



**RS Global**  
Journals

**Scholarly Publisher**  
**RS Global Sp. z O.O.**  
ISNI: 0000 0004 8495 2390

Dolna 17, Warsaw, Poland 00-773  
Tel: +48 226 0 227 03  
Email: editorial\_office@rsglobal.pl

---

<b>JOURNAL</b>	International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science
<b>p-ISSN</b>	2544-9338
<b>e-ISSN</b>	2544-9435
<b>PUBLISHER</b>	RS Global Sp. z O.O., Poland
<b>ARTICLE TITLE</b>	A LITERATURE REVIEW ON EUROPEAN INTEGRATED BORDER MANAGEMENT
<b>AUTHOR(S)</b>	Xuedan Yao
<b>ARTICLE INFO</b>	Xuedan Yao. (2022) A Literature Review on European Integrated Border Management. <i>International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science</i> . 2(34). doi: 10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30062022/7844
<b>DOI</b>	<a href="https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30062022/7844">https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30062022/7844</a>
<b>RECEIVED</b>	03 June 2022
<b>ACCEPTED</b>	23 June 2022
<b>PUBLISHED</b>	30 June 2022
<b>LICENSE</b>	 This work is licensed under a <b>Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License</b> .

---

© The author(s) 2022. This publication is an open access article.

# A LITERATURE REVIEW ON EUROPEAN INTEGRATED BORDER MANAGEMENT

*Xuedan Yao*

*Beijing Language and Culture University, Beijing*

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal\\_ijitss/30062022/7844](https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijitss/30062022/7844)

---

## ARTICLE INFO

**Received** 03 June 2022  
**Accepted** 23 June 2022  
**Published** 30 June 2022

## KEYWORDS

Integrated Border Management; the Schengen Agreement; Frontex.

## ABSTRACT

In the wake of the Schengen Agreement, the EU has assumed the role of maintaining European security, and border integration management has been ranked among the top priorities for the EU. It is necessary to improve border integration management to advance the integration process. Despite this, border integration management in the EU has been challenging, particularly since the refugee crisis of 2015. This article analyzes the current directions and trends of relevant research on border integration management in the EU. Three main areas of research on border integration management are currently being conducted: migration policy, border control agency, and border integration problems. The study concluded that theoretical and organizational analysis need to complement border management research.

---

**Citation:** Xuedan Yao. (2022) A Literature Review on European Integrated Border Management. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Social Science*. 2(34). doi: 10.31435/rsglobal\_ijitss/30062022/7844

---

**Copyright:** © 2022 Xuedan Yao. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the **Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY)**. The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) or licensor are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

---

## Introduction.

European integrated border management reflects the need for political and economic integration and the advancement of EU integration. The EU is, however, primarily an international organization rather than a sovereign nation. Because borders are an integral part of national sovereignty, integrating borders in the EU requires that member states give up some of their sovereignty. In this regard, border integration and integrated management present significant challenges.

The border integration in the EU only reached maturity following the 1985 Schengen Agreement, which introduced measures to gradually eliminate border checks at the common borders between signatory countries. After increasing numbers of EU member states signed the Schengen Agreement, the Amsterdam Treaty mainstreamed it into EU law in 1997. In the Schengen Area, the abolition of the internal border has made it easier for trade and exchange across internal borders and has opened up tremendous opportunities for economic growth. The European Union has established a new regional governance system at its borders. And the member states of the Schengen agreement developed a new set of assumptions and practices related to border control as they evolved into a 'Schengen' border control culture, thereby making a cross-government approach to border control feasible. (Zaiotti, 2007) Even though some studies have shown that peripheral countries benefit most from the Schengen area through transit effects. (Felbermayr, 2018) European integration remains an evolving and never-completed process. (Green, 2013) And the abolition of internal borders and free movement of people have undeniably contributed to the integration of Europe.

## What is integrated border management?

Schengen has facilitated the abolition of internal borders, but the EU has also assumed responsibility for maintaining the security of its borders in the form of stronger external border controls. In turn, the Schengen border states are responsible for controlling the common external borders of the

EU. (Ceccorulli, 2019) After the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001, border management has also become a political priority for the EU. (Zaiotti, 2007)

Border control refers to responding to the intention to cross a border or to the act of crossing a border without regard to any other considerations, including border checks and border surveillance. The European integrated border management concept is derived from Article 4 of the Regulation (EU) 2016/1624. In Regulation, integrated border management refers to coordination and cooperation between the relevant countries and institutions in border and trade-related matters to establish effective, efficient, and coordinated border management at the external borders of the EU. After that, the Lisbon Treaty, which entered into force on 1 December 2009, established a new legal basis for European border control. The treaty brought together previously fragmented justice and home affairs policies under one heading, the Area of freedom, security, and justice (AFSJ) (Takle, 2018)

