VICTORIA BOGINO-LARRAMBEBERE | CARLA CUBILLOS-VEGA | SOFIA DEDOTSI | VASILIOS IOAKIMIDIS | DIMITRA-DORA TELONI
ISABEL MARTÍNEZ SÁNCHEZ | ELISA ISABEL GÓMEZ VALLEJO | ROSA GOIG MARTÍNEZ | MARÍA ASUNCIÓN LILLO BENEYTO
ANA MARÍA LÓPEZ-NARBONA | ELISA ESTEBAN CARBONELL | NURIA DEL OLMO VICÉN | CARLOS GÓMEZ BAHILLO

The social positioning of immigrants and the social order problem

El posicionamiento social de los inmigrantes y el problema del orden social

Ana María López-Narbona*

* Universidad de Málaga. alopeznarbona@uma.es

Abstract:

Hobbes formulated the social order problem in a context of civil war. Is the *social order problem* perspective applicable to tackle with immigration in 21st century Spain? Terrorist attacks in the USA (2001) and, more recently in Europe carried out by citizens of Muslim countries or by European citizens with immigrant and Muslim background, have provoked a fear of the *generalized immigrant*. Radicalisation of young people of Muslim background, youth gangs (Latin gangs in Spain) and mass immigration from poor countries in a context of deep economic crisis raise a concern for Western countries´ populations. The concept of *social positioning* is adapted to the immigration processes. Statistical analyses are developed based on the European Social Survey data for Spain. The aim is to unveil the perception of Spanish population and of immigrants about the *social positioning* of immigrants in the Spanish social order.

Keywords: immigration, integration, Hobbesian social order problem, social cement, social positioning.

Resumen:

Hobbes formuló el problema del orden social en un contexto de guerra civil. ¿Es la perspectiva del *problema del orden social* aplicable a la integración en la España del siglo 21? Los ataques terroristas en EEUU (2001) y, más recientemente, en Europa perpretados por ciudadanos de países musulmanes o por ciudadanos europeos con origen inmigrante y musulmán han provocado un miedo al i*nmigrante generalizado*. La radicalización de jóvenes de origen musulmán, las bandas de delincuentes juveniles (bandas latinas en España) y la inmigración masiva desde países pobres en un contexto de profunda crisis económica plantean una preocupación para las poblaciones de los países occidentales. Se adapta el concepto de *posicionamiento social* a los procesos de inmigración. Se desarrollan análisis estadísticos con los datos del European Social Survey para España. El objetivo es desvelar la percepción de la población española y de los inmigrantes sobre el posicionamiento social de los inmigrantes en el orden social español.

Palabras clave: inmigración, integración, problema hobbesiano del orden, cemento social, posicionamiento social.

1. Introduction

"*There is no place for Industry; because the fruit thereof is uncertain: and conse-quently no Culture of the Earth; no Navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by Sea; no commodious Building; no Instruments of moving, and removing such things as require much force; no Knowledge of the face of the Earth; no account of Time; no Arts; no Letters; no Society; and which is worst of all, continuall feare, and danger of violent death; And the life of man, solitary, poore, nasty, brutish, and short.*"

Hobbes (1966) formulated a social order problem in a context of civil war. Terror-ist attacks in Europe and the USA, perpetrated by Muslims (Inglehart and Norris 2009), radicalisation of young people and mass immigration in Europe, a great part of it of Muslim religion, have provoked the rising to power (or the increasing in votes) of populist parties (Inglehart and Norris 2016; Cherribi 2010) and the publica-tion of theories of conflict of cultures or clash of civilizations (Huntington 1993).

Is the *social order problem* perspective applicable to tackle with immigration in 21st century Spain? Is immigration a social order problem? Or, are we confronted to an "orderly social change" (Wrong 1994)?

This research has used the European Social Survey data (hereinafter, ESS), for Spain, Rounds 2, 4, and 7 (years 2004, 2008, and 2014) to unveil the perception of Span-ish population and of immigrants in Spain about the *social positioning* of immigrants in the Spanish social order continuum, with poles form social order to lack of social order. The opinion of the Spanish population about the place, the status, and the emotional, cognitive, behavioural and legal positioning of immigrants in Spain and the perception of immigrants themselves about their own social positioning may give us the clues to get closer to an understanding of the above mentioned issues. However, as Wrong (1961) suggested, these questions will remain eternally problematic.

