Chapter 13

Forced migration

Psychological contributions that might help to improve the human rights situation

Ulrich Wagner

Introduction

Migration is a phenomenon that has accompanied mankind since its existence. Migration creates diversity and psychologists know that diversity is one of the major preconditions for creativity (e.g. Antonio et al., 2004) and innovation, both in organizations (van Dijk, van Engen, & van Knippenberg, 2012) as well as in societies (Moscovici, 1976). Many economists see the post-World War II Western economic development significantly driven by migration to Europe and the United States (Borjas, 1995). In sum, migration is a mighty impulse of positive individual and societal development.

Migration, however, is not only connected with positive results. It often goes along with hardship, injustice, discrimination and violence – mostly for those moving.

In the following, I will describe some of the immense psychological problems connected with migration, following a prototypical path that migrants – if they are "successful" – have to pass. This path follows from leaving or being urged to leave their homeland, their route of flight – for instance, through Africa or Central America, arriving at the European or North-American borders, to entering these regions of demand, being treated as a – potentially illegal – immigrant, and being confronted with the demands of becoming a legal citizen of the receiving country. I will herein focus on forced migration, because these refugees in particular have to face a lot of problems on their way.

Fleeing home

The United Nations (UN) counted 71 million people on the run, i.e. internally displaced and stateless people, refugees, asylum seekers and returnees (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 2017). Many of them are fleeing because of war, civil war, sexual abuse and other forms of violence – violations of human rights, such as the right to life and physical integrity. Others are leaving their homes because of hunger, poverty and unemployment, violations of the right to work and the right to life. Most move within their countries of origin or to neighbouring countries.

Reasons for flight usually go back to economic or ideological conflicts, often with a long history. That is, individuals or groups are claiming land or property of

others or are interested in enforcing their own religious or political conviction. These interests are then connected with political propaganda and ideology as well as the promotion of specific in-group memberships. The Russian occupation of the Crimea in 2014, for example, was the result of economic interests that were later overpainted with stories of historical ownership of specific ethnic groups. In a similar way, the so-called Islamic State claimed in 2014 to have the only proper access to Islam and other Muslim convictions have to be persecuted and destroyed.

Although reasons for flight might go back to conflicts of interest, as described above, reasons for flight are also often enforced by mismanagement and political corruption. In addition, reasons for flight are further increased by influences of the Global North when industrial countries exploit primary resources in developing countries and thereby intensify conflicts. Moreover, hardship is enforced when industrial countries deliver their highly subsidized agricultural products and thereby destroy local production. Finally, if the major financial sponsors of the UN and other aid agencies cut their support (Erlanger & de Freytas-Tamura, 2015), refugees in the neighbourhood of war and civil war are pressed to leave the region – which happened in 2015 in countries around the civil war region of Syria.

Conflicts about resources often go along with discrimination and persecution of ethnic and national minorities, specific gender groups, language, religious and social minorities and people of specific political conviction. Discrimination and persecution are human rights violations which also contribute to migration and flight, as could be observed when in 2017 Muslim Rohingya people had to leave Myanmar in great numbers due to persecution by the military and by a Buddhist majority.

Psychologists know about the psychological mechanisms behind persecution that lead to expulsion, such as hostile intergroup processes and political propaganda. For example, conflict theory proclaims that when two or more groups perceive themselves in negative interdependence, i.e. if the winning of one group implies the loss of the other one, such conflicts tend to escalate to discrimination and violence (Deutsch, 1949). In addition, escalating conflicts not only go along with an increase in negative intergroup behaviour, but also with the development of negative stereotypes, which justify hostile behaviour against the outgroup (Wagner & Gutenbrunner, 2020, in preparation).

Based on this background knowledge about reasons for fleeing, psychologists have a special responsibility to argue and work against these destroying developments in societies, among other things, by informing politicians and taking a public position.

