

SOCIAL INCLUSION AS AN INSTRUMENT OF INTERNATIONAL STABILITY: MIGRATION, MINORITIES AND HUMAN SECURITY

Carolina BUDURINA-GOREACII

PhD, Associate Professor,
Moldova State University, Moldova
E-mail: carolina.budurina@gmail.com
ORCID: 0000-0003-2406-4212

Liliana BENIUC

PhD, Associate Professor,
Moldova State University, Moldova
E-mail: liliana.beniuc@usm.md
ORCID: 0000-0002-1094-2662

Abstract: *This article examines social inclusion as a strategic condition of international stability across the interconnected domains of migration governance, minority protection, and human security. It argues that the relationship between inclusion and stability is structural rather than merely situational: inclusion has stabilizing effects when it is institutionally grounded in legal security, equitable access to rights and services, meaningful participation, and the recognition of cultural and social difference. Under these conditions, inclusive policies reduce structural vulnerability, strengthen the legitimacy of public institutions, and mitigate intergroup tensions in diverse societies. Methodologically, the study employs a qualitative, explanatory, and comparative research design based on the analysis of academic literature, United Nations and European policy documents, and recent strategic frameworks from the Republic of Moldova. The findings show, first, that social inclusion remains conceptually contested and unevenly operationalized across governance levels. Second, they demonstrate that inclusion contributes to stability through three interrelated mechanisms: human security, governance legitimacy, and minority-rights recognition. Third, they indicate that recent policy developments in the Republic of Moldova increasingly frame inclusion not only as a social-policy concern, but also as a multisectoral issue linked to resilience, democratic governance, and regional security. By reconceptualizing social inclusion as an analytical and strategic variable at the intersection of rights, governance, and security, the article contributes to current scholarship and offers a framework relevant to both academic research and policy design in states affected by migration pressures, geopolitical uncertainty, and institutional transformation.*

Keywords: *social inclusion; international stability; migration governance; human security; governance legitimacy; minority rights; Republic of Moldova.*

Classification JEL: *F22; I38; J15.*

UDC: *316.4.063.3:314.74* **DOI:** <https://doi.org/10.53486/ser2026.24>

1. Introduction

In the context of intensified international migration, growing social diversity, and increasing vulnerabilities associated with regional insecurity and institutional transformation, social inclusion has become a major concern for both academic research and public policy. Yet, despite its frequent use in debates on migration, integration, cohesion, and rights protection, the concept remains analytically unstable and unevenly operationalized across governance levels. It is often invoked as a normative ideal, but far less consistently defined as a category capable of explaining how access, participation, recognition, and legal security shape broader outcomes of resilience and stability. This conceptual indeterminacy weakens policy evaluation and obscures the mechanisms through which inclusion may affect institutional legitimacy, social cohesion, and the management of diversity in contexts marked by mobility and uncertainty.

Against this background, the present article examines social inclusion not simply as a social-policy objective, but as a strategic and analytical variable situated at the intersection of migration governance, minority protection, and human security. The central argument is that the relationship between inclusion and stability is structural rather than situational. Inclusion contributes to stability when it is institutionally grounded in legal security, equitable access to rights and services, meaningful participation, and the recognition of cultural and social difference. Under these conditions, inclusion reduces structural vulnerability, strengthens governance legitimacy, and mitigates the forms of exclusion that can deepen fragmentation and intergroup tension. The article therefore addresses the following research question: through what mechanisms does social inclusion contribute to stability and resilience in societies affected by migration pressures, diversity, and institutional change?

To answer this question, the study employs a qualitative, explanatory, and comparative research design based on the analysis of academic literature, international and European policy documents, and recent strategic frameworks from the Republic of Moldova. This approach makes it possible to examine both the conceptual evolution of inclusion and its policy translation across different governance contexts. Particular attention is given to the Republic of Moldova as a case of institutional transition in which migration governance, European integration, and regional insecurity increasingly intersect. In this setting, inclusion is becoming more visible not only as a matter of social support, but also as a component of resilience-oriented governance.

The originality of the article lies in reconceptualizing social inclusion as a mechanism that links three dimensions often discussed separately in the literature: human security, governance legitimacy, and minority-rights recognition. By bringing these dimensions into a single analytical framework, the article seeks to move beyond narrower approaches that treat inclusion primarily as a welfare objective or a humanitarian principle. Instead, it argues that inclusion should also be understood as part of the institutional conditions under which diverse societies remain cohesive, legitimate, and resilient.

