MACRO-LEVEL SECURITIZATION
OF MICRO-INTEGRATED THREAT PERCEPTIONS IN EUROPE:
A CASE STUDY OF REFUGEES IN TURKEY, GREECE, AND GERMANY

Mehmet Recai UYGUR[1], Fatma SEVER[2]

ABSTRACT

Before politicians used refugees as a tool of interstate relations, refugees and asylum seekers were perceived only as a symbolic or realist threat in social perception. With the use of refugees as a tool of international politics, the phenomenon of threats felt in society has deepened with securitization and started to pose threats to human security. This dialectical relationship between society and the state also changes and transforms the direction and form of the threat. The study will investigate how symbolic or realistic threat perceptions in the public have evolved into securitization by governments, how these two phenomena strengthen each other, and what they mean in terms of human security. The quantitative data used in this study will be explained with integrated threat and securitization theories. This study aims to examine the variations in threat perceptions associated with refugees in Europe, employing an integrated threat theory framework. The focus will be on investigating questions such as "What types of threats are attributed to the presence of refugees and asylum seekers in European countries?" and "What factors contribute to the divergence in perceived threats?". Furthermore, the study will explore the implications of these divergent threat perceptions on national and regional migration governance within each country. This paper will focus on the refugee crisis and examine the cases of Turkey, Greece, and Germany, which are mainly on the refugee transit route and host the largest number of refugees in Europe. In order to describe which threat perception has a decisive impact on Europe, the 7th wave (2017-2020) datasets provided by the "World Values Survey (WVS)" from 2010-2022 will be examined in comparison with previous waves. The cases of Germany, Turkey, and Greece in these datasets will be the main focus of the study.

[1] Senior Researcher, SMK University of Applied Sciences, Vilnius, Lithuania. E-mail: mehmetrecai.uygur@smk.lt, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1872-0885.

[2] Researcher, SMK University of Applied Sciences, Vilnius, Lithuania. E-mail: fatma.seveerr@gmail.com, https://orcid.org/0009-0000-8003-4996.

Introduction

Just as many international relations researchers benefit from interdisciplinary studies and theories, other disciplines and theories have an important role in the formation and development of international relations literature. Thus, the leading theories such as realism, liberalism, social constructivism, and critical theory were adapted from other disciplines such as political science and sociology. Reshaping theories based on different disciplines in international relations and presenting them as part of the discipline of international relations may have caused these theories to remain superficial and incomprehensible. However, theories are inherently interdisciplinary. There are two important reasons why we started this study with such an explanation: first, a theory that is not very familiar to the international relations literature is used in this study, and second, in this article, we did not attempt to transform the theory we used into an international relations discipline. Another innovation in this study is that two theories used by different disciplines are presented as complementary to each other. Thus, our conclusion is that researchers may consider theories not as paradigm that need to be adapted to another field but as complementary approaches. Every new theory rises on the foundations of another theory or theories; this is how science progresses.

Many studies on the securitization of migration have been handled only on the axis of the securitization approach, and the theoretical background of the threat phenomenon has been ignored in the studies (Ünal-Eriş and Öner 2021; Topulli 2016; Sweet 2017; Huysmans 2000; Wennerhed 2016). In other studies on the securitization of migration, the concept of "security threat" was frequently used, and most of these studies still use only the securitization approach (Ceccorulli 2009). The concept of security threat, in our opinion, is a concept that contains ambiguity because insecurity is a natural consequence of the threat phenomenon. There is a diversity of security as well as a diversity of threats in social life. The facts of life safety and threats to life are related. It will be more enlightening to consider different theoretical approaches in order to make the threat-security relationship more significant and dispose of the ambiguity of the concept of "security threat".

In the international migration literature, theoretical studies related to migration in national and international contexts are extremely limited. In other words, no studies have been found that examine the phenomenon of migration together with theoretical studies at the micro and macro levels. Thus, this study aims to expose this gap in the literature. One of the theoretical approaches discussed in the study is the Integrated Threat Theory, frequently used in social psychology. The theoretical framework of this study is based on the Integrated Threat Theory, which examines issues and the state of affairs at the micro level

(in a national or societal context), and the Securitization Theory at the macro level. Securitization Theory investigates issues and social phenomena at the macro level in the critical security approach. Therefore, in this sense, it is important that the phenomenon of migration, which affects humanity in all its aspects, be handled from a multidisciplinary perspective in this study. Hence, migration includes a process starting from the relationship of a person with another person to the relationship of a state with another state. Migration does not only define human relations. Other phenomena, such as nature and climate, can also be mentioned within the scope of migration, so much so that the phenomenon of climate refugees has found a considerable area in the academic literature.

In this study, we will examine the origins of the unrest and insecurity built into society as a result of migration. The main factors that make it difficult for people to live together with outsiders or strangers will be investigated. There are numerous studies on xenophobia in the social sciences, especially in the political science. The number of studies emphasising the importance of the human-society-state dialectical relationship underlying xenophobia is extremely low. As stated at the beginning of the study, each approach is an extension of the previous. Therefore, as the main argument of this study, we argue that the basis of xenophobia is the securitization of the out-group and, accordingly, the construction of the perception of threat against the out-group. These phenomena are like the links of a chain that are tightly connected to each other. The formula "securitization => Integrated Threat => xenophobia" is a metaphorical situation with the epidemic phenomenon that started at the national level and became an international problem.

In this article, it will be discussed how the securitization processes of asylum seekers or refugees progress, how the securitized segment becomes a threat to the social base, and the international effects of this. The migration wave that started with the Arab Spring in the Middle East is about to enter its 12th year on the day this article was written. In this process, there were approximately 3.5 million Syrian refugees as of September 2022 in Turkey, the country most affected by migration movements (Mülteciler Derneği 2022). The mild climate created by the guest-host approach in the first years of migration began to give way to social tension as the number of refugees increased over time. The desecuritization process for asylum seekers applied for by the government failed due to the increasing number of them. The actions of opposition parties and several non-governmental organisations aimed at securitizing refugees widened their impact, and the anti-democratic tendencies that increased with the economic crisis caused the deepening of dark scenarios for an uncertain future. In the shadow of all these issues, the securitization process became even more intense. In this process, asylum seekers became a security problem and took a place in society as a threat object.

