2 Transition periods	21
3.3 Lack of migrants' knowledge on their rights as EU citizens and their lack of access to information on mobility	22
3.4 Administrative and legal barriers for labor migrants	23
3.5 Inefficient integration of migrants	24
Chapter 4: Possibilities to facilitate mobility. Recommendations for overcoming obstacles to EU mobility in the field of migrants' integration and their access to information on mobility and EU citizenship rights	27
4.1 Already existing EU instruments to facilitate mobility	27
4.2 Recommendations for overcoming obstacles to EU mobility in the field of migrants' integration and their access to information on mobility and EU citizenship rights – “one-stop mobility shop” for migrants.....	30
Conclusion	37
Bibliography.....	41

Introduction

Free movement of workers next to the free movement of goods, services and capital, is one of the four main economic freedoms of the EU. The first appearance of the right to free movement dates back to 1957 and the Treaty of Rome, which considered this right only from the economic point of view. Therefore, at that time, free movement right was intended to be granted only to workers who could contribute to creating common market. However, since the Treaty of Maastricht, free movement became an essential element of European citizenship and is extended to every citizen of the Union, independent of the fact whether they are economically active or not. Moreover, as noted by Catherine Barnard “from the legal development of free movement of workers it is possible to detect the embryo of what later became EU citizenship” (Barnard 2007, 307).

Today, the right of free movement for EU citizens is a supranational right guaranteed by European law and is linked to both market integration and rights of EU workers and EU citizenship granted to all citizens of EU Member States (MS). Freedom of movement for workers guarantees the right for EU nationals to move to another MS to take up employment and to establish themselves in the host country with their family members on the same terms as nationals. The legal framework protects EU workers from direct or indirect discrimination against them on the basis of their nationality. EU migrant workers and their families are also entitled to equal treatment not only in work-related matters, but also in regard to, tax advantages and social benefits. (European Commission 2006c).

Free movement of workers as a significant element of the *acquis communautaire* of the EU has been debated by many theoreticians and practitioners (Carrera 2004; Geddes 2003, ECAS 2008; Stark 1990). Scholars have also paid attention to the issue of legal, administrative and cultural obstacles to labor mobility, which make the personal decision to

move abroad difficult for EU citizens and therefore limits EU mobility (Traser 2008; Donaghey and Teague 2006; Zimmermann 2009; Carrera 2005; Ray 2004). However, since mobility is the most fundamental dimension of European citizenship, it is crucial to acknowledge and better understand barriers to mobility, as well as improve some policies to greater facilitate labor mobility in the EU. The possible solutions to improve EU workers' mobility and therefore enhance mobility among the EU citizens have not received much attention from scholars and therefore deserve further consideration.

The main puzzle in the field of free movement of workers within the EU is that despite the fact that there has been significant progress in overall political integration of the EU and the development of legal framework guaranteeing free movement of workers, overall intra-European mobility is still low. The Community responds to this problem by adopting a series of instruments to encourage EU citizens to move, but they seem to be inefficient, and in practice only 2% of the EU population exercise their right to free movement (Traser 2008), which means that free movement within the Union remains at a very low level.

One of the major issues concerning the level of mobility in the EU is the fact that EU is facing significant demographic changes which will lead to considerable fall of employment in Europe. Therefore, as pointed out by the European Commission, achieving sustained economic growth in the EU will require attracting more labor migrants. It is, then, important to promote and facilitate labor mobility within the EU (European Commission 2003b). Therefore, the contribution of my research is presenting ways in which certain barriers to mobility can be overcome and consequently labor mobility can be enhanced among EU citizens.

Therefore, the objective of this thesis is to examine main obstacles to freedom of workers mobility pointed out by scholars and practitioners, in order to understand why overall labor mobility in the EU is so low. I will show that there are still number of legal,

administrative and cultural barriers that make personal decision to move abroad difficult for EU citizens, and prevent them from taking full advantage of the benefits of geographical and labor mobility, and therefore, lead to limitations in exercising the rights of European citizenship and cause the mobility to be low.

The key research question in this paper is: *even though there has been significant progress in overall political integration of the EU and existence of legal and political framework guaranteeing free movement of workers, why is the intra-EU mobility low?* The main hypothesis is that there are still many legal, administrative and cultural obstacles to EU-intra labor mobility causing the mobility to be low. I will also present recommendations on *how to overcome certain obstacles to fully exercised freedom of workers mobility and consequently enhance mobility among the EU citizens.*

To give theoretical background and show the significance of the research topic, I will first present a literature review on different approaches to migration issues and show the importance of labor mobility in general, as well as the link between different theoretical frameworks of mobility, within which European labor mobility can be situated. After that, aiming to show political and legal background of free movement rights in the EU, I will assess the stages of EU free movement development.

Furthermore, to answer my research question and to understand why there is only little mobility among EU citizens, I will analyze and evaluate current main obstacles to European labor mobility. Finally, I will present my recommendations for possible action in this area. I will therefore close with presenting innovative mobility project called “one-stop shop” for migrants, an effective mechanism for integration and information providing for migrants in their local community. This mobility instrument can overcome two main obstacles to free movement of workers, which are inefficient integration of migrants and lack of migrants’

knowledge on their rights as EU citizens and their access to information on mobility. As a result, “one-stop shop” project can help enhancing mobility among EU citizens.

Chapter 1: Different scholarly perspectives on labor mobility

The concept of labor mobility and more precisely of free movement of workers as one of the four main freedoms of the EU has been a subject much discussed by scholars working on EU socio-economic development. This concept has been evaluated from different historical, political and economic perspective and often linked directly to the concept of the EU citizenship. In order to give theoretical background to my research question: why, although there has been significant progress in legal development of free movement of workers, as well as progress in political integration of the EU, the labor mobility on the European level is still very low, in this chapter I will show the importance of labor mobility pointed out by scholars and identify the link between different theoretical frameworks of mobility, within which European labor mobility can be situated.

1.1 The importance of labor mobility

Free movement of workers is often defined as a significant element of the *acquis* of the freedom of movement for persons, which in turn is one of the four fundamental freedoms (goods, services, capital and persons) guaranteed by the Treaty of the European Union (Barnard 2007, 250). The right to move freely is also linked to essential political element of the rights represented by the status of EU citizenship (Carrera 2004; Geddes 2003). Moreover, labor mobility is mostly viewed as having overall positive effect on the EU (Dobson and Sennikova 2007). In order to show the importance of labor mobility for scholars, as well as for practitioners, I will identify different approaches to migration issues.

Geddes (2003) sees the European migration as a main social aspect of the European integration. Therefore, using comparative approach in explaining EU countries' domestic politics and historical experience with migration, Geddes examines the impact of the EU on

the politics of migration on local, national and European level. Moreover, Geddes explores broad aspects of social considerations which are linked to migration, especially EU citizenship. What is also important, by looking at the issue from social perspective, Geddes sees the free movement as a facilitator for European political integration.

A more legalistic approach to free movement of workers in the EU is developed by Robin White. Based on the EU case law, White (2004) emphasizes the legal aspects of free movement of workers in the EU and the obstacles to free movement, at the same time connecting the rights of labor migrants with their rights as EU citizens. On the other hand, Hix and Noury (2007) examine the determinants of EU migration policies looking at the recent migration legislation from the European Parliament, concluding that it is political rather than economic interests ultimately shaping migration policy on the EU level. In both legal approaches, concept of free movement of workers is therefore important for connecting legal rights of workers as, not only participants of the common market, but also EU citizens.

Other, social aspect of labor mobility is introduced by Carrera (2004), who links the economic concept of free movement with status of the EU citizenship. At the same time, EU citizenship covers not only economic freedoms but also a broader range of political, social, and judicial rights. Other scholars, such as Stark (1990), and Dobson and Sennikova (2007) focus on the different social aspect of labor mobility, namely social and diaspora networking, which link migrants with their destination country. These scholars see personal and family networks as important facilitators of mobility, thanks to their help to provide new migrants with job search and support of the mobility process as a whole.