The article is structured as follows. The first section reviews the relevant literature and identifies the main conceptual and analytical gaps in existing scholarship. The second outlines the methodological approach and explains the logic of corpus selection and comparative interpretation. The third presents the main findings and discusses the mechanisms through which inclusion contributes to stability across different governance contexts. The final section summarizes the principal conclusions, reflects on the limits of the study, and suggests directions for further research.

2. Literature Review

The literature increasingly treats social inclusion as a central concept in debates on migration, minority protection, and social cohesion, yet its analytical status remains unstable. While the term is widely invoked in both academic and policy discourse, it is often used as an umbrella notion covering equality, participation, non-discrimination, access to services, and belonging, without sufficient precision regarding its core dimensions, indicators, or expected effects. As Koehler et al. (2020), the International Organization for Migration (IOM, 2017), and Ben Brik and Brown (2024) suggest, this conceptual breadth has normative appeal but analytical costs: it complicates policy evaluation, weakens

comparability, and obscures the mechanisms through which inclusion may shape wider outcomes such as social cohesion, institutional legitimacy, and resilience.

A major point of divergence in the literature concerns the relationship between inclusion and integration. In some works, the two are used almost interchangeably, whereas in others inclusion is treated as either a component, a precondition, or a possible outcome of broader integration processes. Belugina et al. (2018) note the absence of a settled understanding of what inclusion requires in practical terms and how it evolves into successful integration. This ambiguity is reinforced by the persistence of competing normative paradigms in European debates, including assimilation, multiculturalism, equality-based integration, and cohesion-oriented approaches. Spencer (2006) show that these paradigms allocate responsibility differently between migrants, institutions, and host societies, thereby producing distinct models of adaptation, participation, and belonging. The literature therefore remains divided not only on what inclusion means, but also on how it should be operationalized and by whom.

At the same time, existing research converges on the view that social inclusion is multidimensional and cannot be reduced to economic incorporation alone. Access to employment remains important, but the literature increasingly emphasizes that inclusion also depends on education, health care, housing, legal protection, cultural recognition, and civic participation. Malloy and Gazzola (2006) demonstrate that cultural and linguistic recognition are not secondary add-ons, but constitutive elements of inclusion for minorities. Similarly, Koehler et al. (2020) argue that inclusion must be understood within broader structures of power, inequality, and rights, and that purely administrative or compensatory approaches are insufficient. However, while the literature acknowledges this multidimensionality, it does not always specify how these dimensions interact or which of them are most decisive in producing broader social and political effects.

A further strand of scholarship links inclusion directly to vulnerability, rights, and human dignity. In migration studies, exclusion is frequently associated with precarious legal status, weak social networks, discrimination, and limited access to essential services. Bass (2018) highlights the structurally vulnerable position many migrants occupy in receiving societies, while OHCHR (2017) stresses that inadequate rights-based governance leaves migrants disproportionately exposed to exclusion, exploitation, and insecurity. The IOM (2017) likewise frames integration and cohesion in terms of effective access to education, health care, decent work, and legal protection. Yet an important analytical issue remains insufficiently resolved: much of this literature convincingly shows why exclusion is harmful, but it is less precise in demonstrating how inclusion becomes a stabilizing mechanism rather than simply a normative corrective.

The literature on social cohesion provides a partial answer by linking inclusion to belonging, trust, and public attitudes toward diversity. Bauloz et al. (2020) argue that inclusion is central to the migration cycle because it shapes not only migrants' access to rights, but also the quality of coexistence in receiving societies. At the same time, anti-immigration sentiment, racism, xenophobia, and securitized political narratives can undermine both inclusion and cohesion. Giampaolo and Ianni (2020) extend this perspective by treating migrant inclusion as a cross-sectoral issue connected to labour, urban governance, and sustainable development. However, the literature remains less clear on whether cohesion should be understood as an outcome of inclusion, a parallel process, or an intervening condition mediating between policy frameworks and stability outcomes.

This unresolved relationship weakens attempts to explain why similar inclusion measures may produce different effects across contexts.