Being an object of threat in a foreign country is an extremely dangerous situation. Feeling this deeply, the asylum seekers sought ways to leave Turkey. This tendency of the refugees has mobilised the countries of the European Union, and they have started to seek solutions for Turkey to keep the refugees within its borders. Realising that the asylum seekers are creating a kind of uneasiness in Europe, the Turkish government did not hesitate to use this phenomenon as a political manoeuvring tool. The statements of the President of Turkey that "We will open the borders" are examples of the securitization of asylum seekers not only at the micro level but also at the international level. With this securitization, it has been observed that the perceived threat of European Union citizens, even if they are not in intense contact with asylum seekers, has increased. Anti-propaganda against foreigners was extremely popular during the Brexit process. The pro-Brexit government, arguing that foreigners can easily come to the country, especially the propaganda that Turkey is close to signing the Schengen agreement and that they will invade England as a result, has been the propaganda that convinced British society to exit from the European Union. It has been repeatedly stated that if the UK does not leave the EU, it will face an influx of Muslim immigrants and a radical Islamist threat. The following statements are included in the propaganda:

> "The birth rate in Turkey is so high that in just eight years, one million people from Turkey could join the UK population. Turkey's accession to the Union will not only put pressure on public services but will also pose a threat to the UK's national security. The crime rate in Turkey is much higher than in England. Gun saving is much more common. Due to the EU's free movement laws, the government will not be able to prevent Turkish criminals from entering the UK" (Aras and Gunar 2017).

With ready-made data sets for Turkey, Germany, and Greece, we will try to construct a relevant framework in this study to comprehend what all these components signify. Thus, the paper will review the literature on the integrated threat and Securitization Theory and briefly discuss these theories using these WVS-based datasets. Also, comparative data analysis methods will be used in the study. This study will use the qualitative research method but also benefit from comparing quantitative data from the 7th wave (2017-2020) datasets provided by the "World Values Survey (WVS)" with previous waves.

The Conceptual and Theoretical Framework

In this study, which focuses on the phenomenon of human security, the concepts of security, human security, migration, immigration, and refugees will be briefly explained. In addition, we believe that it would be useful to briefly examine the concepts of prejudice and discrimination, which are socio-

psychological phenomena, to better understand the relationship between security and migration.

Security and Human Security

Security indicates order and predictability in dealing with other people. The concept of security is closely related to a conflict-free environment, society, and state; it explains the "peace" situation (Brauch 2008, 2). Traditional security concepts suggest a person living alone, like Robinson Crusoe, is safe until another person, such as Friday, arrives (Jackson-Peer 2011, 15). This viewpoint assumes dangers from nature are predictable, unlike human interactions, which can be uncertain and lead to mutual insecurity.

These dynamics also apply on a larger scale to societies and states created from individual interactions. When two people interact, concepts like politics, rules, and group behaviour emerge. This interaction could result in cooperation or conflict, leading to the creation of rules and discipline within a group. Those breaking these rules may be excluded from the group, indicating a parallel between how individuals and states behave. Individuals, societies, and states all interact in similar ways, negotiating security concerns and rules of conduct.

The behaviour of a state that will be alone in the international system cannot produce the same results as the behaviour of a state that shares the international system with other states. Security, explained through the process starting with the individual and progressing to the formation of the state, is not a transferable phenomenon from one level to another but an affecting phenomenon. To put it more clearly, individuals do not enter into absolute security by transferring their sense of insecurity or situation to the higher authorities (family, tribe, and state) they have created. While security was previously only about individuals, when a higher authority was created, it became the subject of both individuals and authorities. These phenomena are handled at the unit level in the international relations literature. As the domain of security expands, the focus begins to shift. Although there is no agreed explanation of what security is in different theoretical approaches, there is a general view that security means being free from threats to fundamental values (Baylis 2008, 73). However, according to John Baylis (2008), there is no consensus on which unit level the focus of security will be (73). This distinction leads us to traditional and critical security theories. In this context, we will explain human security factors without mentioning traditional security approaches.

After the two world wars in which humanity suffered heavy losses and the cold war with great tension, the understanding of security based on soldiers, weapons, and the survival of the state began to be questioned. Discourses and

arguments that security is not limited to a narrow area based on national interests but that security has social and environmental dimensions have begun to find supporters both theoretically and practically. The permanence of a state's power in the international system, which leaves its citizens in misery and hunger because it spends a large part of its economic resources to protect the borders of the country, is not a very realistic situation. In a system where human values are ignored and the greed for power is at a high level, the duration of national security is only as long as a person's life. With the new understanding of security, the framework of national security has also begun to change. National security has started to be a phenomenon that can be ensured not only by foreign political moves and military power demonstrations but also by maintaining superior democratic norms and values.

At the centre of the changing perception of security is the changing understanding of national security. The concept of national security covers all the combinations of a country's domestic and foreign policies. It covers not only issues such as national security, peace, welfare, health, and environment within the country but also stability, health, environment, political relations, and law in foreign lands. In short, national security is the coverage of all sectors of security, both at the national and international levels. As can be understood from this, states are responsible for human security not only within their borders but also beyond them.

Human security primarily refers to the state of being free from chronic threats such as hunger and disease. However, all kinds of dangers that people may encounter at home, at work, or in the community can also be the subject of human safety. Threats, especially those faced by developing countries, such as mass migration, epidemics, poverty, inter-communal conflicts, development problems, unemployment, the arms trade, a lack of education, and the exploitation of women and children, can be evaluated within the scope of human security.

Human security was formally conceptualized for the first time in the Human Development Report published by the United Nations Development Programme in 1994 (UNDP 1994). The seven principles of human security, which were included in the United Nations Development Programme in 1994, are in parallel with the five sectors of security identified by Barry Buzan, one of the leading names in the Critical Security Approach. Buzan divides security into five basic sectors in his 1983 work called "People, States, and Fear". This step, which goes beyond the narrow patterns of traditional security understanding, has also attracted the attention of the United Nations at the international level. The security sectors that Buzan put forward are Military Security, Political Security, Societal Security, Economic Security, and Environmental Safety (Buzan 1983).