Finally, more economic approach to migration was introduced by Borjas (1995), who assumed that migrants typically seek better living and working conditions and therefore people usually migrate from low income economies to high income countries with highest living conditions and economic expansion. In the view of economic approach, migration is

seen as a mechanism to balance supply and demand on the labor market (Feld 2005; Borjas 1995). Therefore, this approach views labor migration as a crucial facilitator for economic growth in the EU.

In conclusion, these examples show why migration is an important scholarly topic from political, historical, legal, social and economic perspectives. Moreover, acknowledging the diversity of frameworks within which the labor migration can be situated, I would like to focus on neofunctionalism and economic theories of migration as the most relevant and necessary theories to identify progress made in development of free movement of workers in the EU, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

1.2 Economic theories of migration and neofunctional theory of EU integration

This part of the chapter is sought to outline broader, conceptual frameworks in which EU migration can be situated. I will use economic theories of migration, as well as the neofunctional theory of EU integration to explain general economic benefits of migration and historical development of EU migration.

EU labor migration can be explained from economic, more global perspective by economic theories of migration and from historical integration perspective by neofunctional approach. To demonstrate this, the chapter proceeds, first, by explaining two explanatory approaches to labor mobility – neofunctionalism and economic theory of migration and second, by arguing that both theory streams explain the phenomenon of labor migration, but, nevertheless, cannot provide the answer to the main question of this paper, namely why overall level of intra-European labor mobility - less than 2% of all EU citizens living or working in another member state (Traser 2008) - is so low.

Labor mobility can, first of all, be explained from strictly economic point of view. Within the economic theory benefits of labor mobility are seen from economic efficiency

perspective. Furthermore, economic theories underline that labor mobility is generally encouraged by economic, work related motives, such as utility and profit-maximization (Piore 1979; Hicks 1966; Borjas 1995).

Along the same line, one of the **economic theories of migration** which provides the explanation for the volume of migration was introduced by Everett Lee and points out the idea of push and pull factors which influence migration (Skeldon 1999). The examples of push factors of migration are unfavorable conditions in the country of origin, such as lack of job opportunities or emigration traditions. As for the pull factors for migration, they consist of, for example, social aspects such as better education, health and housing in the country of destination. Lee, therefore, states that the primary cause for migration is linked to labor, and more specifically, to better external economic opportunities abroad.

Another economic theoretical concept of migration is neoclassical theory of international migration advocated by Hicks (1966) and Borjas (1995), who suggest that labor migration is a process of economic development and explain that migration is caused by geographic difference in the supply and demand of labor. Therefore, in their view, the main trigger factor for migrating is the wage differentials between countries. This theory also assumes that individuals choose their country of residence that maximized their well-being.

In addition, these traditional economic theories with push and pull factors have been subject to criticism by Stark, as perceived to have too narrow focus to such a broad concept as migration. Therefore, new economics of labor migration theory introduced the idea that decision about migration is not made only by individual actor, but rather by larger units, such as social and economic networks, typically families (Stark 1990). According to Stark, remittances as an outcome of migration are seen as a form of insurance for resource diversification, a risk minimizing strategy. Therefore, in this approach, previously supported

income-maximizing factor of migration is replaced by risk-minimizing factor and migration is seen rather as a calculated strategy, and not as “act of desperation”.

Different, more historical conceptual approach to development of EU labor mobility is represented by **neofunctionalism**. This theory, developed by Ernst Haas in 1958 (Stroby-Jensen 2003; Schmitter 2004) sees the integration in terms of its positive spillover effect, stating that cooperation between states in economic sector will lead to further political integration in other policy areas, such as social policy. According to this theory free movement of workers within the EU was another step towards further integration between member states, following economic cooperation and explains Europe’s movements toward supranationalism in matters of labor migration. Here, the assumption is that the integration process would trigger a much more substantial flow of migration across national borders within Europe.

Therefore, this theory can be a good explanation for European migration waves, such as the postwar migration from Southern to Northern Europe (central to the post-war economic boom which generated demand for migrant workers) and extended flow of labor migrants after 2004 European enlargement. If we take it a step forward, neofunctional approach can explain how free movement, which started as a purely economic phenomenon (free movement of workers), later developed into more social concept-EU citizenship. Consequently, this theory can be a good justification for both the evolution of political institutions and legal framework of free movement for EU citizens within which single market progressed as a part of the integration process and pushed the process of political integration forward. However, similarly to economic migration theories, it does not give explanation why European migration, despite the fact that it is a trigger for European integration, does not progress and still represents low level of 2% of EU citizens working or living in other EU Member State than their home country.

To conclude, European neofunctional integration theory and international economic migration theory provide consistent theoretical framework within which European labor mobility can be situated. They do, however, lack the explanation why intra-European mobility happens to be so low. Consequently, they are more appropriate to explain historical development of the EU free movement rights and significance of international migration. In order to understand why EU mobility is low, I will, later in the paper, identify obstacles to workers mobility on European level.

1.3 Methodology

This thesis has a qualitative research design. Moreover, my research case focuses on a policy development on the EU level, and therefore, I use a single case study. In order to answer my research question I will rely on the method of documents' analysis related to the issue of labor mobility in the EU.

Documents which I will analyze come from different sources. I will use policy documents produced by civil society organizations (such as ECAS), international organizations (such as International Organization for Migration, the World Bank, United Nations) and business (PricewaterhouseCoopers) to learn civil society and business perspective on free movement, which mostly highlights the obstacles to free movement. Moreover, I will also introduce EU legal documents (Directives of the European Parliament, Decisions of the Council of the EU, Council and Commission Regulations, Communications from the European Commission, Reports of the European Commission) to show historical and legal background of the free movement concept. Furthermore, I will identify existing EU instruments, established to promote and facilitate mobility among EU citizens (such as EURES, Erasmus Programme, Europass, SOLVIT, and European Health Card). In my research I will also use statistics regarding EU labor mobility and will analyze Eurobarometer public opinion surveys on geographic and labor market mobility to show that the EU has a

strong mandate from public opinion to act in this area and that EU citizens have rather positive views on the benefits of labor mobility.

The positive side of the use of document analysis is that it will allow me to indicate current obstacles to labor mobility from which I draw further recommendations for possible actions to facilitate labor mobility in the EU. However, this combination of methods has some limitations. They are based on the fact that some ways and solutions I will introduce to facilitate mobility are difficult to measure. Therefore, some recommendations which I will draw in this paper will be based on assumptions. Additionally, other research methods could be used, such as interviews with practitioners in this field to further explore the issue of free movement of workers.

Chapter 2: Development of EU free movement of workers' rights

The free movement rights are a dominant symbol of the EU and a fundamental part of the European common market. This has been emphasized especially in the last decade in the context of progress made in the political integration of the Union. As indicated in the previous chapter, although there has been significant development in legal aspects of free movement of workers, as well as progress in overall political integration of the EU, the labor mobility on the European level is still very low. Therefore, the process of development of EU free movement of workers' rights and their advantages are presented in this chapter with the aim of showing and assessing political and legal framework of free movement of workers' rights in the EU and identifying possible gaps, which prevent MS' nationals from taking full advantage of the benefits and potential of labor mobility. These obstacles will be analyzed further in chapter 3. The assumption here is that the evolution of free movement as a purely economic phenomenon to a more social concept can be important for identifying the limitations to the exercising of workers' right to free movement.