This research is based on two perspectives: Spanish population´s and immigrants´ points of view on the social positioning of immigrants within the social order. Indirectly, two processes are under scrutiny: immigration and integration. Both processes are inextricably linked (on the nexus between immigration and integra-tion, see Penninx 2006, who suggests that the nexus between immigration and inte-gration can be understood at three different levels: in research, in policy frameworks

and in current policy practices in the EU; Guild 2006, describes a continuum immigration-integration-citizenship, in which integration is a mechanism for immigrants to become an integral part of the state, i.e., a citizen).

The data on immigration for Round 2 corresponding to the year 2004 and Round 4 regarding year 2008 have revealed very scarce. These two analyses are very poor, although coherent with year 2014; therefore they are not exhibited in this paper.

If perception is reality (Merlau-Ponty 1962; Thomas and Thomas 1928), which perception do the Spanish population and immigrants have about the social positioning of immigrants in Spain in the 21st century? Is this perception of the kind of a social order problem?

Nation-states are not immovable realities but processes that imperatively adapt to new challenges. Western populations fear an eventual undermining (or change) of the coexistence and cohabitation, the economy, the labour market, the culture, in sum, the social order. The ESS (Spain 2014) database has been used to carry out some statistical analyses about the components that give sense to the social positioning of immigrants in the social order of the Spanish society and about the components that best explain the perception of respondents (hereinafter, R) regarding the impact of the social positioning of immigrants on the main pillars of the social order.

Merton (1938) defined five groups in society, which resulted from the independent combination of the two phases of the social structure (culturally defined goals and acceptable modes of achieving them). One of the five groups, rebellion, occurs when emancipation from the reigning standards, due to frustration or to marginalist perspectives, leads to the attempt to introduce a *new social order*. Could immigrants be considered rebels or should they be otherwise classified?

The following section (section 2) provides the theoretical framework to understand what do the social order continuum and the social positioning of immigrants mean in this paper. Section 3 presents three statistical analyses; first, some frequencies of the opinion of Rs about the relation between immigrants and the main pillars of the social order in Spain (criminal law, economy, taxes, religion, culture, the labour market, and the coexistence and cohabitation); second, a principal component analysis (PCA) to obtain the main factors influencing the (Spanish population and immigrants´) opinions about the social positioning of immigrants; and, three, regression relationships (Stepwise Regression, SR) for estimating immigrants´ social positioning core factors (key factors selected from the PCA) that, according to Rs, impact on the main pillars of the social order. The aim of PCA and SR is to further understand the relation emerged from the frequencies analyses. Discussion and concluding comments are exposed in section 4.

It should be noted that this research is not about designating a concrete place for immigrants in the social order continuum but about a previous task, the challenge to

understand the foundations of the social positioning of immigrants within the Span-
ish social order.

2. The social order and the social positioning of immigrants. Theoretical framework

2.1. The social order

The foundation of the social theory poses a very simple question, what holds
societies together? Human societies suffer tensions that make them vulnerable to an
eventual dissolution (Wrong 1994), then, what is the social cement? Parsons (1937)
suggested that Hobbes was the first thinker to clearly formulate the problem of order
in describing a putative state of nature characterized by universal conflict as the con-
dition human beings had to overcome in order to pursue a collective mode of exis-
tence.

Favell (1998) poses the question of how can a political system achive stability and
legitimacy by rebuilding communal bonds of civility and tolerance (a moral social
order) across the conflicts and divisions caused by the plurality of values and
individual interest? Immigration and integration may be problematized as social
order issues by operationalizing the social positioning of immigrants within the
social order continuum.

What does it mean to be a problem of social order? Which domains of the
nation-state are affected by it? A problem of order is a fundamental one. The main
pillars of society, institutions and foundations themselves, are under threat. It is a
problem that has to do with conflict and further to that it has to do with all that binds
us together.

There are some important dimensions of the problem of social order that should
be taken into account and applied to the conceptualisation of the social positioning
of immigrants as a social order problem.