Migration and its Perception: Prejudice and Discrimination

Migration can be briefly defined as an individual or mass movement of people from one region to another for various reasons (Karpat 2010, 71). When the phenomenon of migration, defined as a simple human movement at the most basic level, is handled with an in-depth perspective, it will be seen that it includes complex processes and networks of relations. In order to analyse this complexity, it is important to consider many phenomena together and establish relationships between them. In general, immigrants, including permanent or temporary migrants, are considered rational to improve their living conditions. A few of the phenomena that need to be associated are the current political, environmental, and economic situations, religious and ethnic identities that reveal various aspects of human life, economic understanding, and cultural forms (Porumbescu 2016, 66; Baker and Tsuda 2015, 8). In light of these facts, migration can be handled at two basic levels: voluntary and compulsory. The problematic aspect of migration is that it mostly occurs by force. Forced migrations are generally massive migrations with international impact (Hazan 2012, 6). Political and social facts briefly mentioned at the entrance play an active role in forced migrations or refugee movements. However, there are aspects of migration that have different meanings. For example, it is mentioned about immigration cases that they are not for production but for consumption and that they do not make the immigrant or refugee feel like a refugee. These people are generally wealthy in terms of financial means, settle in places they go temporarily or permanently, and tend to create a new lifestyle for themselves (Benson and O'Reilly 2016).

The UN "Convention on the Legal Situation of Refugees" (adopted July 28, 1951), in other words, the 1951 Geneva Convention, states that a person living in a country where there is a war-conflict situation or where the person does not feel politically and socially safe deals with the individual's opportunities to seek asylum in another country. There are several situations that distinguish refugee status from other immigrant statuses. First, refugees are people who have to leave their areas unintentionally due to various concerns. Second, refugees have a strong expectation that they will be able to benefit from international protections. Third, refugees return to the country they had to leave when the war or conflict ends or when conditions become favourable (UN OHCHR 1951). So, in International Law, a refugee is a person or group who is threatened or forced to leave their country of origin as a result of religious, ethnic, ideological, or political pressures (UN OHCHR 1951).

Prejudice refers to the situation where a person or people belonging to a certain social class, individually or collectively, positively or negatively, have a prior judgement against other groups or individuals (Gudykunst 2015, 145).

Although prejudices can be both positive and negative, the general opinion is that prejudices are negative. Allport defines prejudice as an erroneous and inflexible dislike (Allport 1954, 9). In this definition of Allport, it is emphasised that prejudice is a thought pattern that is generally placed on the wrong grounds. Prejudices, which are fed by in-group members towards their out-groups and often contain unfounded opinions, are thought patterns that cause discrimination between individuals and societies. Based on prejudices, it is stated that there are stereotypes that unwittingly affect the decision-making and behaviour processes of individuals (İlhan and Çevik 2003, 54). In that case, it can be said that discrimination arises from prejudices, while prejudices arise as a result of stereotypes.

Discrimination is the process of pouring prejudices into behaviours (Driedger and Mezoff 1981). Defining prejudice as a categorization devoid of legitimate grounds, Francis explains discrimination as different forms of behaviour that are not legitimate in this direction. (Driedger and Mezoff 1981). What is meant here is illegitimate behaviour that is caused by unfounded thoughts that arise as a natural consequence of in-group membership. The group structures in which discrimination occurs in its most severe form are religious, ideological, and ethnic because ethnic, religious, and ideological groups are those that have existed for thousands of years (Hogg 1997, 6). It is expected that stereotypical attitudes will be more evident in such deep-rooted group structures. This naturally leads to prejudices and the othering of the out-group, which is its behavioural derivative.

The securitization and integrated threat theories used in this study will be explained separately, and the significant relationship between these two theories will be examined through data sets in the continuation of the study.

Integrated Threat Theory

There are certain conditions for an integrated threat to occur in society. First of all, the existence of a settled society is necessary. In nomadic societies, it is not possible to speak of an integrated threat. Realist and symbolic threats, as elements of the integrated threat, necessitate a settled society. A second situation is when a foreign group, uncertain about how long the hospitality processes will last, begins to mix with the settled society. A third element is that the political elites emphasise that foreign groups coming to the country can pose a danger. And finally, the situation where the foreign group gives the impression that they would never leave the country they entered. All these facts are sufficient to initiate an integrated threat in society. In the integrated threat process, it does not matter whether the group that feels the threat is a dominant group or not. Foreigners coming to the country may be victims or

weak people fleeing the war. However, this situation does not prevent the emergence of the threat phenomenon.

In light of all these considerations, it is important to present the theoretical framework of the integrated threat. Culture is the main inclusive and determining element of intergroup relations that emerged as a result of the classifications that have been formed and developed throughout the history of humanity. While power and talent were the determining factors in the primitive ages, culture took over this mission over time. Thus, groups with different cultural backgrounds begin to perceive other groups as a threat to their own culture. One of the biggest consequences of perceiving other groups as a threat is that it leads to prejudice (Esses, Haddock, and Zanna 1993). Threat theory, in its most general expression, focuses on the situation where one group sees the existence of another group as a threat to itself. As mentioned above, refugees are the "other" of the societies they migrated to; in other words, they are their outer groups. Settled societies may see this new immigrant community as a threat that feeds on their prejudices against them (Hilton and von Hippel 1996).

Prejudices and attitudes occur against the group in question, regardless of whether they have sufficient information about the out-group at the individual or group level. This situation draws on the roadmap of the Integrated Threat Theory. The integrated threat theory, first introduced by Walter G. Stephan in 2000 and later modelled after Thomas F. Pettigrew's Intergroup Communication Theory, which focused on the conditions that develop and change intergroup relationships, focused on the conditions that lead to perceptions of threat among groups (Wagner et al. 2008). Four basic types of threats have been identified as determinants of attitudes towards out-groups. These are realistic threats, symbolic threats, negative stereotypes, and intergroup anxiety. In this study, only the concepts of realistic and symbolic threats will be discussed.

Realist Threat

The threats that people perceive in the outside world are extremely diverse. The diversity of sources of detected threats also complicates the resolution of problems without any classification. The realist threat approach is one of the classifications of the integrated threat theory. Generally, threats arising from materially measurable phenomena felt towards the out-group are called realist threats (Stephan, Ybarra, and Morrison 2009). The individual may feel threatened by the group's welfare, the group's resources, or the group's power. These threats are felt at the social/group or national levels. The perception that foreign groups will put the country in a weak position in the international system is a realistic threat perception at the group level. However, the person feels the main threat at the individual level. According to the realistic threat approach, the threats

perceived by the individual towards the economy, health, and education opportunities are realistic (Stephan Ybarra, and Morrison 2009). Settled communities may feel that refugees or asylum seekers are taking away their job opportunities; they may think that refugees have free access to healthcare and education services; and as a result, they may assume that refugees or asylum seekers reduce the welfare of the country. All these phenomena can be classified under the name realistic threat. Stephan and Mealy describe intra-group, regional, political, and economic threats and threats with the potential to cause physical harm as realistic threats (Stephan and Mealy 2012).