2.1 Historical and legal development of EU freedom of movement for workers

Free movement of workers is part of the more general right to free movement of persons, one of the fundamental freedoms guaranteed by Community law and also an essential element of European citizenship (Castro 2002). The origins of EU free movement rights can be traced back to the *Treaty of Rome* (1957) and Articles 39 to 42 of the EC Treaty, which applies to migrant workers, i.e. EU nationals who leave one EU country to work in another EU country. As indicated by Everson (1995, 73), the right to free movement was initially linked to economic function and was not applicable to economically non-active

persons. It was, therefore, market-oriented right for workers as economic citizens, not a generalized right open to all. The Treaty considered the individual as a meaningful actor in the European integration in his or her capacity as a worker. According to the Treaty, therefore, Europeans were not viewed as participants in a political community, but rather as production factors and market participants (Olsen 2008).

Moreover, free movement of workers' rights have been developed by secondary Community legislation to shape the newly opened internal market. The 1968 Council *Regulation 1612/68* on freedom of movement for workers within the Community was based on non-discrimination principle based on nationality. It entitled all nationals of a Member State to enjoy equal treatment in access to employment, remuneration, access to accommodation, social benefits and a worker's right to be joined by his/her family. Articles 10 and 11 extended the beneficiaries to workers' family members. Moreover, according to the second paragraph, Article 7 of the Regulation, the migrant worker "shall enjoy the same social and tax advantages as national workers" (Council of the European Communities 1968). Prohibition of discrimination is, therefore, a way of ensuring fair treatment of migrant workers, their integration in the host MS, improving their living and working conditions, as well as encouraging their movement. One of the main objectives of the regulation was also to create "an ever closer union, among the peoples of Europe"(Council of the European Communities 1968). This shows the evolution of the rights for individuals, not only linked to their participation in the common market, but also to his connection to the European Community.

Another legislative mechanism with much importance in the field of free movement of workers is the *Directive 2004/38/EC* on the right to reside freely. The Directive merged into a single instrument all the legislation on the right to move and reside freely on EU territory for EU citizens and their family members, consisting of two regulations and nine directives

(Carrera 2004). It was designed to encourage EC citizens to exercise their right to move and reside freely within MS and simplify administrative procedure in this matter (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2004). It is based on the original **Regulation 1251/70** from 1970, which stated that nationals of another member state had a right based on previous occupation to remain in the territory where they had worked before (Commission of the European Communities 1970). Here, the aim was to facilitate mobility in Europe through granting some social rights and benefits which were linked to work and family. Furthermore, starting from 1970's the development in the area of free movement started to focus on the social and individual aspects of the right of free movement beside the economical one.

The right to free movement of workers is completed by social security schemes and mutual recognition of diplomas. The new **Directive 2005/36/EC**, which has come into effect on 20 October 2007, consolidated all existing Directives covering rules for recognition of professional qualifications and mutual recognition of diplomas between member States. This directive was introduced in order to help make labor markets more flexible and encourage mutual recognition of qualifications between EU member states, as well as simplify administrative procedures (Zimmermann 2009). Moreover, **Regulation 1408/71** of the Council of 14 June 1971 on the application of social security schemes established a system for coordinating social security system, including social benefits and access to health care for migrant community nationals (Council of the European Communities 1971). Although MS retained their competences with regards to national social security systems, they are obliged to respect the basic principle of equality of treatment and non-discrimination. The regulation, therefore, ensures that these systems do not disadvantage or discriminate persons who are exercising their right to free movement.

Although freedom of movement was initially seen as an economic phenomenon, the **Maastricht Treaty** provided more articulated social and political dimension to this right. In

this context, the formal introduction of European Citizenship by the Maastricht Treaty in 1993 was a significant step in the field of free movement. More specifically, new legislation adopted in 1990s guaranteed the right to move and reside also for those not employed, which extended the scope of free movement of persons from workers to nationals of all Member States, regardless of whether they are economically active or not. The core of this new concept, however, remains the same right to mobility which previously was attached to the market citizen (Everson 1995, 73).

The previous examples of the free movement legislation and development of EU citizens' rights show us the evolution of the European Community integration. What started as rights for individuals as workers (economic citizenship) introduced by the Treaty of Rome, later developed into full European citizenship (political citizenship). Today, free movement of workers entitles EU citizens to enjoy equal treatment with nationals in access to employment, working conditions and all other social advantages, which aim at helping new labor migrants to integrate in the host community. Any national of a Member State is entitled to move and reside freely in another Member State.

However, some argue that the current legislation continues to require an economic element for the existence of a right to free movement of persons and therefore imposes limits on this right (Carrera 2005; Oliveira 2002). This lies in the fact that non-workers have the right to move only if they do not require social or medical assistance from the host member State (Oliveira 2002). The same rule applies with regards to right of residence for more than six months. This rule concerns only persons who are not a burden on the social services of the host Member State during their stay, by being employed, having sufficient resources and sickness insurance, following vocational training as a student or being a family member of a Union citizen who falls into one of the above categories (European Parliament and Council of the European Union 2004). Those economically inactive or those with an atypical

employment situation (part-time workers, seasonal workers) face many difficulties while trying to exercise their right of residence (Carrera 2005).

In conclusion, implementing free movement of labor has been a major step in EU social policy area and involved the mutual recognition of professional qualifications, harmonization of social security requirements, and the most important, new approach to rights of individual, not only as a worker, but also as an EU citizen.

2.2 Why is the EU mobility an issue? Economic and political advantages of free movement of workers in the EU

As the development of free movement concept shows, EU practitioners have proposed many new legal initiatives to promote labor mobility in the EU. There are number of justifications for promoting and facilitating geographic and professional mobility, which will be identified in this part of the chapter.

From the economic point of view, labor migration is a positive phenomenon. Furthermore, from the workers' point of view, the right to mobility means the potential to acquire new skills and work qualifications. The overall effect of migration on the average standard of living of the labor migrant is also positive (Kleinman 2003, 61).

In addition, from the employers' point of view, workers' mobility means that they can hire workers best suited for the job. As far as receiving countries are concerned, labor mobility has a positive influence on their economy, by contributing to growth rates, and complementing the domestic workforce (Traser 2008, 3). Furthermore, empirical evidence has shown that remittances can financially benefit home country, being a large source of income and contributing to its overall economic growth (World Bank 2006). Moreover, returning labor migrants bring back knowledge and skills they have attained abroad and by doing it, improve the efficiency of their home country's labor market (Turmann 2005, 19).

There is, however, a popular view that high level of labor migration might cause job loss among domestic workforce and downward pressure on wages. In the public's view it is often the case that employers may lay off existing workers and recruit migrants at a lower rate of pay. However, empirical studies conducted in European Member States reach the conclusion that migration has had little or no job displacement effect and wage dumping (Boeri 2003).

Furthermore, as pointed out in the Communication from the Commission from December 2002 "Citizens who exercise their right to free movement of workers within the European Union ... are contributing to the creation of a genuine European labor market" (European Commission 2002b). This view is linked to the concept that labor migration played a major role in the economic reconstruction and economic growth in postwar Europe (Donaghey and Teague 2006, 657) and, therefore, is important for the economic development of the EU.

Moreover, scholars agree that labor mobility is a strong instrument to foster fast economic growth and efficiency and at the same time ensures the best location of resources (Zimmermann 2005, 425). The role of mobility has also been stressed in the employment policy guidelines (2005-2008) as a factor contributing to the strengthening of the infrastructure of labor markets in Europe and as an instrument for more effectively anticipating the effects of economic restructuring (Council of the European Union 2005). In addition, Zimmermann (2005, 440) points out that "higher labor mobility can successfully increase the flexibility of the labor markets in Europe provide incentives to slow down wage growth, and thus allow more people to find gainful employment".

Most migration practitioners agree that labor migrants are one of the best solutions to ageing European population, by filling the demographic deficit in the long-term decline in the working population of most MS (United Nations 2001). The UN report concludes that

population decline is inevitable in the absence of replacement migration and, as for the EU, migration would need to nearly double to prevent population decline in general and a decline in the labor force in particular (United Nations 2001, 91). Others point out that, although problems of the EU economy cannot be solved by labor migration alone, jobs and skills mismatches in all professional levels in EU MS can only be filled by the recruitment of workers outside the domestic labor market (Hansen 2003, 30). Labor migration can, therefore, play an important role in connecting the needs of the labor market, such as decreasing the shortage in certain professional sectors.