First, social order is a matter of degree. We may represent graphically a continuum
in which in one pole there is the social order and in the other the lack of order, disorder
is present along the continuum. In principle, applied to our topic, all immigrants have
a position in the receiving society although in different degrees (Portes and Rumbaut
2001; Portes and Borocz 2004; Portes et al. 2005; Portes and Zhou 1993; Freeman
1986, 2004, 2006; Alba 1999; Alba, R. and Nee, V. 1999, 2004). We can say with
Merton (1938) that, in no group, is there total absence of regulating codes of conduct;
however groups vary in the degree to which the folkways, mores and institutional
controls are effectively integrated with the more diffuse goals, which are part of the
culture matrix.

Second, the units that are bound together within the social order may vary from individuals, dyads, families, local communities, politically organized associations or imagined communities (Wrong 1994). From another viewpoint, these are the macro, meso and micro levels of interaction within the social order (Heckmann 2005, 2006).

Third, a social order problem implies that there are at least two actors: those who defend pervasive values, ideals and beliefs and those who oppose them. Is then there a clash of civilizations (Huntington 1993) or a Hobbesian war of all against all? Or are we confronted to a social order problem of a completely different nature?

Fourth, and last, the problem of social order should be distinguished from its solutions. As we will see, the questions of Spain´s ESS 2014 database pose the problem. The intersubjective agreement reveals itself as the eventual solution. In democratic and pluralistic societies, conflicts should be treated, at least, in a bidirectional way, i.e., taking into account the points of view of all parts.

2.2. The social positioning of immigrants

The concept *position* has been taken from Blumer´s group position theory of prejudice and from the works developed by Moghaddam et al. (2003), Harré and Davis, 1990 and Parrott (2001).

The reasons not to directly address the research on immigration and integration from the prejudices and stereotypes perspective and, instead of that, to use the concept social positioning are fivefold; first of all, talking about social positioning does not imply a value judgement previous to any other consideration. In effect, if we talk about prejudices and stereotypes, we are, *a priori*, negatively assessing immigrants. With the concept of social positioning, an aseptic treatment is guaranteed from the very beginning. Second, individuals have to place (social positioning) themselves and others into different categories. This differentiation of categories, perforce, establishes a relationship between members of the categories. Ideas and feelings about racial groups of necessity have implications for appropriate relations between members of those groups (Blumer 1958). Third, the concept social positioning reminds the main process that forms the person, i.e., intersubjective relations. Human beings are not conceivable without intersubjective relations; therefore, as we will see, the concept social positioning is very appropriate. Four, social positioning refers to social beings as a complex whole, because the social positioning is concerned with how society influences the cognition, motivation, development, and behaviour of individuals and, in turn, is influenced by them (Cartwright 1979). Five, social positioning contains in itself the Space(place)-Time continuum as it makes reference to a place but also to a process that changes and evolutions within time.

Blumer (1958) suggests that the group position *is not a mere reflection of the objective relations between racial groups. Rather it stands for "what ought to be" rather than for "what is". It is a sense of where the two racial groups belong… In its own way, the sense of group position is a norm and imperative, indeed a very powerful one. It guides, incites, cows, and coerces."* We argue that this approach may also be usefully applied to relations between Spanish population and immigrants. Assigning a group position in the social order implies, among other things, granting different rights, privileges, and places of action (Blumer 1958; Elias and Scotson 1994; Moghaddam et al. 2003). For Bobo (1999), the sense of group position is a normative construct and functions along two important axes (the hierarchical ordering and social positioning and the socioemotional embrace or recoil). Positions are social and exists as patterns of beliefs in the members of a relatively coherent speech community (Harré and Moghaddam 2003).

This paper will use the term positioning as a matter of priority because attributing a position or a place in the social order continuum is considered a process, not a static reality. Therefore, social positioning is defined as the dynamic and strategic construction of personal identities relative to those of others (in our paper, immigrants) as an essential feature of social interaction (Harré and Davis 1990). One way of positioning one´s opponents is to state what behaviour they ought to be having and what emotions they ought to be feeling, and to characterize as inappropriate the behaviours and emotions they are having or feeling. It is worth highlighting, then, the emotional (Bower 1991; Salovey et al. 1991; Brown 1995; Hage 2003; Parrot 2003; Ahmed 2004; Demertzis 2006; Yuval-Davis 2006; Thompson y Hoggett 2012), cognitive (for the interaction between emotion and cognition see Phelps 2006) and behavioural mechanisms of response of human beings (Smollan 2006); these dimensions contribute to the social positioning of immigrants in the minds of the Spanish population and in their own minds and contribute to the framing of the social positioning of immigrants as a social order problem.