Symbolic Threat

Symbolic threats, as in realist threats, are perceived at two different levels, again for groups and individuals. A symbolic threat to the group refers to threats to the religion, values, beliefs, ideology, and worldview of the group. The individual symbolic threat, on the other hand, refers to threats to the self-esteem, self-identity, or dignity of the individual (Leighton 2012). Out-groups with a different worldview may be viewed by the in-group as a threat to their cultural identity. New norms, beliefs, and symbols can be thought of as the opposite of values, leading to fears that other cultures will override the group's way of life. Sometimes, even not seeing them as supportive is enough to perceive them as a threat within the group (Stephan, Diaz-Loving, and Duran 2000). Even though foreigners continue to exist as a small minority in society, their conscious coexistence and solidarity cause uneasiness and anxiety among the local people with different traditions and cultures. The masses of people remaining in uncertainty begin to produce delusions and dark scenarios. Organisation among foreigners can be seen as a potential threat to acting together with solidarity and minority psychology.

An integrated threat to the out-group, whether arising from symbolic or realist threats, contains the possibility of great conflict in the long run. The result of these perceived threats is more than just chronic xenophobia, because xenophobia is not the last stage of hatred or unwillingness. As stated in realist thought, people have the potential to resort to any means to feel completely safe. This is one of the basic elements underlying many ethnic, ideological, or religious conflicts in history.

Securitization

Securitization in social relations is a visible phenomenon in all dimensions. The effort of parents who prepare their children for life to teach what is dangerous and what is safe is a simple example of the process of securitization

and desecuritization. There are a few ways to explain to a young child how dangerous a burning stove full of wood is. So, parents do not tell their children that the stove is a heater; instead, they try to explain that the stove can burn them. Children must reach a certain level of maturity to understand that the stove is a heater. After these, the process of desecuritization of the stove object begins. This is how the processes of securitization and desecuritization work in social phenomena. Securitization is classified under the Copenhagen School of Critical Security Approaches. Ole Wæver, Barry Buzan, and Jaap De Wilde, who are the leading names of the Copenhagen School, state that certain conditions must be met for securitization to take place. The first of these is the act of speech. Speech acts are actions performed by political elites or decision-makers that target a specific object (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998). Decision-makers define problems as part of the security agenda, resulting in the practice of constructing security threats through discourse (Buzan, Wæver, and de Wilde 1998). The Copenhagen School focuses on how the discourse framing is constructed rather than questioning whether a problem is a "real security threat". Another necessary element for the construction of securitization is acceptance by the target audience. In other words, the existence of a mass that will accept or be convinced of the speech acts of the political elite is necessary. For securitization to take place, the existence of an object that can be presented as a threat and the fact that the legal authorities assert this threat are also important. The issue and phenomenon, which are the subject of securitization, appear to be an existential threat at the state level. Once securitization takes place, it will also enable the government to take extraordinary measures because there will be no mechanism to criticise or prevent any measure from being taken against a phenomenon seen as a survival problem. In light of the speech-act approach, policy-making processes take place at three different levels. Accordingly, issues are classified according to their severity as non-politicised, politicised, and securitized (Hisarlıoğlu 2019). The desecuritization process, on the other hand, starts with the reverse operation of this process.

Securitization does not begin with the speech act alone, as the Copenhagen School representatives argue. Didier Bigo, the leading name of the Paris School, states that securitization can be built over time with control mechanisms. Bigo explains the situation as follows: "The state wants to deal with individual security and expand the concept of public order. ...Control and surveillance technologies and new knowledge in the social sciences strengthen this pressure to maximise security, to activate political power, and to carry out the policy of life, in which the reproduction of life is more important for the government rather than producing death" (Bigo 2000). The surveillance mechanisms that the state has placed in society are the very process of securitization that settles in the subconscious of society over time. For example, a wall built on its border

is as effective an act as a speech act in the construction process of securitization. In this study, while we can see the arguments of the Copenhagen School in Turkey, we can also see the securitization phenomenon, which can be explained by the approaches of the Paris School in Germany.

From Securitization to Integrated Threat in Europe: The Findings from the World Values Survey

In order to understand the macro-level securitization of European public perception of refugees and immigrants, the paper has examined the WVS-based datasets through the Integrated Threat Theory. Since we aim to show the gap by doing due diligence rather than hypothesis testing, the WVS items, which are explanatory for the Integrated Threat Theory, have been examined descriptively. In this regard, the samples of the articles are from Greece (2017), Germany (2018), and Turkey (2018). Accordingly, the paper mainly considers the WVS Wave 7, which was conducted on 1,528 cases in Germany, 1200 cases in Greece, and 2415 cases in Turkey. The article also controls the demographic variables for which the WVS provided the nationally representative survey for the population (Inglehart et al. 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Haerpfer et al. 2022).

Table 1: Q262 – Age

	Total	Germany	Greece	Turkey
Up to 29	22.8% (1,170)	16.20%	17.50%	29.50%
30-49	38.7% (1,990)	30.80%	36.10%	45.00%
50 and more	38.5% (1,982)	52.90%	46.40%	25.50%
(N)	5143	1,528	1,200	2415
Mean	44.77	50.8	49.05	38.83
Std Dev.	16.81	18.09	18.32	12.67

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

According to Table 1, the mean age of respondents in Germany is 50.8, 49.05 in Greece, and 38.83 in Turkey. In addition, the gender distribution among these respondents was made to be equal. Another significant variable is whether these respondents are immigrants or have a family member who is. According to the WVS data, approximately 90% of respondents are non-immigrants and do not have immigrant parents (Inglehart et al. 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Haerpfer et al. 2022).

Findings on the Symbolic Threat

In order to understand whether there is a perception of immigrants as a symbolic threat, three main items were examined. In this context, "Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbours? Immigrants/foreign workers? (Table 2)", "What have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?, "Strengthen cultural diversity (Table 3)", "What have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?, and "Lead to social conflict (Table 4)" questions were examined for three countries (Haerpfer et al. 2022, 4).