On the other hand, from the EU point of view mobility also means development of common European identity as an important vehicle for the creation of a true consciousness of European citizenship. Since the Treaty of Maastricht, mobility is an essential element of European citizenship and as such can also foster the sense of European citizenship. Introducing EU citizenship to the EU environment has made the rights to enter, reside, and remain in the territory of another Member State an integral part of the legal heritage of every EU citizen (Carrera 2005, 703). Consequently, free movement of workers can both promote *the* European citizenship and enhance the working of the EU economy.

To conclude, although labor mobility has been recognized as generally beneficial and there has been significant progress in legal framework of free movement of workers, as well as progress in the overall political integration of the EU, labor mobility on the European level is still very low. Therefore, I will proceed in the next chapter by identifying the obstacles to mobility which need to be recognized and minimized. The objective of this thesis is to examine main obstacles to workers' mobility in order to understand why overall labor mobility in the EU is still low. The next two chapters will, therefore, analyze obstacles and identify new ways and solutions to facilitate mobility on European level.

Chapter 3: Main obstacles to European labor mobility

Since the introduction of free movement of workers and open labor market in the EU in 1957, much of the discussion about EU labor mobility is around the question why so little movement is actually taking place. As pointed out by scholars, even the creation of the European Common Market has not significantly stimulated the mobility. (Zimmermann 2005). As indicated by my research statement, although there has been significant progress in legal framework of free movement of workers, as well as progress in overall political integration of the EU, the labor mobility on the European level is still very low. To understand why there has been only small progress in citizens' mobility in the EU, in this chapter, I will identify and analyze main obstacles to European labor mobility which are pointed out by scholars and practitioners in the field of labor migration.

3.1 Public opinion on free movement in the EU

According to Julianna Traser from European Citizen Action Service (ECAS), a non-profit organization from Brussels, overall intra-EU mobility has not changed in previous years and even with enlargement, free movement within the Union remains at a low level, concerning less than 2% of the population (Traser 2008, 4). Moreover, according to the findings of a 2007 study, in 15 old MS the share of workers from 12 new MS has remained under 1% of the total employed workforce (Honekopp 2007).

Furthermore, despite a favorable opinion on free movement among the EU citizens there is little intra-EU mobility. The Eurobarometer survey on geographical and labor market mobility published in 2006 indicates that there is strong support from public opinion for the EU policy on mobility (European Commission 2006a). Geographical mobility is generally perceived as beneficial for European integration by 62% of respondents. Moreover, for 53%

of respondents EU represents “freedom to travel and work in the EU”. However, when asked about difficulties they would expect to face when moving to another Member State, respondents mostly indicated the following: almost 50% pointed out the lack of language skills, difficulties in adapting to new culture (20%), access to social protection and social services (15%). Finally, 10% of respondents admitted that they believe that a potential barrier for mobility would be facing difficulties in having their skills and diplomas recognized (European Commission 2006a). However, another survey shows that despite strong support for geographical mobility, only 5% of all EU citizens indicated that they might move to another EU country to find a job (European Commission 2006b). This shows that there is no indication of mass migration in the EU.

Moreover, both geographic and labor mobility are important for productivity and competitiveness in the EU (Turmann 2005). By reducing barrier to movement of labor the EU can develop more flexible and adaptable workforce responsive to changes in economic situation (PricewaterhouseCoopers 2006, 7). However, despite positive view on mobility and the fact that freedom of movement has been a basic principle of the European Community since the Treaty of Rome, the EU mobility of labor has been relatively small compared to the total workforce. Therefore it is important to highlight the difficulties that EU citizens still face while moving within borders of the EU, causing low level of EU geographical mobility.

The most important barriers identified by scholars and practitioners in the field of free movement of workers which prevent workers from moving from one Member State to another are the following: transitional arrangements (Traser 2008; Donaghey and Teague 2006; Zimmermann 2009; European Commission 2008), lack of migrants’ knowledge on their rights as EU citizens and their access to information on mobility (European Commission 2002a; PricewaterhouseCoopers 2006; EURES 2007; Traser 2008; ECAS 2008), administrative and legal barriers for labor migrants (Carrera 2005; EURES 2007; European Commission 2002b;

European Commission 2006d; European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions 2007; PricewaterhouseCoopers 2006), and inefficient integration of migrants (European Commission 2004; Munz 2008; Krieger and Fernandez 2006; Ray 2004). I will proceed next part of the chapter by describing these obstacles in detail.

3.2 Transition periods

Transitional arrangements allow the old MS to establish total or partial restrictions to freedom of movement for workers from the new MS for a period of maximum of seven years after accession. At the latest, MS must open their labor market fully by 2011 for 8 new MS and by 2013 for Bulgaria and Romania.

Many scholars see transition arrangements introduced to labor mobility after 2004 and 2007 enlargements as one of the main obstacles to EU labor mobility. Donaghey and Teague (2006) see restrictive transitional arrangements as being against the EU legal framework which gives EU labor workers the right to equal treatment and non-discrimination on grounds of nationality. Donaghey and Teague, together with other scholars also call for lifting up the transition periods (Traser 2008; Zimmermann 2009) as mechanisms imposed to new MS, which in their opinion, widen the gap between the principle of free movement as a fundamental right of European citizens and how they are treated in practice.

Furthermore, in 2006 the Commission published a report on the transitional provisions for the period from 1 May 2004 to 30 April 2006. Report provided a legal basis enabling the old MS to decide whether they wanted to continue to make the free movement of workers subject to national restrictions during the period from 1 May 2006 to 30 April 2009 (European Commission 2006c). What is interesting, however, is that two years later another European Commission's report showed that mobile workers from new MS have had a positive impact on MS' economies, made significant contribution to EU economic growth, and have not led to

serious disturbances on their labor markets (European Commission 2008). In this report, European Commission called on the MS to lift restrictions to the free movement of workers as quickly as possible for better economic development of the EU.

Yet, today, 10 MS still block their labor markets from migrants, maintaining general restrictions or restrictions in some sectors/professions. This decision prevents EU workers to use one of their main rights as EU citizens and makes it difficult for them to move from one MS to another.

3.3 Lack of migrants' knowledge on their rights as EU citizens and their lack of access to information on mobility

Another obstacle in this field is lack of migrants' knowledge on their rights as EU citizens and their lack to information on working possibilities in other MS. From the perspective of labor migrants looking for new job opportunities abroad there is still a gap in terms of their knowledge on their rights as EU workers and citizens (Traser 2008, 44). In addition, European Commission in its action plan for skills and mobility identifies access to information on mobility is one of the main challenges to European labor market, causing low level of vocational and geographical mobility in the EU (European Commission 2002a). Moreover, evidence from the Citizens' Panel organized by ECAS (2008) shows that many people still do not know how they could benefit from EU legal initiatives in the field of free movement of workers. ECAS also points out that information is either not available or it is not easily understandable by worker migrants. In addition, EURES report shows that individuals who believe that there is not enough information on mobility are interested in simple information, such as information regarding work condition, accommodation, cost of living and the way of life in the destination country (EURES 2007), but still cannot easily access it.

Furthermore, as pointed out by PricewaterhouseCoopers report (2006, 9) majority of potential job candidates are unaware of possible opportunities available abroad and benefits from being mobile. The report also shows that many EU employees are not aware of the EU job resourcing centers, such as EURES.

In conclusion, these examples demonstrate that EU citizens cannot fully exercise their rights for free movement, simply because they are not aware of their own rights as EU citizens or they do not have the complete access to information on mobility.