The security literature introduces a further shift by framing inclusion in relation to human security rather than solely migration management. Bilgic (2018) argues that a human security approach reorients analysis from the protection of borders to the protection of persons, emphasizing freedom from fear, freedom from want, and human dignity. Lami and Kojku (2025) similarly show that migration governance may move beyond a state-centred security paradigm toward a more human-centred understanding.

However, this shift is not linear or uncontested. Häkli and Peltonen (2026) demonstrate that the European Union's New Pact on Migration and Asylum combines humanitarian language with practices of control, categorization, and selective protection, thereby reproducing vulnerability even within formally protective frameworks. This critical literature is particularly valuable because it shows that inclusion cannot be inferred from rhetoric alone: rights-based discourse may coexist with exclusionary institutional arrangements, and humanitarian framing does not automatically translate into durable inclusion.

In the case of the Republic of Moldova, the literature is more limited, but recent strategic documents suggest an emerging attempt to embed inclusion within a broader governance and resilience framework. The draft national programme on the staged integration of foreigners, including displaced persons, for 2025–2027 presents integration as a multisectoral process involving education, health, labour-market access, housing, culture, social protection, and community participation (Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova, 2025).

The draft National Programme on Migration and Asylum for 2026–2030 further links migration governance to European Union alignment, institutional development, regional security pressures, and a combined logic of protection, regulation, and integration (Government of the Republic of Moldova, 2025). In parallel, the United Nations Sustainable Development Cooperation Framework for the Republic of Moldova 2023–2027 places inclusion, resilience, and equal opportunities at the centre of the national development agenda (United Nations in Moldova & Government of the Republic of Moldova, 2022). These documents suggest a gradual conceptual broadening, yet they remain primarily programmatic and do not by themselves resolve the analytical question of how inclusion contributes to stability.

Taken together, the literature shows three things. First, social inclusion is widely recognized as normatively desirable but remains conceptually fragmented. Second, important progress has been made in linking inclusion to rights, vulnerability, cohesion, and human security, yet the relationship between these dimensions is still insufficiently theorized. Third, existing studies do not adequately clarify the mechanisms through which inclusion contributes to institutional resilience and social stability, especially in contexts marked by migration pressures, geopolitical uncertainty, and institutional transformation. This article departs from prior approaches by treating social inclusion not merely as a social-policy objective or a humanitarian aspiration, but as an analytical and strategic variable connecting human security, governance legitimacy, and minority-rights recognition to international stability. In doing so, it seeks to address a significant gap in the literature and to provide a more integrated framework for understanding inclusion in contemporary societies.

3. Methodology

This article employs a qualitative, explanatory, and comparative research design in order to examine how social inclusion functions as a mechanism linking migration governance, minority protection, and human security to broader outcomes of stability and resilience. The study is based on document analysis, since the research objective is not to measure a single empirical variable, but to clarify the conceptual framing, normative evolution, and policy operationalization of inclusion across different governance contexts.

The empirical corpus consists of fifteen key sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, international and European policy documents, and recent strategic frameworks from the Republic of Moldova. Sources were selected according to three main criteria: conceptual relevance to social inclusion, direct connection to migration or minority protection, and analytical usefulness for understanding the relationship between inclusion and stability. Preference was given to recent and authoritative materials, while several earlier works were retained because they provide foundational distinctions still relevant to the debate. Sources were excluded where inclusion was addressed only marginally or without clear relevance to the stability dimension.

The corpus covers publications and policy documents issued mainly between 2003 and 2026. This temporal range makes it possible to capture both the longer evolution of the concept and its more recent reformulation in the context of intensified migration, regional insecurity, and institutional transformation. The documents were coded around the following categories: social inclusion, integration, social cohesion, migration governance, minority rights, human security, vulnerability, participation, recognition, legal security, and stability. The analysis was then organized around three principal dimensions: human security, governance legitimacy, and minority-rights recognition.

To make the comparative argument more explicit, the study uses Germany, Sweden, and France as European reference cases, alongside the Republic of Moldova. These cases were selected not to produce an exhaustive country comparison, but to provide analytically contrasting models of inclusion governance. By contrast, the category “Eastern European states” used in Table 1 is not treated as a single case in the strict methodological sense, but as a synthetic regional benchmark derived from comparative literature and policy overviews. Its function is heuristic, allowing the Moldovan case to be situated within a broader regional context of more uneven and fragmented inclusion frameworks.