People on the run and refugees often face problems leaving their countries of origin due to a lack of appropriate documents. They might be denied such documents by their country of origin. Or the access to visas for their goal country is complicated or even impossible due to administrative means of the potentially receiving country (Kastner, 2017). In addition, incarceration in countries of origin or transit countries frequently occurs. This again is a violation of human rights, specifically of Article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR: United Nations General Assembly, 1948), which implies free movement within a country and movement across country borders. Furthermore, the escape routes often are accompanied by new persecution and violence – especially torture and sexual violence.

Intermediate stations and arrival at goal country

When migrants and refugees approach a place to stay – whether their final goal region or a place from which they have no opportunity to move on – they often are in a situation of extreme psychological insecurity and are traumatized. They require professional psychological support, a need which sometimes only becomes visible after a period of stay. Often, however, such help is denied. In Germany, for example, which offers relatively good health care for immigrants, only immediately needed medical support is funded. Sometimes, this results in a restriction of trauma therapy in the form of mere drug treatment without psychotherapeutic assistance. Many psychologists nevertheless provide professional support for free for people in need – also an expression of psychologists' responsibility for human rights and of overcoming the consequences of human rights violations. In addition, one has to hold in mind that, even though trauma treatment is one of the best-developed psychotherapies, the specific circumstances accompanying flight can create complicated situations even for trained clinical psychologists. Culture-specific psychological disease patterns, their expressions and thus opportunities for help may differ from the experiences of Western professionals. Hence, one of the major tasks for Western psychology is to develop a deeper understanding of culture-specific consequences of trauma and options for appropriate treatment.

Even if migrants and refugees arrive in a region which ensures their bodily integrity, they usually have to face further major difficulties. Article 14 of the UDHR declares the right for everyone "to seek and enjoy in other countries asylum from persecution" (United Nations General Assembly, 1948). The emphasis of the 1951 Refugee Convention (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951) is the protection of persons from political persecution for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a partial social group or political opinion. Getting access to these rights is often accompanied by strong bureaucratic and legal restrictions for the individual applying for asylum. For example, the European Dublin III Regulation (European Parliament and the Council, 2013) prescribes that a person has to apply for asylum in that European Community member state where he or she arrived first. Such regulations produce a lot of problems for people applying for asylum if they are – for whatever reasons – carried through different European states on their flight. The bureaucratic procedures for applying for asylum or the temporary right to stay often are not transparent for applicants and complicated to complete. In Germany, for example, applicants first have to declare their request for asylum, then applicants are compulsorily assigned to specific centres for asylum seekers where they are interviewed about their motives. Within a period of six months, a decision should be made by the responsible institution, a period during which taking a job is prohibited. A negative decision and the demand to leave the country can be formally objected. However, at least at this stage of the procedure an applicant needs lawyers' support.

In addition to bureaucratic difficulties, new immigrants often have to face rejection and discrimination from parts of the receiving society and its political elites. Psychologists have good and empirically supported knowledge of the causes of prejudice, discrimination and violence. For example, Sherif (1967) divided boys in a summer camp into two groups and organized sport matches like tug of war

between the groups, promising pocket knives for the winning team after a week. He found that these tournaments not only stimulated participants' engagement on behalf of the ingroup, but also instigated the development of negative mutual stereotypes and name calling regarding the outgroup.

Henri Tajfel and his team (Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971) demonstrated that the mere categorization of people into two artificial groups – e.g. a blue and a green one – can contribute to ingroup bias, i.e. to benefit ingroup members and discriminate against members of the other group. This ingroup bias can be observed even when participants in the experiment know that the group assignment was totally random (Billig & Tajfel, 1973). Tajfel (1978) as well as Tajfel and Turner (1979) later explained the results of the minimal-group experiments with the Social Identity Theory: people identify with groups and group memberships are relevant for their identity. In addition, the theory supposes that people strive for a positive identity. These two assumptions imply that people try to positively differentiate their ingroup from relevant outgroups. One way to achieve this is to devalue the outgroup and its members.

Later, Stephan and co-workers (e.g. Stephan & Renfro, 2002) added the component of intergroup threat to Sherif's Realistic Conflict Theory and to Social Identity Theory: outgroup devaluation is enhanced if the outgroup is perceived as a threat to the ingroup. Such threats can encompass realistic threats to the ingroup's material resources ("they threaten our economy") or symbolic threats ("they threaten our way of life") to the ingroup's values and norms.