3.4 Administrative and legal barriers for labor migrants

The Communication from the Commission of 11 December 2002 - Free movement of workers: achieving the full benefits and potential of free movement of workers (European Commission 2002b) points out practical, administrative and legal obstacles which still remain in the field of free movement of workers and prevent workers from taking full advantage of the benefits of geographical mobility. As highlighted in the previous chapter, the right to move and reside is still much dependent on economic factors, such as financial situation of the person moving. As a result, person without sufficient resources to cover his stay in the host country will not be granted residence rights. Moreover, access to residence, education, and the employment market is still subject to some economic conditions (Carrera 2005).

In addition, scholarly literature points out other legal limitations to the exercise of the right to free movement of workers. These are the following: limitations on public security and public health system (such as having to pay social security contributions in more than one MS), as well some limitations to employment in the public service of the host country (European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions 2007). Moreover, PricewaterhouseCoopers report (2006, 13) concludes that most often quoted legal and institutional barriers for labor migrants are differences in tax systems between MS and

lack of integrated EU employment legislation. EURES (2007) adds that pension rights are not automatically transferable, qualifications and skills acquired in other countries are not always recognized and the access to jobs in the public sector is limited.

Furthermore, report ‘Europeans on the move – Portraits of 31 mobile workers’ published by the European Commission, which examines personal stories of mobile workers in the EU MS, identifies various bureaucratic difficulties that European nationals encounter when they start working abroad. One example comes from an EU citizen who moved from Germany to Netherlands for work related reasons and cannot receive a loan from either German, or Dutch banks. The problem here is that the German bank would not offer him a mortgage because he does not have an income in Germany, and Dutch bank also refuses the same service, because his house is in Germany (European Commission 2006d, 28). He ends his story by saying: “There doesn’t seem to be that much information out there to help people either. The EU may enable you to travel and work in different countries but it ends there. Everything after that such as the social security issues, residency and so on you will have to sort out yourself” (European Commission 2006d, 29).

In conclusion, there are still many problems with incorrect interpretation of the legislation on free movement, as well as legal and administrative barriers for labor migrants who wish to work in another MS.

3.5 Inefficient integration of migrants

Although legal barriers are significant obstacles to citizens’ mobility, social and cultural barriers pose a major difficulty as well. As pointed out by Krieger and Fernandez (2006, 10) one of the main difficulties in working abroad is adapting to a different culture (23%), which causes difficulties in integrating into a new community.

According to Regulation 1612/68, elimination of the obstacles to the free movement of works requires establishing conditions for integrating workers and their family into the social environment of the host country (Council of the European Communities 1968). Moreover, in 2004 the European Commission in its communication on migration and integration concluded that economic migrants play an important role in the economic and social development of the EU and therefore the EU must achieve better social integration of migrants into their host society (European Commission 2004).

Furthermore, Munz (2008) and Ray (2004) point out that although EU and MS have introduced some policies and programs intended to help integrating EU labor migrants into their host communities, such as language trainings, skills development and anti-discrimination measures, nevertheless, some migrants still experience social exclusion in the country of destination. Consequently, to counter social and cultural barriers faced by migrants, better integration of migrants in their host communities is necessary.

In conclusion, the above mentioned examples show that there are still a number of legal, administrative and cultural barriers that make the personal decision to move abroad difficult for EU citizens and therefore limit EU mobility. There are also behavioral impediments, such as the fact that many EU citizens are not willing to change countries while looking for new employment opportunities.

Moreover, the many practical barriers to mobility might be seen as a gap in the EU integration process and obstacle to full freedom of movement for EU citizens. While, for example, transition arrangements are legal, they are against the concept of European citizenship, and a fundamental right to equal treatment and free movement (Traser 2008, 43). Therefore, there is a need to acknowledge and better understand the barriers to mobility, make information on the implications for legislative systems across the EU available for labor migrants, as well as to change or improve some policies. For that reason, in next chapter, I

would like to contribute to EU-policy making in the area of workers' mobility by presenting recommendations for improving the situation of EU migrants in the field of their integration and access to necessary information on mobility and EU citizenship rights.

Chapter 4: Possibilities to facilitate mobility. Recommendations for overcoming obstacles to EU mobility in the field of migrants' integration and their access to information on mobility and EU citizenship rights

As stated in previous chapters labor mobility is a strong instrument to foster fast economic growth in the EU. Therefore, it is important to promote and facilitate EU labor mobility. As chapter 3 of this thesis has proved, despite the considerable steps undertaken by the EU and by MS to facilitate mobility, there are still some barriers to EU mobility which cause intra-EU migration to be low. For that reason, in this concluding chapter I will identify already existing mechanisms to promote mobility on EU level and present ways in which mobility can be enhanced among EU citizens in the area of integration of migrants and their access to information on mobility and their rights as EU citizens.

4.1 Already existing EU instruments to facilitate mobility

Acknowledging the importance of free movement of persons as a fundamental right and opportunity for EU citizens, the EU has made progress in promoting geographical occupational mobility in some areas at the EU level. Since the year 2000 and introduction of Lisbon strategy, the main objective in the EU mobility policy broadened from freedom of movement to facilitation and promotion of the active usage of the right of freedom of movement and professional mobility (Council of the European Union 2000).

The mobility policy has shifted to more active stance in educational mobility, mainly in terms of lifting legal and administrative barriers faced by students, trainees and researchers. To encourage freedom of movement and assist young people in studying and working abroad,

European Commission introduced **Erasmus Programme**. The goal of this programme is to enable individuals to study abroad, find student placements in enterprises, exchanges between young workers and university staff training. By 2009 the Erasmus Programme has granted two million student scholarships for studies or work placement in another MS (European Commission 2010).

Freedom of movement is often limited by differences in training from one MS to another. In order to help make labor markets more flexible, the EU has allowed the **mutual recognition of professional qualifications**. In this field, the Parliament *Directive 2005/36/EC* has established a system for recognition of non-formal and formal learning, transparency and transferability of qualifications, by allowing mutual recognition of certificates and diplomas (European Parliament and the Council of the European Union 2005). Along the same line, the EU has established **Europass**, an instrument for transparency of qualifications and competences, which aims at helping EU citizens present their vocational and professional qualifications more clearly and effectively (European Parliament and the Council of the European Union 2004). As noted by practitioners “lack of cross border recognition of professional qualifications and barriers to the use of services from other countries have been stumbling blocks in the past, but these are beginning to be addressed (PricewaterhouseCoopers 2006).

Another instrument to encourage free movement of workers within the EU and inform EU citizens about job opportunities abroad and provide them with advice on mobility is the **EURES** (European Employment Service) network launched in 1994. The Commission sees EURES as a fundamental tool for networking between employers and potential workers as well as between public employment services, trade unions and employers’ organizations in the MS (European Communities 2006). Regarding problem solving instruments on EU level, European Community introduced **SOLVIT**, an online problem solving network, which aims

at helping EU citizens and businesses with legal problems concerning the misapplication of Internal Market rules (European Commission 2001).

Moreover, in order to inform EU citizens of the benefits of geographical and labor mobility European Commission designated the year 2006 as **European Year of Workers' Mobility**. The purpose of the initiative was to inform EU citizens of the realities of working in another country, the existing instruments to promote freedom of mobility (EURES in particular) and to make them aware of the rights they are entitled to as EU migrant workers. The initiative also aimed to promote the exchange of good practice between public institutions, social partners and private sector on mobility, and to promote geographical and job intra-European mobility (Public Policy and Management Institute 2008).

Regarding social security schemes for labor migrants, particularly access to health public services, the EU has made major efforts to create an environment conducive to workers migrants and introduced, in 2004, **European Health Card**. This card is intended to facilitate health insurance portability and entitles cardholders to access health care services anywhere in the EU and to be reimbursed of the costs by their own MS (European Commission 2003a). Efforts have also been made in order to increase the **portability of occupational pension rights** (EURES 2007).

These examples show that the EU has improved its communication and access to different instruments for facilitating mobility on European level, but mainly in education mobility. There is, however, some room for improvement in the field of workers mobility in general, especially regarding access to information on mobility and EU rights, and integration of migrants. Therefore recommendations presented in next part of this chapter will focus on these issues.