Social inclusion was assessed through qualitative indicators recurrently identified across the literature and policy corpus, including access to education, employment, health care, housing, legal protection, social assistance, cultural recognition, civic participation, and anti-discrimination safeguards. Stability was treated as a broader analytical construct reflected in reduced vulnerability, lower intergroup tensions, stronger social cohesion, improved institutional trust, and enhanced governance resilience. In this sense, the methodological objective is not to establish direct statistical causality, but to identify recurring institutional patterns and plausible mechanisms through which inclusion may contribute to stability.

This approach is appropriate because it connects conceptual debates, normative frameworks, and policy developments within a single analytical structure and allows comparison not only of policy measures, but also of the governance logics underlying them. At the same time, the study has clear limits. Because it relies on qualitative document analysis, it does not provide

definitive causal proof, and the Moldova-specific evidence remains largely programmatic due to the recency of the national documents examined. The findings should therefore be read as a theoretically grounded and policy-relevant interpretation rather than as a final causal demonstration.

4. Results and Discussion

The document analysis confirms that the central issue is not whether social inclusion matters, but how it is conceptualized, operationalized, and institutionally embedded across different governance contexts. Across both the academic literature and the policy corpus examined, inclusion remains a normatively powerful but operationally uneven category. This matters because the stabilizing effects often attributed to inclusion cannot be assessed convincingly where the concept itself is weakly delimited or inconsistently translated into policy instruments. The findings therefore suggest that inclusion contributes to stability only under specific institutional conditions, which become visible through three interrelated dimensions: human security, governance legitimacy, and minority-rights recognition.

For the purposes of this analysis, social inclusion is understood as the effective incorporation of migrants and minorities into the main institutional and social spheres of the receiving society, including access to rights, services, protection, and public life. Integration is treated as the broader process of mutual adaptation between migrants and host societies, while social cohesion refers to the degree of trust, solidarity, and shared belonging that sustains coexistence in diverse communities (Bauloz et al., 2020; IOM, 2017; Spencer, 2006). This distinction is analytically important because it allows the discussion to move beyond terminological overlap and to focus instead on the mechanisms through which inclusion affects resilience and stability.

A first finding is that conceptual elasticity is not a merely semantic problem; it has direct methodological and political consequences. Across the corpus, social inclusion functions as a broad umbrella term, but the criteria by which it is assessed vary substantially across policy domains and institutional settings. As Ben Brik and Brown (2024) show, inclusion may encompass education, labour-market access, housing, health, and participation, yet the absence of sufficiently harmonized measurement frameworks makes comparative assessment difficult. This ambiguity weakens the evidentiary basis of claims that inclusion strengthens resilience, cohesion, or legitimacy, because the object being evaluated is not always defined in comparable terms. In this sense, one of the most significant findings of the analysis is that the instability of the concept itself partially explains the instability of the policy outcomes associated with it.

A second finding concerns the tension between rights-based and resilience-oriented policy frames. In the documents reviewed, inclusion is presented either as an obligation derived from equality, dignity, and non-discrimination, or as an instrument for managing diversity, reducing tensions, and strengthening institutional capacity. These two frames are not necessarily incompatible, but they produce different emphases and sometimes different policy logics. The rights-based frame prioritizes legal protection, equal access, and recognition, whereas the resilience-oriented frame emphasizes coordination, programmability, and the capacity of institutions to absorb social pressures. The analysis shows that inclusion is most effective where these two logics converge. By contrast, where

inclusion is framed only rhetorically, without legal guarantees, participation mechanisms, and implementation capacity, its stabilizing potential remains limited.

This becomes particularly clear in relation to the institutional architecture of inclusion. The findings suggest that inclusion is most likely to have stabilizing effects when it is embedded in coordinated, multi-level, and cross-sectoral governance arrangements rather than in fragmented or compensatory interventions. Inclusion cannot be reduced to a single policy field, because exclusion itself operates across multiple and mutually reinforcing domains. Where legal status, access to services, language support, labour-market integration, education, social protection, and participation are addressed through a broader strategic framework, inclusion is more likely to produce durable effects. Where, by contrast, policies remain sectoral, weakly coordinated, or reactive, the result is often uneven implementation, weak monitoring, and reduced long-term impact. This finding reinforces the broader argument that the stabilizing value of inclusion is institutional before it is rhetorical.