It is interesting to think about the empirical situations created by the responsible authors of the above-mentioned theories and studies: Sherif (1967) told the participating boys that the summer camp programme would imply a weeklong tournament, Tajfel et al. (1971) informed the participants in their minimal-group experiments that they were now members of a specific group and Stephan and Renfro (2002) in their experiments presented the outgroup as threatening the ingroup's material resources or values. This means that the experimental groups did not really exist and the situations were not actually competitive or threatening: the experimenters simply fabricated such conditions for their study participants. From this perspective, there is an obvious connection between the experimental situations described and the way in which we all, as citizens, learn about the groups to which we purposely belong or are assigned, and about the character of different outgroups. Society members' perception of immigrants as being dangerous and threatening strongly depends on the communication and impact of opinion leaders, who may be politicians, other "public" people, the press or the internet.

The receptivity of people to indirect information as well as their ability and tendency to be influenced by the messages that others deliver impose a high responsibility on those who send such messages. Psychologists have the obligation to inform the public about the dangerous consequences that distorted news about immigrants can entail, not only for immigrants themselves but also for society as a whole.

A special situation of stress emerges if families are separated during the flight: children and close family members end up in different countries or part of the family may still live in the region of origin. Many receiving states have serious restrictions related to family reunification. This is a violation of Article 16 of the UDHR and of the Convention of the Rights of Children (United Nations General

Assembly, 1989) to safety, education and family. In such an extreme situation, refugees not only need juridical and legal support, but also psychological help. Developmental psychologists know about the importance of the family for the development of their offspring. Many states ratified the relevant conventions proposing minors' assistance and the importance of families. Nevertheless, they often ignore both psychological knowledge and human rights in their everyday administrative performance when receiving immigrants and refugees.

In general, one can get the impression that, when it comes to immigration, especially immigration of refugees, the receiving societies make a significant distinction between the autochthonous population and the newcomers – in the right to work, schooling, free movement, health care, access to the social security system, care of families, and so on. This is often accompanied by human rights violations and extreme negative consequences for migrants. In addition, one has to think about the moral costs European and North American societies have to pay while walling off their country against immigrants: the contradictions between their own moral and ethical aspirations, often relating to the European Enlightenment, and political practice come with extremely high costs for moral and societal cohesion in the affected Western countries (Myrdal, 1944).

Integration

If a positive decision is made about an immigrant's or refugee's right to stay, the question of integration into society arises. Practically, this often means that the immigrant has to learn the language, find a place to live, obtain the needed diplomas from schools or other institutions in the relevant educational system and find a job.

The Canadian psychologist John Berry (e.g. 1997) developed a model according to which the kind of acculturation depends on the answer to two questions: first, is an immigrating person interested in getting into contact with the new society? Second, is the same person interested in holding relations with the heritage culture? Both questions can be answered, independently of each other, with yes or no, so that a four-field panel emerges, describing integration (i.e. both questions being answered with yes), assimilation (i.e. being interested in getting into contact with the new culture whilst giving up the connection with the old one), separation (i.e. avoiding contact with the new society and solely focusing on the old culture) and marginalization (i.e. answering both questions with no). This model describes integration significantly differently from the political understanding of integration delineated above, which comes close to assimilation in Berry's model. In addition, Berry's concept of acculturation expectations can be used to describe the perspective of immigrants, as well as the receiving society members' expectations for immigrants and themselves, i.e. how far the majority is ready to recognize and approach the cultural perspective of the immigrating minority as well. Through a model like that of Berry, it becomes clear that psychological knowledge can make significant contributions to our understanding and handling of concepts of integration that go above and beyond the public debate about it.