Table 2: Q21 – Immigrants/foreign workers

Country	Mentioned	Not mentioned	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	3.90%	95.70%	0.30%	0.10%	1528
Greece	25.70%	73.90%	0.10%	0.30%	1200
Turkey	48.10%	49.20%	2.40%	0.30%	2415
Total	29.7% (1,530)	68.8% (3,539)	1.2% (63)	0.2% (11)	5143

On this list are various groups of people. Could you please mention any that you would not like to have as neighbours? Immigrants/foreign workers

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

As in the social distance scale, how the respondents react to being in the same neighbourhood with a different group member as a neighbour, such as an immigrant, is an important item for symbolic threat. Thus, the survey question about whether they want immigrants/foreign workers as their neighbours has been examined. According to the Wave 7 data, although 48.10% of the participants in Turkey mentioned that they do not want immigrants, the majority in Germany and Greece stated that there would be no problem living with immigrants in the same neighbourhood. Additionally, when Wave 6, Wave 5, and Wave 4 are examined for the same question, the rate of not wanting immigrant neighbours has steadily increased in Turkey (from 39% to 48%) and Greece (from 14% to 26%). Conversely, there was no fluctuation in the data of the respondents in Germany between 1999 and 2022.

Table 3: Q123 - Immigration in your country: Strengthens cultural diversity

Country	Disagree	Hard to say	Agree	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	21.30%	7.70%	68.50%	2.40%	0.30%	1528
Greece	33.10%	15.70%	46.00%	4.70%	0.50%	1200
Turkey	39.60%	25.80%	30.70%	2.90%	0.90%	2415
Total	32.6% (1,679)	18.1% (929)	45.5% (2,340)	3.2% (164)	0.6% (31)	5143

From your point of view, what have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?: Strengthen cultural diversity

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

In the overall picture, the mean effect of immigrants on cultural diversity is positive. Although the respondents seem to indicate that refugees/migrants strengthen cultural diversity, the disagreement rates for the Greece and Turkey samples are high. As seen in Table 2, 68.5% of the respondents in Germany agree, and 39.6% of the participants in Turkey disagree with this item. At first glance, there is no significant relationship between the symbolic threat and the items in Table 3. Table 4 shows a dilemma for symbolic threat perception.

Table 4: Q129 – Immigration in your country: Leads to social conflict

Country	Disagree	Hard to say	Agree	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	9.60%	6.70%	82.00%	1.60%	0.10%	1528
Greece	19.60%	20.30%	57.00%	2.70%	0.50%	1200
Turkey	11.00%	23.60%	61.80%	2.80%	0.80%	2415
Total	12.6% (648)	17.8% (916)	66.7% (3,429)	2.4% (123)	0.5% (27)	5143

From your point of view, what have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?: Lead to social conflict

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

In Table 4, the last item examined for symbolic threat indicates the responses to whether the immigrants in their countries lead to social conflict. The survey results for this item seem considerably different from tables 2 and 3. Unlike Tables 2 and 3, Greece and 61.80% of those in Turkey stated that

immigrants lead to social conflict. Thus, Table 4 shows that even though the individual symbolic threat perceptions vary, the intergroup symbolic threat perception is high in all three samples. Although the participants did not specify threat perception in the other two items, this situation changed radically in Table 4.

Findings on the Realistic Threat

Table 5: Q34_3 – Jobs scarce: Employers should give priority to (nation) people than immigrants (3-point scale)

Country	Agree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	27.10%	53.90%	17.70%	0.70%	0.60%	1528
Greece	70.50%	15.20%	13.70%	0.50%	-	1200
Turkey	63.80%	15.60%	18.50%	1.80%	0.30%	2415
Total	54.5% (2,802)	26.9% (1,383)	17.1% (882)	1.2% (60)	0.3% (17)	5143

Do you agree, disagree or neither agree nor disagree with the following statements? When jobs are scarce, employers should give priority to people of this country over immigrants.

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

In particular, it has been observed that some contradictory results have emerged in some countries regarding the symbolic threat. While the belief that refugees increase cultural diversity is extremely strong, the opinion that refugees can cause social conflict is equally strong. The contradiction here is explainable. When the participants were presented with positive statements, such as increasing cultural richness, their responses to these statements were also positive. However, the number of participants who stated that social conflict could occur was higher. The negativity caused by the word conflict, which is at the core of the problem, had a direct impact on the formation of a symbolic threat perception among the participants.

According to Table 5, there is a different situation in the questions that can be considered in the realist threat category of the research. Germany, which is in better economic condition than Turkey and Greece, felt fewer threats to the economy. Agreeing with the idea that "employers should give priority to their own citizens rather than immigrants" remained at the level of 27.10% in

Germany. The level of agreement with this opinion was 70.5% in Greece and 63.80% in Turkey. The size of the threat felt by these two countries, which have low economic welfare levels compared to Germany, is high. In Table 6, this situation follows a similar course. While the perception that citizens should be given priority decreased from 50% to 29% in Germany over the years, it remained at around 70% in Greece and 65% in Turkey.

Table 6: Q34 – Time Series

	Greece			Germany			Turkey		
	1999-2004	2005-2009	2017-2022	1999-2004	2005-2009	2017-2022	1999-2004	2005-2009	2017-2022
Agree	77%	71%	71%	56%	50%	29%	65%	64%	64%
Disagree	13%	21%	15%	29%	30%	49%	26%	25%	16%
Neither	9%	7%	14%	11%	16%	20%	7%	7%	19%
No answer	0%	1%	-	1%	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%
Don´t know	1%	-	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%
(N)	1,142	1,498	1,200	2,036	4,102	3,706	4,607	3,672	2,415

Source: Inglehart et al. 2014a, 2014b, 2014c; Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany, Greece, Turkey (1999-2018).

Table 7: Q121 – Impact of immigrants on the development of the country

Country	Rather bad	Quite bad	Neither good, nor bad	Quite good	Very good	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	5.40%	25.10%	40.50%	24.10%	2.80%	1.60%	0.50%	1528
Greece	17.60%	29.80%	35.30%	13.90%	2.20%	0.90%	0.40%	1200
Turkey	26.40%	36.00%	26.70%	7.00%	1.20%	2.00%	0.70%	2415
Total	18.1% (931)	31.3% (1,611)	32.8% (1,688)	13.7% (704)	1.9% (98)	1.6% (83)	0.6% (29)	5143

Now we would like to know your opinion about the people from other countries who come to live in [your country] - the immigrants. How would you evaluate the impact of these people on the development of [your country]?