The social positioning of immigrants within the social order is permanently and constantly constructed, reconstructed, destroyed, and restored. Burgess (1925) suggests that the processes of disorganization and organization are in reciprocal relationship to each other and both cooperate in a moving equilibrium of social order toward a progressive end. Disorganization as preliminary to reorganization of attitudes and conduct is almost invariably the lot of the newcomer to the city.

3. Social positioning of immigrants within the social order in figures

Predicting immigrants´ social positioning is critical for social order and social cohesion in any country. Three main statistical analyses (frequencies, PCA and SR) are developed in order to address these issues.

For simplicity, this paper divides Rs into two groups, one the *"born in Spain"* (also called in this paper Spanish population) and the other those *"not born in Spain"* (also called immigrants). Both perspectives are confronted to search for similarities, dissimilarities and links of union. Three analyses have been carried out to deepen on the social positioning of immigrants within the social order in Spain in the year 2014.

3.1. The spanish population perspective (born in spain)

Is the Spanish society *positioning* immigrants as a social order problem? According to Elias and Scotson (1976), newcomers are perceived by established as people who do not know their place. The following table shows the opinion of the Spanish population about the question of whether *Immigrants make country´s crime problems worse or better*.

TABLE 1. Immigrants make country's crime problems worse or better

		Frequency	Valid Percentage	Accumulated Percentage
Valid	Crime problems made worse	140	8	8.3
	1	129	7. 3	15.9
	2	263	15	31. 5
	3	364	20.7	53
	4	225	12.8	66.4
	5	461	26.3	93.7
	6	49	2.8	96.6
	7	28	1.6	98.2
	8	19	1. 1	99.3
	9	5	0.3	99.6
	Crime problems made better	6	0.3	100
	Total	1689	96.2	
Lost	Refusal	8	0.5	
	Don't know	59	3.4	
	Total	67	3.8	
Total		1756	100	

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

If we divide the answers (Table 1 above) into three groups, the percentage of born in Spain who consider that immigrants make crime problems worse reaches 66,4% (answers ranging from *Crime problems made worse* to answer number *4*). On the contrary, the Spanish population of the sample who considers that immigrants make

crime problems better amounts to 6,1% (answers from *6* to *Crime problems made better*). The percentage of born in Spain who are in the middle (answer number *5*) amounts 26,3%. The interpretation of this position number *5* is ambiguous, as it could be understood that the Spanish population think that immigrants do not make crimes problems worse or better, or that they do not know or are not sure about their answer.

Frequencies of opinions about the contribution of immigrants to the economy (*Immigration bad or good for country's economy*) and the coexistence and cohabitation (*Immigrants make country worse or better place to live*) are more balanced than opinions about crime. Frequencies about culture (*Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants*) are positive and regarding labour market (*Immigrants take jobs away in country or create new Jobs*), they are negative. In sum, it appears that the perception of immigrants by the Spanish population is paradoxical as the social positioning of immigrants could be considered a social order problem with regard to some pillars but in relation to others, it seems that not (Díez Nicolás 2004, 2009).

The analysis of other pillars of Spanish social order shows also paradoxical results. In the question whether *Immigrants take out more taxes and services than they put in or less*, the percentage of those born in Spain who thinks that immigrants take out more taxes and services than they put in is 53%. Those in the middle (answer in the position number 5) amount to 26,8%. A smaller percentage of 14,4% thinks that immigrants generally put in more. In the case of the question concerning *Religious beliefs and practices undermined or enriched by immigrants*, the percentage of those born in Spain who think that immigrants undermine religious beliefs is 25,5%. Those in the middle (answer in position number 5) amount to 44,0%. A percentage of 30,5% thinks that immigrants enrich religious beliefs.

From the point of view of the Spanish population, some of the main pillars of the Spanish social order seem to be threatened by immigrants: legal system, labour market, taxes, but others do not.