The analysis further shows that the relationship between inclusion and stability operates through three mutually reinforcing mechanisms.

First, inclusion strengthens human security by reducing structural vulnerability. Migrants and minorities with access to legal protection, education, housing, health care, justice, and employment are less exposed to marginalization, dependency, abuse, and exploitation (IOM, 2017; OHCHR, 2017). In this sense, inclusion functions not simply as social accommodation, but as a preventive security mechanism. It reduces the conditions under which exclusion may escalate into insecurity, distrust, grievance, or long-term social fragmentation. This supports the human security literature, which shifts the focus from the protection of borders to the protection of persons and communities (Bilgic, 2018). At the same time, the analysis confirms the warnings of critical scholarship: human-centred rhetoric does not automatically guarantee protective outcomes, especially where legal precarity and selective categorization remain embedded in migration governance (Häkli & Peltonen, 2026).

Second, inclusion reinforces governance legitimacy. Public institutions are more likely to be perceived as legitimate when they are accessible, predictable, non-discriminatory, and capable of responding to the needs of diverse populations. This legitimacy is not produced by service delivery alone, but by the broader perception that institutions operate according to principles of fairness, equal treatment, and participation. The findings therefore support the argument that integration is sustainable only when it is conceived as a reciprocal and institutionally mediated process rather than as unilateral adaptation by migrants alone (Spencer, 2006). In practical terms, inclusion contributes to stability because it reduces the gap between formal rights and lived institutional experience, thereby strengthening trust in governance structures.

Third, inclusion contributes to stability through minority-rights recognition. The evidence reviewed shows that social cohesion cannot be sustained through socioeconomic incorporation alone if cultural, linguistic, and identity-based dimensions of belonging remain unrecognized. Malloy and Gazzola (2006) make clear that cultural participation and equal recognition are not secondary supplements to inclusion, but core dimensions of it. Policies that require conformity at the expense of difference may produce formal incorporation, but they rarely generate substantive belonging. By contrast, where equal access is combined with recognition, participation, and anti-discrimination guarantees,

diversity is less likely to be experienced as a destabilizing factor and more likely to be integrated into the social fabric in durable ways.

The comparative evidence also indicates that policy effectiveness depends less on the existence of isolated inclusion measures than on the coherence of the overall inclusion architecture. Germany and Sweden illustrate relatively consolidated models in which strategic planning, multi-level coordination, and policy continuity reinforce inclusion outcomes across multiple domains. France reflects a different but still structured model, in which universalist principles coexist with targeted territorial and post-2015 inclusion measures. By contrast, the weaker institutionalized Eastern European settings synthesized in the analysis reveal greater fragmentation, weaker participation channels, and more limited monitoring capacity. This does not mean that Western European cases are normatively superior in all respects, but it does show that inclusion becomes more credible and more effective where access, coordination, and participation are linked within a broader governance framework.

Within this comparative landscape, the Republic of Moldova appears as an emerging case of programmatic inclusion. The recent draft programmes examined do not yet constitute a fully consolidated inclusion architecture, but they do indicate an important conceptual shift. Inclusion is increasingly framed not only in relation to basic service provision, but also in relation to institutional resilience, governance capacity, European alignment, and regional security pressures (Government of the Republic of Moldova, 2025; Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova, 2025). This is analytically significant because it suggests that Moldova is beginning to move from a narrow social-policy understanding of inclusion toward a broader strategic one. The Moldovan case is therefore relevant not as a finished model, but as a case of institutional transition in which the stabilizing logic of inclusion is becoming more explicit at the policy level.

To make the comparative argument more explicit, Table 1 synthesizes the main documentary findings on the architecture of inclusion and its stability-relevant effects across selected European cases and the Republic of Moldova. The comparison focuses on policy scope, institutional coordination, legal security, sectoral domains of inclusion, cultural recognition, civic participation, and the documented or anticipated implications for cohesion and stability. The table does not claim exhaustive equivalence of cases; rather, it serves as a structured analytical device for identifying broader patterns in the relationship between inclusion, resilience, and fragmentation.