Surveys show that immigrants usually prefer integration (and sometimes even separation; see Frindte, Boehnke, Kreikenbom, & W. Wagner, 2017) in Berry's term,

whereas receiving societies expect immigrants to assimilate. This often leads to misunderstandings, mutual rejection and prejudice (see also Bourhis, Moise, Perreault, & Senecal, 1997). Elaborating on Berry's model, it makes sense to differentiate between different contents of acculturation (Wagner, 2018). For example, most would agree that a receiving country and its citizens expect newcomers to respect the existing laws and basic customs, such as the equality of gender groups and the acknowledgement of human rights. In other fields of living, an integrative approach from both sides to one another is possible, for example by acknowledging important issues in the immigrants' culture by the introduction of new holidays, which in addition would follow the demand for the human right to participate in cultural life and to enjoy one's culture (see also the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, United Nations General Assembly, 1966).

Human needs are not constant (Maslow, 1970). When immigrants or refugees arrive in a country, they often have to bear a burden of terrible, even life-threatening experiences from their countries of origin and the escape. Their primary demand is safety and survival. Bad living conditions in first reception centres are, at that moment, acceptable, if not luxury. Having lived in safe conditions for a while and having had the opportunity to observe the standard of living in the new society increase their aspirations and activate higher needs, such as needs of belonging and participation and the need to fulfil cognitive aspirations. These adaptations of needs are not unique to immigrants. Psychologists therefore should inform the public and political decision makers about such psychological processes. What is needed is an open debate about integration of newcomers and the development of a common vision of living together – taking the needs and interests of both sides, newcomers and receiving societies, seriously into account.

What are the preconditions that make individuals identify with societies? From a psychological point of view, identification with groups and with society specifically depends on society's offers for participation. That is, individuals – with and without a migration background – have to recognize that adjusting to societal expectations and norms has positive consequences for them and contributes to the avoidance of negative consequences. Identification then leads to acceptance of societal norms and finally to social participation and contribution (Deci & Ryan, 2000), accomplishing individual well-being. Identification with and commitment to societal norms also imply reduction of deviancy. The described process then results, on the societal level, in an increase of societal cohesion (Wagner, 2018). Thus, helping people identify with the society in which they live is in the interest of all – those who are expected to identify as well as society as a whole.

Radicalization

What happens if identification with society and commitment to societal norms are not realized – if, for example, new immigrants perceive themselves as rejected and permanently excluded from participation and acknowledgement? Exclusion and being the target of prejudice lead to impairments of well-being and psychological suffering (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2013). In addition, they can lead to deviant behaviour and violence (Wagner, 2018), from petty crimes and gang violence up to severe sexual violence and rape. Immigrants becoming perpetrators of extreme

violence are often the disappointed who perceive themselves as unaccepted (Wagner & Lemmer, 2019): They have recognized that their primary expectations about their chances in the new country cannot be fulfilled or, even worse, they are expecting deportation from the country because they have not been acknowledged as legal immigrants or refugees. The aim of this psychological analysis is not to excuse the perpetrators, but it shows that disappointing living conditions without positive expectations for the future can contribute to deviance, violence and societal decline (see also Anhut & Heitmeyer, 2000), thereby endangering important human rights for everyone, majority and minorities.

Recent research shows that feelings of exclusion significantly contribute to political and religious radicalization and violence (Wagner & Maaser, 2018): radicalization often is a consequence of ingroup–outgroup categorization combined with feelings of deprivation and threat, i.e. exclusion, and a political or religious ideology that justifies the use of violence against the outgroup. Again, if the interest is to prevent radicalization and religious and political violence, societies have to offer opportunities for participation in order to avoid exclusion – for example, by allowing families to reunite.

Various states react with expulsion of immigrants who do not acquire the right to stay, but also of those who come to notice due to crime and violence. Such a situation is often accompanied by dramatic experiences of stress, and it may demand psychological support in order to deal with this. The author of this chapter is unsure what to say concerning psychologists being engaged in the deportation of unacknowledged or criminal immigrants and refugees – even if this decision is backed by a fair juridical decision.

In summary, since psychologists know so much about the conditions that support integration and societal cohesion as well as the conditions that lead to endangerment of human rights, they are requested to apply this knowledge, either by individually contributing to integration of immigrants, or by counselling the public and political decision makers on the consequences of inclusive or exclusive political strategies.