According to Duez, the unified external border created by the EU represents the political community of the EU, and IBM's strategies have contributed to the situation of a "castle under siege." The EU provides a powerful tool for integration and unification by creating a united external border. (Duez, 2014) There has been a shift in citizenship among member states due to the disappearance of internal borders. There was, however, a specific element of exclusion and discrimination in this 'bastion of Europe.' (Rigo, 2005) A rise in populist sentiment in Europe has been attributed to the arrival of refugees and migrants, and the term "they" for refugees confirms the exclusivity of the "bastion of Europe". (Börzel, 2018) As a result, the EU has become increasingly dependent on the support of citizens for the European integration project. Public support is essential to maintaining the legitimacy of the EU, and public opinion limits the position and actions of governmental elites on the international scene. (Hobolt, 2016) The outbreak of the refugee crisis has thus brought into question the Schengen system in a way never before seen. A Schengen member state has the right to temporarily restore the ability to control its internal borders in cases of severe threats to internal security under the EU treaty. The provision allows member states to exercise some freedom in managing their internal borders, but it also leaves member states divided on whether to maintain the existing integrated border management. It is also possible that the public might begin to doubt the stability and effectiveness of the "Bastion" built up by the EU.

### **Integrated border management and migration policy.**

There has been a Schengen crisis in the EU due to the large number of immigrants arriving in 2015 and 2016. (De Somer, 2020) This is why some scholars argue that the influx of refugees has significantly impacted EU countries and hindered the EU's integration process. The crisis has, according to Geddes, increased the strength of external and internal re-borders, while internal de-borders have become blurred. As far as migration policy is concerned, the EU has an internal system of open borders and external restrictions on migration, which result in member states' ability to regulate the flow of nationals from third countries, but not their control of internal migration flows. (Geddes, 2016) Because EU member states' economic development varies widely, refugees prefer to go to a country with better social welfare and a more developed economy. Nedergaard argues that tense borders undermine the rule of law, security, and welfare systems, as citizens from other countries quickly overrun the few countries that provide such services. (Nedergaard, 2019)

Further, the European Union's asylum policy relies on the decisions of its member states, and the EU can only control its borders to the extent that it can do so at its external borders. (Kriesi, 2021) Consequently, attitudes towards accepting refugees differed sharply between EU member states, ultimately resulting in a split within the EU.

Some scholars have used the theory of Securitization to explain the relationship between the EU's border integration management crisis and the refugee crisis. However, other scholars disagree with the simple attribution of the crisis to the refugee crisis. Securitization usually refers to the transfer of a conventional political issue to the realm of security politics by a state actor. (Wæver, 1993) The mass arrivals of asylum seekers in Europe in 2015, often referred to as the EU's "refugee crisis," pose a threat to the EU's collective self. The EU's push for border control measures may be viewed as a move to securitize the refugee issue and portray migrants and refugees as a security risk. (Ceccorulli, 2018) As a result, the EU's push for border control measures may be seen as an attempt to securitize the refugee issue. To prevent future terrorist attacks, the repatriation of refugees is a necessary policy, and the EU's response is characterized as preemptive and anticipatory. (Baker-Beall, 2019) The EU approaches

problem-solving by treating the refugee crisis as an existential challenge for the EU. (Ceccorulli, 2019) This implies that the EU's securitization initiative emphasizes strengthening the EU's internal security rather than addressing the plight of migrants.

### **European agency of border management: Frontex.**

The EU made several attempts before the refugee crisis to harmonize its refugee and migration policies following the Dublin Convention. In this Regulation, a set of criteria is established by which member states are responsible for processing asylum claims. (Karamanidou, 2018) In its initial design, the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) sought to create a unified asylum system across the EU. Based on the Schengen Agreement, the EU began work in 2004 on establishing Frontex, an integrated border management agency. In 2006, 500,000 illegal migrants were apprehended in the EU, and 40% were deported. (Fijnaut, 2015) However, Frontex depends entirely on the material resources and support provided by the member states. (Pollak, 2009) Due to this, Frontex has been left with several restrictions regarding its movements.