Table 2 shows the opinion of the Spanish population on whether or not *it is better for a country if almost everyone shares customs and traditions.*

TABLE 2. Better for a country if almost everyone shares customs and traditions

		Frequency	Percentage	Accumulated Percentage
Valid	Agree strongly	211	12.2	12.2
	Agree	601	34.8	47. 1
	Neither agree nor disagree	486	28.2	75.2
	Disagree	361	20.9	96.2
	Disagree strongly	66	3.8	100
	Total	1725	100	
Lost	Don't know	31		
Total		1756		

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

As seen in Table 2 above, 47,10% of the Spanish population strongly agrees or agrees that *it is better for a country if almost everyone shares customs and traditions*. Those who neither agree nor disagree amount to 28,2% and those who disagree or strongly disagree are only 24,7% of the Spanish population. The concepts of multiculturalism, interculturalism or superdiversity seem to be foreign to the majority (75,2%) of the Spanish population represented in the sample.

After the frequency analyses (Tables 1 and 2), some questions arise. Which are the main components that contribute to the social positioning of immigrants within the main pillars of the Spanish social order? And, what do these components inform us about?

To answer to these questions, statistical analyses based on PCA and SR are developed. The PCA[1] is applied to a number of variables (Items) of the ESS Round 7, 2014 for Spain in order to use the resulting principal components (PCs) as predictors in a SR model. First we focus on the *"born in Spain"* perspective. The *"not born in Spain"* viewpoint is exposed in the following subsection.

The PCA for the opinion of Spanish population (*born in Spain*) about the social positioning of immigrants results in 6 PCs. The labels we have given to the PCs are as follows: 1. Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants, 2. Qualification for Immigrants, 3. Primary and Secondary Relations with Immigrants, 4. Prejudices in relation to the Other, 5. Equality, and 6. Number of Immigrants in the country. The 6 components or key factors explain at least up to 56,73% of the variation of all variables.

---

[1] PCA avoids high correlation between the predictor variables, reduces the number of variables and helps to understand complex interrelations among them in predicting the social positioning of immigrants from two different perspectives (R´s born in Spain and R´s not born in Spain).

After obtaining the PCA, five dependent variables of the Spain ESS 2014 database were regressed (SR)[2] on the set of 6 principal components: *1. Immigrants make country´s crime problems worse or better, 2. Immigrants take jobs away in country or create new jobs, 3. Country´s cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants*, *4. Immigration bad or good for country´s economy,* and *5. Immigrants make country worse or better place to live.* These five variables have been chosen because they represent the main pillars of the social order in Spain, i.e., legal system (criminal system), labour market, culture, economy, cohabitation and coexistence. The final results (last steps of SR) for each SR are exposed in the Tables below (Table 3 to Table 7); all of them are statistically significant.[3]

Table III shows the final model (step 4) where the PCs correlate with the dependent variable concerning crime in Spain (*Immigrants make country´s crime problems worse or better"*). The Model Summary (not exhibited in this paper) shows a final adjusted r-square of 0.214 which means that the 4 predictors account for 21.4% of the variance in the opinion about the social positioning of immigrants.

These results are coherent with the most recent literature. In effect, with a Beta coefficient of -0.419, Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants is the strongest predictor supporting the opinion of the Spanish population with regard to an essential issue of social order in Spain such as the social positioning of immigrants in the criminal system. Permissiveness makes reference to the position of Rs regarding allowing many or few immigrants from poor countries, Muslims or Gypsies entering Europe. Institutional Treatment of Immigrants refers to the treatment Government gives to refugees and whether or not the Government treatment to immigrants is better or worse to that given by Rs.

---

[2] According to Koklu et al. (2010), multiple linear regressions are a statistical tool for understanding the best relationship between an outcome variable (dependent variable) and several predictors (independent variables). The technique is used for both predictive and explanatory purposes. The regression models show the strongest core factors affecting social positioning of immigrants. The proposed relationships may be considered valuable for predicting social positioning of immigrants in Spain.

[3] The Significance (Sig.) figures are below 0.05, i.e., they are significant at 95 per cent. The value of 0,000 means the figure is too small for three decimal place representations. All the tables show that Tolerance (percentage of the variance in a given predictor that cannot be explained by the other predictors) is equal to 1,000, therefore there is no multicollinearity and the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is not greater than 2.