Measures needed to reduce human rights violations in the context of (forced) migration

Even though the Refugee Convention (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, 1951) grants the right to apply for asylum when in a country, there is no human right which proclaims a right to immigrate to a country or to stay there – and many consider this to be a shame. Additionally, many states purport to act in accordance with human rights, but if one takes a closer look into administration practice, hardships and human rights violations emerge. For example, the American political decision in the summer of 2018 to separate children from their parents when they were accused of having crossed the border illegally (Sacchetti, 2018) is a violation of the rights of children. The same holds true for the decision of the German administration not to allow parents of minor refugees in Germany into the country, even though the European Supreme Court had decided in accordance with the Convention on the Rights of the Child (European Court, 2018).

Migration, especially forced migration and flight, is often connected to extreme hardship, discrimination, cruelty and violations of human rights. Forced migration and its consequences are usually a result of political decisions and conflicts. Therefore, the responsibility for the reduction and avoidance of human rights violations rests with politicians – and as such, in democratic states, with the voters who can decide for parties and policies which either contribute to or prevent human rights violations.

From the perspective of the states in the Global North, Europe and North America, which used to be the prime destinations of forced migration, a political programme which earnestly tries to reduce hardships connected with forced migration and human rights violations should address the realization of the following list of means:

Working against reasons for flight

- Stopping the destruction of the environment which impairs the living conditions in many countries of origin
- Working against local and international violent conflict escalations
- Improving developmental co-operation without endangering the development of local economies.

Protecting migration paths

- Offering the opportunity to apply for immigration and asylum in regional diplomatic representations of the goal countries
- Creating legal opportunities to immigrate in the form of immigration acts.

Promoting integration

- Receiving countries clarifying what they expect from people living within their borders, i.e. in which areas of life they expect assimilation and where they offer integration opportunities
- Taking into account the changing needs of immigrants
- Promoting the reunion of families
- Taking care of affordable accommodation opportunities
- Promoting fair access to schooling, universities and training for jobs
- Ensure appropriate job qualities and payment
- Avoiding spatial segregation or ghettoization.

It is interesting to see that many of the preconditions needed for integration not only address the demands of new immigrants, but also those from the disadvantaged parts of the receiving society. Often, the problems of immigrants are not the cause of problems for others; they simply make existing issues visible, like problems in the residential market, access to schooling and the work market. Thus, promoting integration often helps prevent human rights violations not only for immigrants, but also for other parts of the population.

Migration, and especially forced migration, is strongly connected to intergroup conflict, negative outgroup stereotyping, discrimination and intergroup violence.

These phenomena contribute to unacceptable living conditions and further lead to persecution and violence. Even though one may see the mitigation of hardships and human rights violations primarily in the duty of politics, intergroup conflicts and their dramatic consequences are significantly influenced by psychological processes, too. Psychologists have scientific expertise on how to work against them.

Gordon Allport proposed in 1954 that:

> prejudice … may be reduced by equal status contact between majority and minority groups in the pursuit of common goals. The effect is greatly enhanced if this contact is sanctioned by institutional supports (i.e., by law, custom, or local atmosphere), and provided it is of a sort that leads to the perception of common interests and common humanity between members of the two groups.
>
> (Allport, 1954, p. 281)

Allport related his ideas to the relationship between Whites and Afro-Americans in the United States. Research shows that contact also significantly improves the relationship between other groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), including the relationship between new immigrants and the autochthonous population (Kotzur, Tropp, & Wagner, 2018). Contact research implies that the improvement in positive contact between groups reduces hardships and human rights violations connected with migration and flight. Paluck (2009), for example, successfully initiated a media programme in Rwanda to establish intergroup contact between former civil-war enemies. A number of contact intervention programmes for schools (see the example below) and leisure time activities to improve intergroup relations between students have also been proved to be effective (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015). Contact theory can be used to decide about an integrative composition of teams in organizations (van Knippenberg, De Dreu, & Homan, 2004) and it gives recommendations for settlement policies in receiving countries, namely to give newcomers the possibilities to get into contact with the receiving population (without isolating them from others of a similar origin: Veling et al., 2008). This means, for example, avoiding huge reception centres for new immigrants which make contact between inhabitants and the neighbourhood impossible. It also implies taking care of integrated housing and schooling, and improving the possibilities of newcomers regarding access to traditional community institutions, like sports and art clubs and voluntary fire brigades.