4.2 Recommendations for overcoming obstacles to EU mobility in the field of migrants' integration and their access to information on mobility and EU citizenship rights – “one-stop mobility shop” for migrants

The main conclusion of this thesis is that despite the fact that there has been significant progress in legal and political development of free movement of workers in the EU, some obstacles for free movement (legal, administrative, cultural and behavioral) still exist, causing the European labor mobility to be low. The previous chapters identified main obstacles to European labor mobility. This chapter will introduce one instrument which could tackle two of the main obstacles at once, namely **lack of migrants' knowledge on their rights as EU citizens and their access to information on mobility, as well as inefficient integration of migrants** and therefore significantly facilitate EU mobility.

The idea here is that these two obstacles can be overcome by giving migrants access to necessary information and at the same time effectively integrate them into local community. The instrument which I would like to introduce is “**one-stop mobility shop**” for migrants¹. This mechanism can tackle these two obstacles thanks to its innovation that services for migrants, such as providing information, assistance, advice and problem solving can be offered to migrants in one place and be easily accessible in their host community.

I have chosen to work on these obstacles because, as proved in the previous chapter and identified by scholars and practitioners in the field of free movement, these are the major barriers which prevent migrant workers from fully using their rights for free movement. As pointed out by many practitioners and scholars it is an urgent task to finally deal with these issues on European level (ECAS 2008; Munz 2008; Krieger and Fernandez 2006; Ray 2004). Moreover, projects such as integration and information initiatives for migrants are high on

¹ The idea of „one-stop shop” was previously used by me in the term paper for Policy Process and Policy Analysis course entitled „Integration of immigrant workers In Poland: a way to facilitate mobility”.

European agenda and therefore have strong support from the peer groups in this field (European Commission). The other two obstacles to EU mobility which were identified in previous chapter are not discussed further because, although they are important, they either require further research to present policy recommendations (administrative and legal barriers for labor migrants) or they soon will stop being an obstacle to mobility (the last transition period must be lifted and therefore all MS must open their labor markets fully by the end of 2011).

The need for overcoming mobility obstacles and consequently attracting new labor migrants is recommended by the fact that significant demographic changes will cause EU population to age, which will lead to considerable fall of employment in the EU. Achieving sustained economic growth will therefore require greater productivity and more labor migrants (European Commission 2003b). Consequently, it is important to implement better integration strategies to help migrants adjust to their new communities in countries of destination. Successful integration of migrants into the host community, as indicated by Turmann (2005), can increase productivity and competitiveness of the region where community is based. Therefore, investment in incentives for migrants' integration into the host country can bring high returns.

In addition, the potential of mobility may not be realized because many EU citizens lack the information on not only existing opportunities abroad, but also relevant EU mobility instruments (European Commission 2005). Therefore, it is important to reduce fragmentation of information for EU citizens and raise their awareness of the benefits of working in another MS. The "one-stop mobility shop" also aims to involve in the project other target groups. Therefore, "one-stop shop" initiative for migrants would bring together mobile workers as well as mobility stakeholders (social partners, non-profit organizations, and authorities at EU,

national and local level) and would be run by local non-profit organizations, with a support of regional and local Employment Offices and government.

Moreover, in order to make informed choices, labor migrants need adequate information on employment and living conditions in their destination country as well as their rights as EU citizens. While there is information available, it is often the case that this information is difficult to access by migrants. “One-stop shop”, on the other hand, would operate mainly in the local community and would therefore be easily accessible by migrants.

In addition, citizens need active support to use their rights of free movement, but providing information should not only be done in traditional, passive actions like leaflets or websites. The idea of “one-stop shop” for migrants therefore comes in as an innovative project for integration and information providing for migrants in their local community. “One-stop shop” can provide many wide-range services for migrants and their families: information, advice and problem solving, aiming at assisting immigrants in their local community, and, if necessary, relief programs for vulnerable migrants.

The concept of “one-stop shop” for migrants is based on the idea that wide range of services and assistance for migrant workers and their families should be available in one place, so that people seeking information and help do not need to go from one service provider to another. These migrants’ centers can offer assistance to migrants and improved, coherent service in the areas of housing, banking, health, vocational and language training, career advice, integration in the local community and awareness rising in the field of EU citizens’ rights. By providing language and vocational trainings and information campaigns for local community migrant centers can effectively integrate migrants into the host community. Last but not least, they work towards reducing exploitation of and prejudice towards newcomers. This initiative could also be helpful in fighting social exclusion of the migrants.

Such reference points for labor migrants with information on EU mobility and problem-solving do partially exist and are represented by EURES and SOLVIT on-line instruments. However, these services are only available on-line and are very much scattered, being available in different institutions. “One-stop shop” creates more synergy between services for migrants and makes them accessible for migrants in their local communities. Practitioners often point out that traditional ways of providing information on mobility are not sufficient (Vale 2007). “One –stop shop” is therefore an innovative alternative for conventional information spreading and aims at tackling the problem from the bottom-up perspective by helping migrants in their local host communities.

This idea of migrants’ centers is not new. A similar project was run by ECAS, non-governmental organization (NGO) based in Brussels, which in 2008 built a partnership with four other NGOs from Paris, Poznan, London and Dungannon. Their cooperation, however, aimed at helping mostly vulnerable migrant workers. The partnership was set up in order to explore different approaches and practices of helping vulnerable migrant worker, who were often unemployed and homeless. The outcome was successful, mostly because it helped many migrants to set up in their new destination countries, brought together many stakeholders and allowed to learn from each other and exchange best practices (ECAS 2008).

Moreover, in many communities in Europe migrant services already exist, but they are often scattered, offered in different institutions, whereas the innovative “one-stop shop” center can offer these services in one place, easily accessible for migrants. In addition, the innovation in this project lies in the approach used to integration problem where local partnerships can create added value and new opportunities for the stakeholders involved in the project.

Moreover, migration should be a subject of cooperation between different stakeholders active in the labor mobility field. This should be a matter of responsibility between

governments, public authorities, social partners and employers. They all have an important role to play in designing accurate migration policies, protecting the rights of labor migrants, and mobilizing support for new initiatives in this field. Voluntary sector has already done much with respect to spreading information, collecting and showing examples of good practices, vocational and information training for migrants in their host communities (ECAS 2008) . Voluntary sector should not, however, be left alone in this field since it does not have all necessary resources to deal with this issue. Moreover, successful integration of migrants and raising their awareness about their rights as EU citizens is a complex issue and as such is only possible to tackle by communication and effective partnership between different actors dealing with migration issues. The kind of cooperation established for “one-stop mobility shops” would assure quality standards and competence among wide range of stakeholders and bring their unique migration experience together. Each of the stakeholders involved in the project would have important role to play: training organizations would be responsible for vocational trainings, trade union and local authorities would ensure that the rights of migrants are protected, and finally local non-profit organizations would help integrating migrants into the local community.

In view of the fact that, next to providing information, preparation of individuals for their departure is crucial for their success in their mobility experience, institutions in the country of origin have also a big role to play in this project. Their role as partners in the “one-stop shop” project would be to inform migrants about their future living and working environment prior to their departure, promote mobility and inform the migrant workers of the risks and realities associated with labor migration. Moreover, together with destination country’s institutions, they would improve migrants’ access to information on migration and labor legislation in the destination country. What is more, migrant centers would carry on information campaigns in countries of origin and destination in order to inform individuals

about their rights in the EU and make it easier for mobile individuals to choose their best option of mobility, as well as orientation and training for migrant workers and members of their family.