Due to a lack of staff and funding, Frontex struggled to handle this vast refugee management task after 2015's refugee crisis. The EU should also strengthen Frontex's role and collaborate with the various EU migration authorities to support integrated border management in times of crisis. (Fijnaut, C., 2015) In 2016, the EU announced establishing a European Border and Coast Guard Agency (EBCG) based on Frontex. Frontex and the border control agencies of EU member states will create the European Border and Coast Guard Agency within maritime border surveillance. It is primarily responsible for facilitating the development and implementation of EU border management standards and supporting EU member states. (Carrera, 2015) As reported on the official websites of the three central migration management agencies, Frontex has a budget of €540 million until 2021, compared to €142 million and €173 million for EASO and Europol. The EU's migration management is centered on the integration of border control. Additionally, the EU has stated that it will recruit 10,000 guards between 2021 and 2027 so that Frontex can better accomplish its objectives.

Frontex appears to be a technical support agency, focusing primarily on risk analysis and threat assessment. By conducting a risk analysis, member states can manage and regulate their migration and border security agencies and analyze the situation at their external borders. (Neal, 2009) The standard risk analysis model developed by Frontex classifies migration as a risk factor, demonstrating the relationship between migration and security. Additionally, Frontex's risk analysis can provide insight into member states' ability to access EU funds and the perceptions of EU policymakers regarding the ability of states to manage their borders. Thus, Frontex can influence EU decision-making through risk analysis, despite not exercising formal decision-making powers. (Horii, 2016)

Conversely, the confidentiality of risk analysis and criminal intelligence has resulted in a lack of transparency and democratic accountability in the agency's actions. (Carrera, 2007) Frontex operates within an area of political controversy without hard science, so member states retain a high degree of control over border management. (Ekelund, 2014) Therefore, the organizational structure of Frontex is still flawed. The failure of Frontex to function as intended has also been attributed to internal conflicts within the member states. It has been challenging to implement the core principles of the Frontex institution, burden sharing, and solidarity due to differences in interests and priorities among the member states. Instead of finding common solutions, member states have sought ways to reduce their transaction costs. (Wolff, 2008)

### **The problem of border integration.**

Schimmelfennig analyzes why the euro crisis promoted integration while the Schengen crisis did not, as the euro and the Schengen crises have been the two biggest crises the EU has faced in recent years. In his opinion, the introduction of the euro has resulted in a significant increase in the interdependence of the financial markets in the eurozone. Undoubtedly, these high-indebted eurozone countries cannot withstand the pressure of the financial markets and therefore do not withdraw from the euro market at their convenience. However, compared to the Schengen crisis, there is a lower degree of cross-country interdependence. (Schimmelfennig, 2018) In this regard, a Schengen agreement based on the Schengen understanding has significantly lower exit costs than those of the eurozone.

The anti-immigration parties are usually not pro-European. The 2015 crisis provided further confirmation of this view. (Guiraudon, 2018) EU member states employ normative and interpretive strategies

to the maximum extent possible to achieve their goals. (Slominski, 2013) Fragmentation is a natural outcome of the legal and political heterogeneity of immigration policies. (Chebel d'Appollonia, 2019) Sweet suggests that supranational institutions such as the EU can enhance their autonomy and influence within the European polity, thus promoting the interests of international societies and promoting the development of supranational governance. (Sweet, 1997) However, due to the 2015 crisis, migration policies have not been able to contribute substantially to the integration of the EU. In other words, the EU is trying to consolidate the regime by using old strategies, while the neighboring and southern frontline states still play a crucial role in its functioning. (Campesi, 2018) This inability of the EU to manage the refugee crisis will aggravate the risk of the crisis spiraling out of control. After the 2020 epidemic, some EU member states resumed internal border control, indicating divergent interests among EU member states regarding border control. Although the EU issued common guidelines for controlling external borders during the epidemic, the measures taken by member states were not consistent.

### **Conclusions.**

Despite the Schengen Agreement facilitating the abolition of internal borders, strengthening external border controls has also become a significant task in maintaining the security of member states' borders, leading to the EU becoming the principal authority for maintaining European security. Research related to integrated border management will remain a significant task for the EU in the future, so it is crucial to continue research in this area. Currently, research is focused on three areas: firstly, the combination of border management and migration studies, particularly the refugee crisis in 2015; secondly, the organization of border integration-related institutions, primarily Frontex; and thirdly, the exploration of the current problems of border integration in the EU, mainly focusing on the divergence of interests between member states. Based on a review of the literature in this area, it is found that while there are more studies related to border integration institutions, there are relatively few studies on Frontex's organizational structure. The second issue is that when explaining border integration in the EU, the theories applied are mainly intergovernmentalism and neo-functionalism. At the same time, there is still much room for theoretical explanation in this Area.