Before presenting the comparative grid, it is necessary to underline that the relevance of comparison in this article lies less in ranking national models than in clarifying the institutional conditions under which inclusion acquires stabilizing effects. The cases selected for discussion illustrate different ways in which inclusion is embedded in governance structures, legal regimes, and sectoral policy arrangements. What emerges from the analysis is that inclusion cannot be reduced to isolated support measures or to declarative commitments in policy documents. Its effects depend on the coherence of the wider institutional architecture through which rights, services, participation, and recognition are organized and made accessible.

A comparative synthesis is therefore useful because it makes visible the differences between more consolidated and more fragmented frameworks, while also showing that policy effectiveness depends on coordination, implementation capacity, and continuity over time.

In this sense, the table below should be read as a structured analytical instrument designed to capture broader patterns in the relationship between inclusion, resilience, and stability across different European settings and the Republic of Moldova.

Table 1. Document-based comparative grid of inclusion architecture and stability-relevant effects

Indicator	Germany	Sweden	France	Eastern European states	Republic of Moldova
Policy design	Comprehensive multi-domain strategy	Mainstreamed integration with targeted support	Universal access with targeted post-2015 measures	Uneven or partial frameworks	Emerging multi-domain programmes
Institutional coordination	Strong federal coordination and monitoring	Mainstream coordination with labour-market focus	Multi-level national-local coordination	Fragmented, with limited strategic coherence	Programme-based coordination with action plans
Legal security and access	Structured inclusion linked to residence status	Residence-based access with targeted support	Documented migrants and refugees prioritized	Narrow, status-based access	Focus on foreigners and displaced persons
Socio-economic inclusion	Strong emphasis on education and employment	Language learning, civic orientation, rapid employment	Universal services with targeted refugee support	Uneven provision, especially in training and education	Labour-market measures and vulnerability-sensitive social support
Recognition and participation	Present but uneven across levels	Stronger participation environment	Local cohesion and participation measures	Weaker participation and limited consultative mechanisms	Early-stage inclusion agenda with cohesion objectives
Stability-related effects	Stronger inclusion infrastructure through coordination and monitoring	Broad participation supports cohesion	Local measures reduce isolation and strengthen interaction	Weak monitoring and fragmented policies increase cohesion risks	Inclusion framed as part of resilience and stabilization

Source. Compiled by the authors based on EU country integration overviews, OECD (2018); Solano & Huddleston (2020); Government of the Republic of Moldova (2025); Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova (2025).

Several policy implications follow from these findings. *First*, legal security should be treated as a foundational condition of inclusion, because migration status structures access to rights, services, remedies, and long-term participation across all other domains. Where status remains precarious, vulnerability is reproduced institutionally. Predictable residence pathways, transparent regularization mechanisms, and clear long-term status rules should therefore be understood not only as instruments of migration management, but also as elements of stability infrastructure.

Second, inclusion requires integrated governance and coherent monitoring frameworks. The analysis confirms that fragmented interventions are rarely sufficient to generate durable stabilizing effects. In this respect, the European Commission's Action Plan on Integration

and Inclusion 2021–2027 is significant because it frames inclusion as a cross-sectoral, multi-level policy priority rather than as a narrow question of service access alone (European Commission, 2020). What matters is not merely the existence of measures, but their coordination across education, employment, health, housing, equality, and participation.

Third, effective inclusion depends on robust multi-level coordination. Evidence from OECD research shows that migrant integration is shaped decisively at the local level and requires stronger vertical coordination, policy coherence, and assessment tools for implementation (OECD, 2018). This implication is especially relevant for the Republic of Moldova, where emerging strategies will have limited impact unless inter-ministerial planning, municipal capacity, and evaluation mechanisms are connected more systematically.

Fourth, participation and cultural recognition should be treated as core, not peripheral, dimensions of inclusion. The MIPEX findings show that political participation remains among the weaker dimensions of integration across Europe, particularly across the East-West divide (Solano & Huddleston, 2020). At the same time, comparative work on cultural inclusion indicates that the underrepresentation of cultural dimensions weakens the overall architecture of inclusion (Malloy & Gazzola, 2006). The analysis therefore supports a broader understanding of inclusion in which belonging, recognition, and participation are integral to resilience and cohesion rather than optional normative supplements.