In conclusion, this description of “one-stop shop” shows that two main obstacles to labor mobility, namely inefficient integration of migrants and lack of their access to information on EU mobility and EU citizen rights can both be tackled by this new innovative initiative. Furthermore, if well managed, integration of migrant’s workers and their greater understanding of their rights as EU citizens can be a facilitator for mobility in the EU. As pointed out by International Organization for Migration (IOM), successful integration can be enhanced by focusing on the dissemination of information on rights and obligations of migrants, advisory services, as well as counseling for migrants (International Organization for Migration 2010). The innovation of “one-stop shop” initiative lies in the fact that it is a place where migrant workers can receive all assistance he/she needs to start new life in a host country and easily access information on working and living in the destination country. Moreover, all these services can be offered to migrants in one place, easily accessible in their host community.

As I have shown throughout last chapters, the mobility in the EU is still significantly low. Moreover, encouraging greater mobility is a challenge and there is, of course, no simple solution to increasing level of mobility. In addition, mobility solution must be based on specific plan. Therefore, what “one-stop shop” can offer is to tackle two main obstacles to EU mobility at once. These are: successful integration of EU migrants in their new community and giving them access to information on mobility and their rights as EU citizens, which would allow them to fully exercise their rights of free movement. Moreover, promoting benefits of mobility and rights of individuals in the EU may help to diminish some of the obstacles that presently restrain potential employees from moving from one MS to another.

Undoubtedly, EU has made some progress in promoting educational mobility in the EU, through different instruments, such as Erasmus Programme and mutual recognition of certificates and diplomas (lifting legal and administrative barriers faced by students), European Year of Workers' Mobility and EURES (information campaign on geographical and labor mobility), SOLVIT (on-line problem solving) and European Health Card (access to health services in the EU).

There is, however, some room for improvement in mobility of EU workers, mostly in initiatives regarding integration of migrants in their host communities and providing them access to information on mobility in the EU and their rights as EU citizens. Furthermore, the objective of this thesis is not only to identify main obstacles to EU labor mobility, but also present a way to overcome them in order to facilitate mobility. Therefore, the innovative idea of “one-stop mobility shop” for migrants, which was introduced in this chapter, could be very useful in this matter. The innovative “one-stop shop” mechanism can tackle two main obstacles to EU labor mobility mentioned previously at once by providing one space with many-range services for migrants and their families and by offering initiatives such as information campaigns and language and vocational trainings in order to integrate migrants with their local community. This instrument can consequently enhance labor mobility among EU citizens, significantly improve the situation of EU labor migrants and fill the gap in the area of integration of migrants and their access to information on mobility and their rights as EU citizens.

Conclusion

Today, the right of free movement continues to be a key symbol of the EU and a fundamental part of the European common market. However, labor mobility which still remains low within the EU is a complex, multi-layered phenomenon. Moreover, as stated by former EU Commissioner for Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities Vladimir Spidla: “Europe is facing a combination of skills shortages, bottlenecks and unemployment[...] If we want to see the number of workers in the right jobs envisaged by the EU growth and jobs strategy, we really need a more mobile workforce” (Spidla 2006).

The theoretical assessment of labor mobility has revealed that migration is generally viewed as an important, positive economic phenomenon (Dobson and Sennikova 2007, Kleinman 2003), crucial facilitator for economic growth in the EU (Feld 2005) and a key factor for European integration (Geddes 2003; Stroby-Jensen 2003). Along the same line, free movement of workers in the EU is often seen as a significant element of the EU citizenship (Carrera 2004) which guarantees various political, social and judicial rights represented by its status (Carrera 2004; White 2004).

Furthermore, the second chapter has provided an overview of EU labor mobility policies and has shown that there has been significant progress in the legal framework of free movement of workers in the EU. With legal developments of free movement rights came a change in perspective of free movement concept. First free movement rights were not intended to be a generalized right open to all, but only to those who can contribute to creating common market. However, with the introduction of EU citizenship in Maastricht Treaty EU workers have finally started being acknowledged as EU citizens.

In addition, the evaluation of the debate on obstacles to European labor mobility has disclosed that despite the fact there has been significant progress in legal and political framework of free movement of workers, as well as favorable opinion on free movement among the EU citizens, the labor mobility on European level is still very low. The examination of main obstacles which are pointed out by scholars and practitioners in the field of labor mobility show that there are still a number of legal, administrative, cultural and behavioral barriers such as transition periods, lack of migrants' access to information on mobility and lack of knowledge on their rights as EU citizens, administrative barriers and inefficient integration of migrants that make the personal decision to move abroad difficult for EU citizens and therefore limit EU mobility,

Moreover, in fourth chapter it has been underlined that the EU has made progress in promoting geographical occupational mobility in some areas by introducing various instruments (such as EURES, Erasmus Programme, Europass, SOLVIT, and European Health Card) to inform EU citizens of the benefits of and facilitate geographical and labor mobility. Nonetheless, there is still some room for improvement in the field of workers mobility in general, and specifically in integration of migrants and their access to information on mobility and EU rights. Therefore, in my recommendations I fill this gap by introducing innovative service for migrants called "one-stop mobility shop" which can efficiently overcome these two obstacles and consequently help to facilitate labor mobility on EU level. This chapter has revealed that providing information on mobility is not sufficient if done in a traditional, passive way, but should rather be managed by introducing innovative projects, which would involve wide range of mobility stakeholders. Similar project was strongly supported by the peer groups in the field of EU labor mobility. Consequently, the assumption that has been established is that with innovation offered by "one-stop shop", this project can bring even

better results by significantly improving the situation of EU labor migrants. As a result, this will lead to enhancing labor mobility among EU citizens.

Finally, the answer to my key research question is that intra-EU mobility is low, because despite the fact that EU has improved its communication and EU citizens' access to different instruments for facilitating mobility on European level, there are still a number of legal, administrative, cultural and behavioral barriers that limit EU mobility and as such they remain main obstacles to full freedom of movement for EU citizens.

However, as presented in my recommendation, one of the possibilities to overcome some obstacles to EU labor mobility (in this case obstacles regarding integration of migrants in their host communities and providing them access to information on mobility and improving migrants' knowledge on their rights as EU citizens) and consequently facilitate geographical and labor mobility among EU citizens is introducing innovative idea of "one-stop mobility shop" for migrants. This mechanism can also significantly improve the situation of EU migrants. My contribution to the field of EU labor mobility is therefore done by filling existing gap in the field of migrants' access to information on mobility and their rights as EU citizens, and their successful integration into the host community.

Nonetheless, this thesis had some research constraints and did not include recommendations for all four obstacles examined in the thesis. However, further policy studies, combined with additional research methods, such as interviews with practitioners in this field may explore this topic further.

In conclusion, encouraging greater mobility is a challenge and there is, of course, no simple solution to increasing level of mobility. However, if no action is taken this might lead to serious economic decline in the EU. Moreover, since mobility is the most fundamental dimension of European citizenship failures in mobility might also lead to undermining the importance of European citizenship. Finally, mobility is both an opportunity and a challenge

for the EU and balanced solution needs to be found in order for the EU to benefit from an integrated single European labor market. As shown in this thesis free movement of workers can help contribute to the needs of the EU labor market. However, for this to work, a strategic pan-European plan is required.