### **REFERENCES**

1. Baker-Beall, C. (2019). The threat of the 'returning foreign fighter': The Securitization of EU migration and border control policy. *Security dialogue*, 50(5), 437-453.
2. Börzel, T. A., & Risse, T. (2018). From the euro to the Schengen crises: European integration theories, politicization, and identity politics. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(1), 83-108.
3. Campesi, G. (2018). Crisis, migration and the consolidation of the EU border control regime. *International Journal of Migration and Border Studies*, 4(3), 196-221.
4. Carrera, S. (2007). The EU border management strategy: FRONTEX and the challenges of irregular immigration in the Canary Islands (No. 261). CEPS.
5. Carrera, S., Blockmans, S., Gros, D., & Guild, E. (2015). The EU's response to the refugee crisis: Taking stock and setting policy priorities. CEPS essay, (20/16).
6. Ceccorulli, M. (2019). Back to Schengen: the collective securitisation of the EU free-border Area. *West European Politics*, 42(2), 302-322.
7. Ceccorulli, Michela and Sonia Lucarelli (2018). 'Migration', in James Sperling and Spyros Economides (eds.), *The EU's Security Strategies*. Abingdon, Oxon and New York: Routledge.
8. Chebel d'Appollonia, A. (2019). EU migration policy and border controls: from chaotic to cohesive differentiation. *Comparative European Politics*, 17(2), 192-208.
9. De Somer, M. (2020). Schengen and internal border controls. From Tampere 20 to Tampere 2.0: Towards a new European consensus on migration, 119-131.
10. Duez, D. (2014). A community of borders, borders of the community: The EU's integrated border management strategy. *Borders, fences and walls: State of insecurity*, 51-66.
11. Ekelund, H. (2014). The establishment of FRONTEX: A new institutionalist approach. *Journal of European Integration*, 36(2), 99-116.
12. Felbermayr, G., Gröschl, J., & Steinwachs, T. (2018). The trade effects of border controls: Evidence from the European Schengen Agreement. *JCMS: Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56(2), 335-351.
13. Fijnaut, C. (2015). The refugee crisis: The end of Schengen? *European Journal of Crime, Criminal law and criminal justice*, 23(4), 313-332.
14. Geddes, A., & Scholten, P. (2016). *The politics of migration and immigration in Europe*. Sage.

15. Green, S. (2013). Borders and the Relocation of Europe. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 42(1), 345-361.
16. Guiraudon, V. (2018). The 2015 refugee crisis was not a turning point: Explaining policy inertia in EU border control. *European Political Science*, 17(1), 151-160.
17. Hobolt, S. B., & De Vries, C. E. (2016). Public support for European integration. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 19(1), 413-432.
18. Horii, S. (2016). The effect of Frontex's risk analysis on the European border controls. *European Politics and Society*, 17(2), 242-258.
19. Karamanidou, L., & Kasperek, B. (2018). Border Management and Migration Control in the European Union.
20. Kriesi, H., Altiparmakis, A., Bojar, A., & Oana, I. E. (2021). Debordering and re-bordering in the refugee crisis: a case of 'defensive integration'. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(3), 331-349.
21. Neal, A. W. (2009). Securitization and risk at the EU border: The origins of FRONTEX. *JCMS: Journal of common market studies*, 47(2), 333-356.
22. Nedergaard, P. (2019). Borders and the EU legitimacy problem: the 2015–16 European Refugee Crisis. *Policy Studies*, 40(1), 80-91.
23. Pollak, J., & Slominski, P. (2009). Experimentalist but not accountable governance? The role of Frontex in managing the EU's external borders. *West European Politics*, 32(5), 904-924.
24. Rigo, E. (2005). Implications of EU enlargement for border management and citizenship in Europe.
25. Schimmelfennig, F. (2018). European integration (theory) in times of crisis. A comparison of the euro and Schengen crises. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 25(7), 969-989.
26. Slominski, P. (2013). The Power of Legal Norms in the EU's External Border Control. *International Migration*, 51(6), 41-53.
27. Sweet, A. S., & Sandholtz, W. (1997). European integration and supranational governance. *Journal of European public policy*, 4(3), 297-317.
28. Takle, M. (2012). The treaty of Lisbon and the European border control regime. *Journal of contemporary European research*, 8(3).
29. Wæver, O. (1993). Securitization and desecuritization (p. 48). Copenhagen: Centre for Peace and Conflict Research.
30. Wolff, S. (2008). Border management in the Mediterranean: internal, external and ethical challenges. *Cambridge review of international affairs*, 21(2), 253-271.
31. Zaiotti, R. (2007). Revisiting Schengen: Europe and the emergence of a new culture of border control. *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 8(1), 31-54.