The study also has limitations. Because it is based on qualitative document analysis, it does not provide direct causal proof of the effects of specific inclusion policies on stability outcomes. Rather, it identifies plausible mechanisms, recurring policy patterns, and institutional conditions under which inclusion is more or less likely to produce stabilizing effects. Cross-country interpretation also remains constrained by differences in national models, policy objectives, and degrees of institutional consolidation. In the Moldovan case, the evidence is still largely programmatic, since the documents examined are recent and provide limited ex post evaluation.

Future research would benefit from combining document analysis with longitudinal and mixed-method approaches, including subnational case studies, outcome indicators, and comparative evidence on trust, participation, and resilience over time. Such work would make it possible to test more precisely the mechanisms identified here and to assess under what conditions inclusion succeeds or fails as an instrument of stability in contexts shaped by migration, insecurity, and institutional transformation.

5. Conclusions

This article has argued that social inclusion should be understood not merely as a normative aspiration of migration and diversity policies, but as a strategic condition of international stability. The analysis shows that inclusion has stabilizing value when it is institutionally grounded in legal security, equitable access to rights and services, meaningful participation, and the recognition of cultural and social difference. Under these conditions, inclusion reduces structural vulnerability, strengthens the legitimacy of public institutions, and mitigates the forms of exclusion that can deepen fragmentation and intergroup tension. Conversely, where inclusion remains fragmented, weakly coordinated, or predominantly rhetorical, its capacity to generate resilience is significantly reduced.

The article contributes to the literature in three principal ways. *First*, it clarifies that the relationship between inclusion and stability is structural rather than situational. Inclusion does not matter only in exceptional moments of crisis; it shapes, more fundamentally, the quality of governance, the distribution of vulnerability, and the conditions of coexistence in diverse societies. *Second*, the study identifies three interrelated mechanisms through which inclusion contributes to stability: human security, governance legitimacy, and minority-rights recognition. *Third*, it advances a more integrated analytical understanding of social inclusion by locating it at the intersection of rights, governance, and security, thereby moving beyond narrower approaches that treat it primarily as a social-policy objective.

The findings are particularly relevant for the Republic of Moldova and for other states confronted simultaneously with migration pressures, regional insecurity, and institutional transformation. In such contexts, inclusion should not be approached as a secondary humanitarian response or as a limited welfare issue, but as part of a broader strategy of democratic resilience and societal stability. Policies are more likely to produce durable stabilizing effects where they are coherent across sectors, supported by predictable legal frameworks, connected to effective institutional coordination, and open to meaningful participation by the groups concerned. In this sense, inclusion should be seen less as an adjunct to governance and more as one of the conditions of governance effectiveness under conditions of diversity and uncertainty.

At the same time, the study has important limitations. Because it relies on qualitative document analysis, it does not establish direct causal proof between specific inclusion measures and stability outcomes. Its contribution lies instead in identifying recurrent mechanisms, institutional patterns, and plausible relationships that help explain why inclusion may function as a stabilizing force in some contexts and not in others. Comparative interpretation is also constrained by differences in national policy models, conceptual vocabularies, and degrees of institutional consolidation. In the case of the Republic of Moldova in particular, the available evidence remains largely programmatic, since many of the national documents examined are recent and have not yet generated sufficiently robust evaluative data.

Future research should therefore move beyond documentary analysis alone and combine it with longitudinal, comparative, and mixed-method approaches capable of assessing more precisely how inclusion affects trust, participation, vulnerability, and resilience over time. Greater attention should also be given to subnational implementation, since the stabilizing effects of inclusion depend not only on national policy design, but also on institutional capacity and social interaction at the local level. Such research would make it possible to test more rigorously the argument advanced here: namely, that social inclusion is not simply a normative good, but an analytically significant and politically consequential variable in the production of stability under contemporary conditions of mobility, insecurity, and institutional change.