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

In Table 7, the rate of respondents who answered the question "How do refugees affect the development of the country?" as "bad" in Germany remained around 30.5%, while this rate was 47.30% in Greece and 62.40% in Turkey. In Germany, the opinion of the participants that refugees negatively affect the development of the country was low. However, there is an opinion that refugees in Greece and Turkey, which are economically behind Germany, negatively affect the development of the countries. Although this rate is below 50% in Greece, it is obvious that there is a scapegoat search that can be shown as the cause of the economic crisis and unemployment. The underlying phenomenon of this search is a perceived realistic threat. The reasons for this extremely high rate of 62.40% in Turkey are historical, sociological, and economic. The economic crisis that broke out with the increasing number of asylum seekers in Turkey had a great impact on Turkish citizens' perception of the outside group as a threat. The fact that a Turkish citizen who has difficulty finding a job thinks that there are 3.5 million asylum seekers in his country and that they are employed in some way makes the dimensions of the threat felt deeply.

Table 8: Q122 – Immigration in your country: Fills useful jobs in the workforce

Country	Disagree	Hard to say	Agree	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	34.80%	12.80%	50.00%	2.40%	0.10%	1528
Greece	39.80%	20.70%	36.60%	2.80%	0.10%	1200
Turkey	45.30%	27.20%	23.50%	3.40%	0.60%	2415
Total	40.9% (2,101)	21.4% (1,101)	34.4% (1,771)	2.9% (151)	0.4% (18)	5143

From your point of view, what have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?: Fill useful jobs in the workforce

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

According to Pratto, Sidanius, and Levin (2006), members of dominant social groups receive a disproportionate share of positive social value from desirable material assets such as political power, wealth, private protection (private security service), plentiful food and decent housing, health care, leisure, and access to education, and they tend to take advantage of symbolic resources. Negative social values, such as non-standard housing, illness, underemployment, dangerous and disgusting work, disproportionate punishment, stigma, and slander, are disproportionately left or coerced on members of subgroups (Pratto, Sidanius, and Levin 2006, 272). With these explanations made by Pratto, Sidanius, and Levin the data in Table 8 becomes

more meaningful. The positive response to the argument that "refugees are doing useful work in the country" was seen as 50% in Germany. In Greece, the number of participants who responded positively to this argument, or, in other words, who agreed with it, remained at a low level of 36.6%, while in Turkey it was 23.50%. Greece and Turkey, which see refugees as a threat economically, have high perceptions of refugees doing useless work. This situation is understandable because those who think that refugees are doing useful work will not think that they harm the development of the country. The data in Table 8 supports Table 7.

<div align="center">Table 9: Q124 – Immigration in your country:
Increases the crime rate</div>

Country	Disagree	Hard to say	Agree	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	24.%7	12.1%	60.8%	2.2%	0.%3	1528
Greece	15.3%	17.4%	66.8%	0.4%	0.1%	1200
Turkey	13.9%	21.5%	61.2%	2.9%	0.6%	2415
Total	17.4% (896)	17.8% (913)	62.4% (3,207)	2.1% (108)	0.4% (19)	5143

From your point of view, what have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?: Increase the crime rate

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

The perceptions of an increase in the crime rate, which can be seen in coordination with the symbolic threat, are very striking in this table. According to the data in Table 9, the perception that immigrants increase the crime rate is around 60% high in all three countries. We observe that in Germany (where the perception that immigrants do useful jobs in the country, the perception that immigrants do not negatively affect the development of the country, and the perception that immigrants should not be treated as second-class people in recruitment are high), the perception that immigrants increase the crime rate (Table 9) and cause social conflict (Table 4) is extremely high.

Table 10: Q126 – Immigration in your country:
Increases the risks of terrorism

Country	Disagree	Hard to say	Agree	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	24.80%	8.70%	64.50%	1.80%	0.20%	1528
Greece	16.80%	18.10%	63.90%	1.20%	0.10%	1200
Turkey	13.10%	22.50%	60.50%	2.90%	1.00%	2415
Total	17.4% (897)	17.4% (895)	62.4% (3,212)	2.2% (113)	0.5% (27)	5143

From your point of view, what have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?: Increase the risks of terrorism

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

The data in Table 9 and the data in Table 10 show great similarity. It has been revealed that the perception that immigrants increase the risk of terrorism is similar and high in all three countries. Although the threat felt in Germany did not appear to be significant economically, it is clear that the threat felt in Germany politically and socially is high.

Table 11: Q128 – Immigration in your country:
Increases unemployment

Country	Disagree	Hard to say	Agree	Do not know	No answer	(N)
Germany	49.90%	11.60%	35.90%	2.50%	0.10%	1528
Greece	18.20%	17.30%	63.50%	1.00%	-	1200
Turkey	8.80%	17.70%	69.90%	2.70%	0.80%	2415
Total	23.2% (1,194)	15.8% (812)	58.3% (3,000)	2.2% (115)	0.4% (22)	5143

From your point of view, what have been the effects of immigrants on the development of [your country]?: Increase unemployment

Source: Haerpfer et al. 2022. Selected samples: Germany 2018, Greece 2017, Turkey 2018.

In Table 11, while the participation rate in the argument that immigrants increase the unemployment rate is 35.9% in Germany, this rate is 63.50% in Greece and 69.9% in Turkey. The fact that the argument did not contain any social and political danger caused the negative perception or perceived threat to be low in Germany.

Conclusion

The international effects of the integrated threat phenomenon, which started with the securitization process, seem to be supported by statistical data. The paper observed that the perception of threat felt in society differs according to the economic, demographic, and political conditions of the three countries (Germany, Greece, and Turkey) examined in the study. With the economic crisis in Turkey and the large number of asylum seekers, the threat manifested itself in all its aspects and became integrated. Thus, the threat felt in Greek territory, which can be considered the Turkish border of the European Union, is low for Turkey but high compared to Central European countries. Greece is the European Union country that has most closely felt the rising securitization and integrated threat in Turkey. This threat perception in Greece, which is one of the parties to the Schengen agreement, has put the whole of Europe on alert, and some agreements have been sought with Turkey, which has a high population of refugees in its country. In this process, the European Union signed a refugee agreement between Turkey and the EU on March 18, 2016 (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2016).

The refugee problem, which was not felt much by the EU until the summer months of 2015, started to occupy the EU member states with the presence of hundreds of thousands of refugees, first from North African countries to EU countries such as Italy and Malta, and then to Greece from the Aegean islands with the closure of the African refugee route. With the public pressure created by the refugee crisis in EU countries and the desires of many EU member states such as Germany and the Netherlands, where far-right populism and Islamophobia are increasingly felt, the Turkey-EU Refugee Agreement was put into practice on March 18, 2016. With this agreement, Turkey agreed to readmit refugees who entered the EU borders irregularly or illegally, and in return, it would obtain financial aid of 6 billion euros to be spent on health, education, and nutrition for Syrians under temporary protection (Ministry of Foreign Affairs 2016). With this move, the European Union aimed to use Turkey as a refugee warehouse or buffer zone, while Turkey received financial aid from the European Union on behalf of the refugees it already hosts. The fate of the money given by the European Union to Turkey to hold the refugees is uncertain. It would be very optimistic to think that a resource is used in accordance with its purpose in Turkey, where everything is grey both economically and democratically. In a nutshell, the way in which the rising securitization of Turkey and the integrated threat that resulted from it are reflected in Europe is striking.