Lessons to be learned

Psychologists have a lot to contribute to understanding and influencing the basic psychological mechanisms behind hardships and human rights violations connected with migration and flight. Clinical psychologists can help migrants and refugees handle the consequences of the often hard to overcome history of expulsion and flight, and school psychologists can use their knowledge in contributing to an integrating school climate. The same holds true for organizational psychologists when thinking about how to adequately create heterogeneous organizational teams. Community psychologists can contribute to the political and administrative design of communities and political psychologists have a lot to deliver in counselling political

decision makers. Psychologists should therefore publicly speak out about all this, also in the political arena. Human rights are a good standard for an appropriate normative psychological position in the context of (forced) migration (Sommer & Stellmacher, 2018).

Case examples

The jigsaw classroom

Even in integrated schools re-segregation can often be observed in the classroom. Students of one ethnic background sit together, separated from students from other ethnic backgrounds. The same can be observed for leisure time activities. Aronson and co-workers used the contact theory to develop and establish a specific kind of small-group work to counteract this ethnic re-segregation (Aronson, 2002; see also Lanphen, 2011). In these co-operation programmes, students are divided by the teacher into heterogeneous groups according to achievement, gender and ethnic background (which differentiates the procedure from other kinds of group work where the groups are composed homogeneously or according to students' choices, which also ends up in homogeneity). Small-group members have to commonly work on a specific question, such as the biography of a famous person. The information needed to fulfil the task is distributed among the small-group members: the teacher delivers information about the early childhood to just one group member, the next group member receives pre-information about the protagonist's youth, the next about early adulthood, and so on. This distribution of knowledge within the small group implies that group members have to work together in order to fulfil their task, i.e. they have to come into contact with each other under the conditions described by Allport (1954). Some variants of the programme additionally expect that all small-group members have to ensure that each group member in the end can successfully report about the small-group's work result. Evaluation studies show that these kinds of programmes really help to overcome mutual rejection and promote intergroup friendship. Furthermore, studies show that this improvement in interpersonal relations is not connected to a drop in students' academic achievement.

When psychologists protest, this can contribute to a positive change in the human rights situation

When in late summer 2015 the number of refugees arriving in Europe and especially in Germany increased to around 600,000, a strong political and media debate arose concerning how to handle this rise in numbers. In September 2015 more than 100 German social psychologists signed an open letter to the German chancellor and the German parliaments. Based on psychological considerations and arguments, the authors asked for clear information on the increased

immigration to avoid misinformation. They proposed a political strategy regarding how to handle immigration by simultaneously taking into account the demands of the refugees and the resident population. The authors condemned a policy which increased feelings of uncertainty and fear about the expense of refugees just to draw political profit from it. And they used their knowledge about intergroup contact effects to recommend an integrated settlement of the refugees. The letter was supported by major German psychology associations and broadly well received by the press. The authors never received feedback from the chancellor; however, there were positive feedback and invitations from members of parliament. Nevertheless, bearing in mind the political debate among the democratic political parties in the past years, one gets the impression that the argument about the importance of intergroup contact opportunities was widely accepted and taken into political consideration. This does not mean that politicians and decision makers would now say that they were forced to think about the opportunities of intergroup contact as a result of that letter in autumn 2015, but it surely made a contribution to the improvement in human rights for immigrants based on psychological arguments.

However, when psychologists protest, this can entail extreme negative consequences for the protesters. In January 2016, a peace petition of Academics for Peace was signed by 1,128 academics in Turkey and delivered to the press protesting against new emerging violence in the Kurdish–Turkish conflict in Turkey. The Turkish government reacted by dismissing academics from universities by executive decree, without due process and legal recourse. The international protest, coming from international psychological associations among others, is ongoing (Pratto, Reicher, Neville, & Kende, 2019).