Bibliography

- Barnard, Catherine. 2007. *The Substantive Law of the EU: The Four Freedoms*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Boeri, Tito. 2003. *Immigration: panacea or danger for the EU?* Milan: Mimeo, Bocconi University.
- Borjas George. 1995. Economic Theory and International Migration. *International Migration Review*, 23:457–485.
- Carrera, Sergio. 2004. *What Does Free Movement Mean in Theory and Practice in an Enlarged EU?* Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.
- Commission of the European Communities. 1957. Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community (EEC). Luxemburg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- Commission of the European Communities. 1970. Regulation no 1251/70 of 29 June 1970 on the right of workers to remain in the territory of a Member State after having been employed in that State. OJ L 142.
- Council of the European Communities. 1968. Regulation no 1612/68 of 19 October 1968 on freedom of movement for workers within the Community OJ L 257.
- Council of the European Communities. 1971. Regulation no 1408/71 of 5 July 1971 on the application of social security schemes to employed persons and their families moving within the Community OJ L 149.
- Council of the European Union. 2005. Decision no 2005/600/EC of 12 July 2005 on guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States. L 205/21.
- Council of the European Union. Lisbon European Council 23-24 march 2000. Presidency conclusions. Lisbon: European Council.
- http://www.europarl.europa.eu/summits/lis1_en.htm (accessed 14.05.2010).
- Dobson, John, and Irina Sennikova. 2007. From fundamental freedom to political and economic “hot potato” in 50 years: labour mobility and migration within the EU. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*. Volume VIII, No 2: 123-136.
- Donaghey, Jimmy, and Paul Teague. 2006. The Free Movement of Workers and Social Europe: Maintaining the European Ideal. *Industrial Relations Journal*. 37, no. 6: 652-666.
- ECAS. 2008. *Recommendations for policy action on workers' mobility*. Brussels: ECAS.

- EURES. 2007. *Research study on obstacles to mobility*. Malta: EURES.
- European Commission. 2001. Communication of 27 November 2001: Effective Problem Solving in the Internal Market (“SOLVIT”). COM (2001) 702.
- European Commission. 2002a. Communication of 13 February 2002: Commission's Action Plan for Skills and Mobility: COM (2002) 72.
- European Commission. 2002b. Communication of 11 December 2002: Free movement of workers: achieving the full benefits and potential. COM(2002) 694.
- European Commission. 2003a. Communication of 17 February 2003 concerning the introduction of a European health insurance card. COM(2003) 73.
- European Commission. 2003b. Communication of 3 June 2003 on immigration, integration and employment COM (2003) 336.
- European Commission. 2004. Communication of 16 July 2004: First Annual Report on Migration and Integration. COM(2004) 508.
- European Commission. 2005. Memo. European Year of Workers' Mobility, the importance of the mobility of workers to the implementation of the Lisbon strategy. Memo/05/229.
- European Commission. 2006a. Eurobarometer 64.1 on geographical and labour market mobility.
- European Commission. 2006b. Special Eurobarometer 65.3 on European Employment and Social Policy.
- European Commission. 2006c. Report on the Functioning of the Transitional Arrangements set out in the 2003 Accession Treaty (period 1 May 2004–30 April 2006). COM(2006) 48.
- European Commission. 2006d. *Europeans on the move - Portraits of 31 mobile workers*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Commission. 2008. Memo. Report on transitional arrangements regarding free movement of workers. Memo/08/718.
- European Commission. 2010. Lifelong Learning Programme. Statistical overview of the implementation of the decentralized actions in the Erasmus Programme in 2007/2008. 13.01.2010.
- European Communities. 2006. *EURES. The European job mobility portal*. Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.
- European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. 2007. *Mobility in Europe-they way forward*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

- European Parliament and the Council of the European Union. 2004. Decision no 2241/2004/EC of 15 December 2004 on a single Community framework for the transparency of qualifications and competences (Europass). L 390/06
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. 2004. Directive no 2004/38/EC of 29 April 2004 on the right of citizens of the Union and their family members to move and reside freely within the territory of the Member States. L 158/77.
- European Parliament and Council of the European Union. 2005. Directive no 2005/36/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 7 September 2005 on the recognition of professional qualifications. L 255/22.
- Everson, Michelle. 1995. The Legacy of the Market Citizen In *The New Legal Dynamics of the European Union*, ed. Jo Shaw and Gillian More. New York : Clarendon Press.
- Feld, Serge. 2005. Labor Force Trends and Immigration in Europe. *The International Migration Review : IMR*. 39, no. 3: 637.
- Geddes, Andrew. 2003. *The Politics of Migration and Immigration in Europe*. Sage politics texts. London: SAGE Publications.
- Hansen, Randall. 2003. Migration to Europe Since 1945: Its History and Its Lessons. *The Political Quarterly*, 74, no 1: 25-38.
- Hicks, John Richard. 1966. *The theory of wages*. New York: St Martin's Press.
- Hix, Simon, and Abdul Noury. 2007. Politics, Not Economic Interests: Determinants of Migration Policies in the European Union. *International Migration Review* 41, no. 1: 182-205.
- Honekopp, Elmar. 2007. *Labour migration studies in nine countries: General background and first attempts to present findings and proposals*. Presented in Budapest on 12th June 2007 at the international expert conference "European cooperation in labour migration: search for best practices" in the framework of the EC AGRO project.
- International Organization for Migration. Migrant Integration Initiative.
<http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/activities/by-theme/facilitating-migration/migrant-integration> [accessed 10.05.2010].
- Kleinman, Mark. 2003. The Economic Impact of Labour Migration. *The Political Quarterly*. 74, no. s1: 59-74.
- Krieger, Hubert, and Enrique Fernandez. 2006. *Too much or too little long-distance mobility in Europe? EU policies to promote and restrict mobility*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

- Munz, Rainer. 2008. *Migration, Labor Markets, and Integration of Migrants: An overview for Europe*. Social Protection and Labor Discussion Paper no 0807. Washington, D.C.: World Bank.
- Oliveira, Castro. 2002. Workers and Other Persons: Step-by-Step From Movement to Citizenship - Case Law 1995-2001. *Common Market Law Review*. 39, no. 1: 77-127.
- Olsen, Espen. 2008. The origins of European citizenship in the first two decades of European integration. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 15, no. 1: 40-57.
- Piore, Michael J. 1979. *Birds of Passage: Migrant Labor and Industrial Societies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Public Policy and Management Institute. 2008. *Evaluation of the European Year of Workers' Mobility. Final Report*. Vilnius: PPMI.
- PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP. 2006. *Managing Mobility Matters 2006*. Dublin: PricewaterhouseCoopers.
- Ray, Brian. 2004. *Practices to Promote the Integration of Migrants into Labour Markets*. Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute.
- Schmitter, Philippe. 2004. Neofunctionalism In *European Integration Theory*, ed. Antje Wiener and Thomas Diez, 45-74. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Skeldon, Ronald. 1999. Migration and Development: A Global Perspective. *International Migration Review*. 33, no. 127: 777.
- Spidla, Vladimir. 2006. Speech during the European Year of Workers Mobility. http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/workersmobility2006/index.cfm?id_page=1 [accessed 16.05.2010].
- Stark, Oded. 1990. On the Economics of International Labour Migration. *Population Studies*. 44, no. 1: 181-182.
- Stroby-Jensen, Carsten. 2003. Neo- functionalism. In *European Union Politics*, ed. Michelle Cini, 85-98. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sub-regional Conference on Employment and Protection of Migrant Workers in Europe. 2000. *Employment and Protection of Migrant Workers in Europe*. Geneva: ILO.
- Traser, Julianna. 2008. *Who's afraid of EU's latest enlargement?* Brussels: ECAS.
- Turmann, Anna. 2005. *A New European Agenda for Labour Mobility: Report of a CEPS-ECHR Task Force*. Brussels: Centre for European Policy Studies.
- United Nations. 2001. *Replacement Migration: Is It a Solution to Declining and Ageing Populations?* New York: United Nations.

<http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/migration/migration.htm> [accessed 07.05.2010].

- Vale, Dan. 2007. Speech at the seminar “Seeing the wood for the trees after the Year of Workers Mobility. Brussels. 16 March 2007.
- White, Robin C. A. 2004. *Workers, Establishment, and Services in the European Union*. Oxford EC law library. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- World Bank. 2006. *Global Economic Prospects 2006: Economic Implications of Remittances and Migration*. Washington, DC: World Bank.
- Zimmermann, Klaus. 2005. European Labour Mobility: Challenges and Potentials. *De Economist*. 153, no. 4: 425-450.
- Zimmermann, Klaus F. 2009. *Labor Mobility and the Integration of European Labor Markets*. Discussion papers, No. 3999. Bonn: IZA.