In recent years, the humanitarian aspects of the refugee crisis have presented themselves in a unique way, dynamically evolving in response to the changing geopolitical landscape. A critical event in understanding this dimension

was the presidential election in Turkey in May 2023. The incumbent President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan was accused by the European Union of authoritarian tendencies and undemocratic practices, such as restrictions on freedom of expression and the imprisonment of opposition figures, journalists, and academics. But the election saw a paradoxical development. Political propaganda spread by the opposition leader calling for the repatriation of Syrian refugees under temporary protection in Turkey caused unexpected irritation in the European Union. When Erdoğan won the election, EU leaders congratulated him with the same words and emphasised the importance of continued EU-Turkey relations. In their congratulatory messages to Erdoğan, European Union leaders have refrained from using the concepts of democracy and human rights. This is a good example of the EU's dilemma between a policy based on normative values and pragmatism.

This conspicuous silence on democratic values and human rights reveals a striking observation. None of the European leaders explicitly addressed the so-called authoritarianism in Turkey, leading to speculation that, for the European Union, containing the refugee crisis within Turkey's borders has become more important than upholding democratic principles. This raises an important philosophical question about the tension between pragmatic politics and idealistic values. It highlights the Machiavellian aspect of international politics, where the ends often justify the means and strategic priorities trump ideological positions. This underlines the concept of "Realpolitik", where political realism or practical politics, especially politics based on power and practical and material factors, trumps ideological concepts. This can be said to pose an ethical dilemma for the European Union: to choose between the stabilisation of the region (and indirectly its own borders) by supporting an allegedly authoritarian regime or the risk of further instability by adhering to democratic principles. This is a classic dilemma, reminiscent of Thomas Hobbes' "Leviathan", where security is often favoured over freedom. However, it is important not to simplify the narrative and to recognise that international politics is complex and multidimensional. This should serve as a catalyst for further academic debate on the implications of the apparent trade-off between human rights and security, democracy and stability, and the extent to which geopolitical decisions can and should compromise ethical values.

References

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Aras, İlhan, and Altug Günar. 2017. "Brexit'in Avrupa Birliği-Türkiye İlişkilerine Etkileri". Paper presented at the conference Uluslararası IX. Uludağ Uluslararası İlişkiler Kongresi.

Baker, Brenda J., and Takeyuki Tsuda. 2015. *Migration and Disruptions Toward a Unifying Theory of Ancient and Contemporary Migrations*. Gainesville: University Press of Florida.

Baylis, John. 2008. "Uluslararası İlişkilerde Güvenlik Kavramı". *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi* 5 (18): 69-85.

Benson, Michaela, and Karen O'Reilly. 2015. "From lifestyle migration to lifestyle in migration: Categories, concepts and ways of thinking". *Migration Studies* 4 (1): 20-37. https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnv015

Bigo, Didier. 2000. "When two become one: internal and external securitisations in Europe". In: *International Relations Theory and the Politics of European Integration*, edited by Morten Kelstrup and Michael Williams, 171-204. London and New York: Routledge.

Brauch, Hans Günter. 2008. "Güvenliğin Yeniden Kavramsallaştırılması: Barış, Güvenlik, Kalkınma ve Çevre Kavramsal Dörtlüsü". *Uluslararası İlişkiler Dergisi* 5 (18): 1-47.

Buzan, Barry, Ole Wæver, and Jaap de Wilde. 1998. *Security*: *A New Framework for Analysis*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Buzan, Barry. 1983. *People, States and Fear*: *The National Security Problem in International Relations*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Ceccorulli, Michela. 2009. Migration As a Security Threat: Internal and External Dynamics in The European Union. *Forum on the Problems of Peace and War*, Florence GARNET Working Paper No: 65/09.

Driedger, Leo, and Richard A. Mezoff. 1981. Ethnic Prejudice and Discrimination in Winnipeg High Schools. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 6 (1): 1-17.

Esses, Victoria. M., Geoffrey Haddock, and Mark P. Zanna. 1993. "Values, Stereotypes and Emotions as Determinants of Intergroup Attitudes". In: *Affect, Cognition and Stereotyping: Interactive Processes In Group Perception*, edited by Diane M. Mackie and David L. Hamilton, 137-166. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gudykunst, William. B. 2015. *Farklılıklar Arasında Köprü Kurmak*. İstanbul: Kırmızı Yayınları.

Haerpfer, Christian, Ronald Inglehart, Alejandro Moreno, Christian Welzel, Kseniya Kizilova, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Marta Lagos, Pippa Norris, Eduard Ponarin, and Bi Puranen, eds. 2022. *World Values Survey: Round Seven - Country-Pooled Datafile Version 4.0*. Madrid, Spain and Vienna, Austria: JD Systems Institute and WVSA Secretariat. https://doi.org/10.14281/18241.18

Hazan, Jacob Ceki. 2012. "Geçmişten Geleceğe Zorunlu Göç: Mülteciler ve Ülke İçinde Yerinden Edilmiş Kişiler". In: *Küreselleşme Çağında Göç Kavramlar,*

Tartışmalar, edited by Suna Gülfer Ihlamur Öner and N. Aslı Şirin Öner. İstanbul: İletişim Yayınları.

Hilton, James. L., and William von Hippel. 1996. "Stereotypes". *Annual Review of Psychology*, 47: 237-271.

Hisarlıoğlu , Fulya. 2019. "Güvenlikleştirme". *Güvenlik Yazıları Serisi*, No. 24.

Hogg, Michael. 1997. *Sosyal Psikolojik Açıdan Grupta Bütünleşme.* Sitem Yayıncılık.

Huymans, Jef. 2000. The European Union and the Securitization of Migration. *Journal of Common Market Studies* 38 (5): 751–77.

İlhan, Rifat. S., and Abdülkadir Çevik. 2003. "Önyargıların Psikolojisi: Psikodinamik Bir Gözden Geçirme". *Nesne Psikoloji Dergisi* 1 (1): 52-67.