Questions

1. If psychologists are interested in improving the situation of migrants and refugees, and also of the receiving populations, what are the typical practical areas they can make a significant contribution in?
2. Considering the different human rights and related international agreements, would you say that they are clear and extensive enough to help governments come to a decision that appropriately takes into account the interests of all parties involved in the processes of migration? If not, what is missing?
3. Imagine you are professionally involved in problems related to migration and flight. Would you need further advice, in addition to the normative standards which the human rights deliver, that might help you in the ethical conflicts your work might bring up?
4. Human rights offer a normative standard in cases where it is unclear what to do. For professional psychologists, such situations might emerge for example if one is requested to help refugees in dealing with post-traumatic

stress syndrome but insufficient financial resources are available for therapy. Other examples would be that psychologists are requested to support unaccompanied minors, to whom the right to live with their families is denied, or that psychologists should be involved in forced returns of refugees. The questions are: Is it acceptable to participate in such measures? Why is it acceptable or not? How can the orientation on human rights help find an answer to those dilemmas?

References

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA and Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Anhut, R., & Heitmeyer, W. (2000). Desintegration, Konflikt und Ethnisierung. Eine Problemanalyse und theoretische Rahmenkonzeption [Disintegration, conflict and ethnicity. A problem analyses and theoretical framework]. In W. Heitmeyer & R. Anhut (Eds.), *Bedrohte Stadtgesellschaft. Konflikt- und Gewaltforschung. [Threatened urban societies. Conflict and violence research.]* (pp. 17–75). Weinheim: Juventa.

Antonio, A. L., Chang, M. J., Hakuta, K., Kenny, D. A., Levin, S., & Milem, J. F. (2004). Effects of racial diversity on complex thinking in college students. *Psychology Science*, *15*, 507–510.

Aronson, E. (2002). Building empathy, compassion, and achievement in the jigsaw classroom. In J. Aronson (Ed.), *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 209–225). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *46*, 5–34.

Billig, M., & Tajfel, H. (1973). Social categorization and similarity in intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *3*, 27–52.

Borjas, J. G. (1995). The economic benefits from immigration. *Journal of Economics Perspectives*, *9*, 3–22.

Bourhis, R. Y., Moise, L. C., Perreault, S., & Senecal, S. (1997). Towards an interactive acculturation model: A social psychological approach. *International Journal of Psychology*, *32*, 369–386.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, *11*, 227–268.

Deutsch, M. (1949). An experimental study of the effects of co-operation and competition upon group process. *Human Relations*, *2*, 199–231.

Erlanger, S., & de Freytas-Tamura, K. (2015, September 20). U.N. funding shortfalls and cuts in refugee aid fuel exodus to Europe. *The New York Times*, Retrieved from www.nytimes.com/2015/09/20/world/un-funding-shortfalls-and-cuts-in-refugee-aid-fuel-exodus-to-europe.html

European Court. (2018). Retrieved from http://curia.europa.eu/juris/document/document.jsf?text=&docid=200965&pageIndex=0&doclang=DE&mode=req&dir=&occ=first&part=1

European Parliament and the Council. (2013). *Regulation (EU) No 604/2013*. from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2013:180:0031:0059:EN:PDF

Frindte, W., Boehnke, K., Kreikenbom, H., & Wagner, W. (2017). *Lebenswelten junger Muslime in Deutschland [Philosophy of life of young Muslims in Germany]*. Berlin: Bundesministerium des Innern.

Kastner, B. (2017, October 27). Wir können helfen, wenn wir wollten, aber wir wollen nicht [We could help if we liked to do, but we do not want to do]. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*, Retrieved from www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/asylpolitik-wir-koennten-helfen-aber-wir-wollen-nicht-1.3727488

Kotzur, P. F., Tropp, L. R., & Wagner, U. (2018). Welcoming the unwelcome: How contact shapes contexts of reception for new immigrants in Germany and the United States. *Journal of Social Issues*, *74*, 812–832.

Lanphen, J. (2011). *Kooperatives Lernen und Integrationsförderung. Eine theoriegeleitete Intervention in ethnisch heterogenen Schulklassen [Co-operative learning and promotion of integration. A theory driven intervention in ethnic heterogeneous school classes]*. Münster: Waxmann.

Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we reduce prejudice outside the lab? A meta- analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*, 152–168.

Maslow, A. H. (1970). *Motivation and personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Moscovici, S. (1976). *Social influence and social change*. London: Academic Press.

Myrdal, G. (1944). *An American dilemma. The Negro problem and modern democracy*. Oxford: Harper.

Nguyen, A. M. T. D., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2013). Biculturalism and adjustment: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *44*, 122–159.

Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 574–587.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751–783.

Pratto, F., Reicher, S., Neville, F., & Kende, A. (2019). *Report of the international observers in Turkey. Academics for peace*. Retrieved from https://barisicinakademisyenler.net/node/1022

Sacchetti, M. (2018, August 31). Still separated: Nearly 500 migrant children taken from their parents remain in U.S. custody. *Washington Post*. Retrieved from www.washingtonpost.com/local/immigration/still-separated-nearly-500-separated-migrant-children-remain-in-us-custody/2018/08/30/6dbd8278-aa09-11e8-8a0c-70b618c98d3c_story.html?utm_term=.310f9948a9bc

Sherif, M. (1967). *Group conflict and cooperation: Their social psychology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Sommer, G., & Stellmacher, J. (2018). Wie Menschenrechte uns den Weg zum Frieden weisen – psychologische Hilfen und Fallstricke [How human rights show the way to peace – psychological aids and pitfalls]. *The Inquisitive Mind*, *4*. Retrieved from http://de.in-mind.org/article/wie-menschenrechte-uns-den-weg-zum-frieden-weisen-psychologische-hilfen-und-fallstricke

Stephan, W. G., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threat in intergroup relations. In D. M. Mackie & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup relations* (pp. 191–207). New York: Psychology Press.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups*. London: Academic Press.

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. O., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *1*, 149–178.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Augustin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–47). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

United Nations General Assembly. (1948). *Universal declaration of human rights – GA Res 217A (III)*. (UN Doc A/810). Retrieved from www.un.org/en/universal-declaration-human-rights/

United Nations General Assembly. (1966). *International covenant on economic, social and cultural rights*. Retrieved from www.ohchr.org/en/professionalinterest/pages/cescr.aspx

United Nations General Assembly. (1989). *Convention on the rights of the child*. Retrieved from www.ohchr.org/EN/ProfessionalInterest/Pages/CRC.aspx

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (1951). Convention and protocol relating to the status of refugees. Retrieved from www.unhcr.org/1951-refugee-convention.html

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2017). *Global report*. Retrieved from http://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/gr2017/pdf/GR2017_English_Full_lowres.pdf

van Dijk, H., van Engen, M. L., & van Knippenberg, D. (2012). Defying conventional wisdom: A meta-analytic examination of the differences between demographic and job-related diversity relationships with performance. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Making*, *119*, 38–53.

van Knippenberg, D., De Dreu, C. K. W., & Homan, A. C. (2004). Work group diversity and group performance: An integrative model and research agenda. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *89*, 1008–1022.

Veling, W., Susser, M. D. E., van Os, J., Mackenbach, J. P., Selten, J. P., & Hoek, H. W. (2008). Among immigrants. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *165*, 66–73.

Wagner, U. (2018). Integration und gesellschaftlicher Zusammenhalt [Integration and societal cohesion]. *Zeitschrift Politische Psychologie – Journal Political Psychology*, *6*, 284–294.

Wagner, U., & Gutenbrunner, L. (2020) Conflict and harmful behaviour – A heuristic guidance for research and intervention in interpersonal and intergroup conflicts. Paper in preparation.

Wagner, U., & Lemmer, G. (2019). Extremistische Gewalt – ein sozio-psycho Modell zur Erklärung, Intervention und Prävention [Extremist violence – A socio-psycho model of explanation, intervention and prevention]. *Praxis der Rechtspsychologie*, *19*, 5–22.

Wagner, U., & Maaser, J. (2018). Integration as a means to prevent intergroup violence. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the international society for research on aggression, Paris, July 10–13, 2018*.