6. References

Bass, L. E. (2018). Social inclusion in a context of global migration - Introduction. *Societies Without Borders*, 12(2), Article 2. <https://scholarlycommons.law.case.edu/swb/vol12/iss2/2/>

Bauloz, C., Vathi, Z., & Acosta, D. (2020). Migration, inclusion and social cohesion: Challenges, recent developments and opportunities. In M. McAuliffe & B. Khadria (Eds.), *World migration*

- report 2020, (pp. 167-194). International Organization for Migration. <https://publications.iom.int/books/world-migration-report-2020-chapter-6>
- Belugina, A., Gurieva, S., & Klempe, H. (2018). Migration: From social inclusion to successful integration. *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioural Sciences*, 35, 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2018.02.19>
- Ben Brik, A., & Brown, C. T. (2024). Global trends in social inclusion and social inclusion policy: A systematic review and research agenda. *Social Policy and Society*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S147474642400054X>
- Bilgic, A. (2018). A human security perspective on migration: A compass in the perfect storm. International Institute of Social Studies. https://www.iss.nl/sites/corporate/files/2018-04/Alil%20Bilgic%20PCC%20inaugural%20lecture_12%20April%202018.pdf
- European Commission. (2020). Action plan on integration and inclusion 2021–2027 (COM(2020) 758 final). <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52020DC0758>
- Giampaolo, M., & Ianni, A. (2020). Social inclusion of migrants in the EU. CeSPI & FOCSIV. <https://gcap.global/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/Social-Inclusion-of-Migrants-in-the-EU-Focsiv-24.02.2020.pdf>
- Government of the Republic of Moldova. (2025). Programul național privind migrația și azilul pentru anii 2026–2030 [Draft government decision]. https://gov.md/sites/default/files/media/documents/sedinte-de-guvern/2025-10/NU-727-MAI-2025_0.pdf
- Häkli, J., & Peltonen, N. (2026). The European Union as a humanitarian border: The production of vulnerability in the New Pact on Migration and Asylum. *Space and Polity*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13562576.2026.2635505>
- International Organization for Migration. (2017). Integration and social cohesion: Key elements for reaping the benefits of migration [Global Compact thematic paper]. <https://www.iom.int/resources/integration-and-social-cohesion-key-elements-reaping-benefits-migration>
- Koehler, G., Cimadamore, A. D., Kiwan, F., & Monreal Gonzalez, P. M. (2020). The politics of social inclusion: Introduction. In G. Koehler, A. D. Cimadamore, F. Kiwan, & P. M. Monreal Gonzalez (Eds.), *The politics of social inclusion: Bridging knowledge and policies towards social change* (pp. 13–40). Ibidem Press. https://gripinequality.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/04/ISBN1333_x1.pdf
- Lami, B., & Kojku, A. (2025). Reframing migration: Toward a human-centered security approach. *Social Sciences*, 14(9), 530. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci14090530>
- Malloy, T. H., & Gazzola, M. (2006). The aspect of culture in the social inclusion of ethnic minorities: Evaluation of the impact of inclusion policies under the open method of co-ordination in the European Union: Assessing the cultural policies of six member states [Final report]. European Centre for Minority Issues. https://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/redakteure/publications/pdf/Report_60_OMC_Evaluation.pdf
- Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Moldova. (2025). Programul național privind integrarea etapizată a străinilor, inclusiv a persoanelor strămutate în Republica Moldova pentru perioada 2025–2027 [Draft programme]. <https://particip.gov.md/ro/document/stages/proiectul-de-hotarire-de-guvern-privind-elaborarea-mecanismului-de-integrare-etapizata-a-strainilor-inclusiv-a-persoanelor-stramutate-din-ucraina/13265>
- OECD. (2018). Working together for local integration of migrants and refugees. OECD Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264085350-en>

Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2017). Human rights of all migrants, social inclusion, cohesion and all forms of discrimination, including racism, xenophobia and intolerance [Issue brief no. 1]. United Nations. https://refugeesmigrants.un.org/sites/default/files/issue_brief_for_first_thematic_session.pdf

Solano, G., & Huddleston, T. (2020). Migrant Integration Policy Index 2020. Barcelona Centre for International Affairs & Migration Policy Group. <https://www.migpolgroup.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Solano-Giacomo-Huddleston-Thomas-2020-Migrant-Integration-Policy-Index-2020.pdf>

Spencer, S. (2006). Social Integration of Migrants in Europe: A Review of the European Literature 2000 – 2006. 28 September 2006. https://www.compas.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/ER-2006-Integration_Europe_Literature_Review_OECD.pdf

United Nations in Moldova, & Government of the Republic of Moldova. (2022). United Nations sustainable development cooperation framework: The Republic of Moldova 2023–2027. <https://moldova.un.org/en/213110-republic-moldova-united-nations-sustainable-development-cooperation-framework-2023-2027>