Inglehart, Ronald, Christian Haerpfer, Alejandro Moreno, Christian Welzel, Kseniya Kizilova, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Marta Lagos, Pippa Norris, Eduard Ponarin, and Bi Puranen, eds. 2014a. *World Values Survey: Round Four - Country-Pooled Datafile Version.* Madrid: JD Systems Institute. www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV4.jsp

Inglehart, Ronald, Christian Haerpfer, Alejandro Moreno, Christian Welzel, Kseniya Kizilova, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Marta Lagos, Pippa Norris, Eduard Ponarin, and Bi Puranen, eds. 2014b. *World Values Survey: Round Five - Country-Pooled Datafile Version.* Madrid: JD Systems Institute. www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV5.jsp

Inglehart, Ronald, Christian Haerpfer, Alejandro Moreno, Christian Welzel, Kseniya Kizilova, Jaime Diez-Medrano, Marta Lagos, Pippa Norris, Eduard Ponarin, and Bi Puranen, eds. 2014c. *World Values Survey: Round Six - Country-Pooled Datafile Version*. Madrid: JD Systems Institute. www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV6.jsp

Jackson-Peer, Jennifer. 2011. *Security in International Relations*. University of London, IR140, 2790140.

Karpat, Kemal H. 2010. *Osmanlı'dan Günümüze Etnik Yapılanma ve Göçler.* İstanbul: Timaş Yayınlar.

Leighton, Dana Charles. 2012. *The Effects of Symbolic and Realistic Threats on Moral Exclusion From the Scope of Justice*. Doctoral dissertation. University of Arkansas, Fayetteville.

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic of Türkiye. 2016. Implementation of Turkey-EU Agreement of 18 March 2016 Accessed October 10, 2022. https://www.mfa.gov.tr/implementation-of-turkey_eu-agreement-of-18-march-2016.en.mfa

Mülteciler Derneği. 2022. "Türkiye'deki Suriyeli Sayısı Eylül 2022", Mülteciler Derneği, Accessed October 9, 2022. https://multeciler.org.tr/turkiyedeki-suriyeli-sayisi/

Porumbescu, Alexandra. 2016. "The Concept of Migration: Linguistic and Sociological Coordinates". *Forum On Studies of Society Conference Proceedings*.

Pratto, Felicia, Jim Sidanius, and Shana Levin. 2006. "Social Dominance Theory and The Dynamics of Intergroup Relations: Taking Stock and Looking Forward". *European Review of Socıal Psychology* 17 (1): 271-320. https://doi.org/10.1080/10463280601055772

Stephan, Walter G., and Marisa D. Mealy. 2012. "Intergroup Threat Theory". In: *The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology*, edited by Daniel J. Christie. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Stephan, Walter G., Oscar Ybarra, and Kimberly Rios Morrison. 2009. "Intergroup threat theory". In: *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination*, edited by Todd N. Nelson, 43–59. London: Psychology Press.

Stephan, Walter G., Rolando Diaz-Lovıng, and Anne Duran. 2000. "Integrated Threat Theory And Intercultural Attıtudes Mexico And The United States". *Journal Of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 31 (2). https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022100031002006

Sweet, Ewan. 2017. *The Securitization of Migration In France The Shifting Threat of Migration: From A Threat To Culture To A Source of Terrorism*. Graduate School of Public And International Affairs, University of Ottawa.

Topulli, Enela. 2016. "Securitization of Migration and Human Rights in Europe". *European Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies* 1 (5): 86-92.

[UN OHCHR] United Nations, Human Rights Office of High Commissioner. 1951. Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, July 28, 1951. https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/convention-relating-status-refugees

Ünal-Eriş, Özgür, and Selcen Öner. 2021. "Securitization of Migration and The Rising Influence of Populist Radical Right Parties In European Politics". *Ankara Avrupa Çalışmaları Dergisi* 20 (1): 161-193.

[UNDP], United Nations Development Programme. 1994. *Human Development Report 1994: New Dimensions of Human Security*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press. http://hdr. undp.org/en/content/human-development-report-1994.

Wagner, Ulrich, Linda R. Tropp, Gillian Finchilescu, and Colin Tredoux. 2008. *Improving intergroup relations: Building on the legacy of Thomas F. Pettigrew*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Wennerhed, Felicia Matz. 2016. *The Securitization of Migrants A critical discourse analysis of migration in EU policy*. Department of Political Science, Lund University.

СЕКУРИТИЗАЦИЈА МАКРОНИВОА МИКРОИНТЕГРИСАНИХ ПЕРЦЕПЦИЈА ПРЕТЊИ У ЕВРОПИ: СТУДИЈА СЛУЧАЈА ИЗБЕГЛИЦА У ТУРСКОЈ, ГРЧКОЈ И НЕМАЧКОЈ

Апстракт: Пре него што су политичари користили избеглице као средство у међудржавним односима, избеглице и тражиоци азила су у друштвеној перцепцији били опажани само као симболична или реалистична претња. С употребом избеглица као средстава у међународној политици, феномен претњи у друштву се продубио секуритизацијом и почео да представља претњу људској безбедности. Овај дијалектички однос друштва и државе такође мења и трансформише правац и форму претње. Ова студија истражује како симболичне или реалистичне перцепције претње у јавности еволуирају у секуритизацију коју спроводе владе, како ова два феномена јачају један другог и шта то значи у контексту људске безбедности. Квантитативни подаци коришћени у студији ће бити објашњени теоријама интегрисане претње и секуритизације. Студија има за циљ да открије варијације у перцепцији претњи повезаних са избеглицама у Европи, користећи оквир теорије интегрисане претње. Фокус је на истраживању питања попут „Које врсте претњи произилазе из присуства избеглица и тражиоца азила у европским земљама?" и „Који фактори доприносе дивергенцији у перцепцији претњи?". Додатно, студија истражује импликације ових дивергентних перцепција претњи по национално и регионално управљање миграцијама у свакој од држава. Рад се фокусира на избегличку кризу и проучава случајеве Турске, Грчке и Немачке, које су главне на транзитној рути и домаћин су највећем броју избеглица у Европи. Како би се описало која перцепција претњи има одлучујући ефекат на Европу, биће анализиран седми талас (2017-2020) сетова података „Светске вредносне анкете" (World Values Survey), спровођене од 2010. до 2022, и поређен са претходним таласима. Случајеви Немачке, Турске и Грчке у овим сетовима података ће бити у фокусу ове студије.

Кључне речи: секуритизација; перцепција претње; људска безбедност; избеглице.