TABLE 3. *"Immigrants make country´s crime problems worse or better"* **variable regressed on PCs. Born in Spain**

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
Step 4	*B*	*Standard error*	*Beta*			*Tolerance*	*VIF*
Principal Components							
(Constant)	3.516	0.051		68.423	0.000		
1. Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants	0.778	0.052	-0.419	15.105	0.000	1.000	1.000
4. Prejudices in relation to the Other	0.258	0.051	0.139	5.018	0.000	1.000	1.000
6. Number of Immigrants in Country	0.229	0.051	-0.124	-4.469	0.000	1.000	1.000
5. Equality	0.145	0.052	-0.078	-2.819	0.005	1.000	1.000
Dependent Variable: *Immigrants make country's crime problems worse or better*							

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

The reciprocal influence of population and public institutions in the formation of their respective opinions and perception about immigrants is evidenced in this latent variable. The influence of public institutions on public opinion has been analysed elsewhere (Nelson and Kinder 1996; Valentino, Hutchings, and White 2002; Brader et al. 2008). Emotions and Beliefs play a mediating role in the public opinion formation (Lodge and Taber 2005; Valentino et al. 2008).

The treatment of Government to immigrants (securitization, i.e., making immigrants an issue of security) has been profusely analysed (Simon 1987; Bourdieu and Passeron 1990; Waever et al. 1993; Waever 1995; Bigo 1994; Bourdie 1998; Mears and Kelly 1999; Huysmans 2000; Buzan and Waever 2003; for Sayad 2004, the very category of the *immigrant* reflects how the state discriminates between different categories of residents and impose a double punishment on immigrants who commit an offense as they are viewed as being intrinsically delinquent by virtue of their displaced status; Tirman 2004; Balzacq 2005; Jackson and Parkes 2006; D´Appollonia and Reich 2008; García Cívico 2011, refers to the states restrictive policies concerning the entrance of immigrants in the seventies petrol crisis; Pizarro and Tannenbaum 2011; Nadler 2012).

As seen in Table 3, Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants is negatively correlated with the perception on the question regarding the contribution

of immigrants to criminality; the less the Permissivenes of Rs and the better the Institutional Treatment of Immigrants compared to treatment of Rs, the worst Rs´ opinion regarding immigrants as criminals.

The second predictor (0,139) is Prejudices in relation to the Other (Allport 1954; Pratto, Sidanius and Levin 2006; Zick, Küpper and Hövermann 2011). This latent variable is positively correlated to the dependent variable, which means that the more the Prejudices, the worst the Rs´ opinion regarding immigrants as criminals.

The third predictor (-0.124) is the Number of Immigrants in the Country (Nadeau et al. 1993; Strabac 2011; Quillian 1995; Scheepers and Coenders 2002; Semyonov et al. 2004 suggested that it is not the number, but the perception of the number; Hooghe and De Vroome 2015; Evans and Need 2002, did not find any relation between the size of the foreign population and the attitudes against the minority groups in Europe). This latent variable is negatively correlated to the dependent variable, which means that the bigger the number (or the perception of the number) of immigrants in the country, the worst the Rs´ opinion regarding immigrants as criminals.

Finally, the fourth predictor makes reference to Equality (The Tampere European Council Conclusions of 1999 stipulated that the European Union must ensure equality, equal treatment and non-discrimination in economic, social and cultural life and measures against racism and xenophobia; see also, Niessen 2006). This latent variable is negatively correlated to the dependent variable, which means that the most pro equal rights and treatment is the R, the better the Rs´ opinion regarding immigrants as criminals.

Table 4 shows the final model (step 5) where the PCs correlate with the dependent variable concerning jobs in Spain (*Immigrants take jobs away in country or create new jobs*). The Model Summary (not exhibited in this paper) shows a final adjusted r-square of 0.313 which means that the 5 predictors account for 31.3% of the variance in the opinion about the positioning of immigrants.

The strongest PC is the same as in Table 3, Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants. Second, the Number of Immigrants in the Country. The third PC is related to the Qualification of Immigrants (education skills, work skills needed, speak country´s language); the importance of this latent variable is coherent with the question posed as dependent variable concerning jobs (Brader et al. 2008). The fourth PC is the Prejudices in relation to the Other, and the fifth, Equality.

TABLE 4. *"Immigrants take jobs away in country or create new jobs"* variable regressed on PCs. Born in Spain

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
Step 5	*B*	*Standard error*	*Beta*			*Tolerance*	*VIF*
Principal Components							
(Constant)	4.654	0.061		76.701	0.000		
1. Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants	-1.216	0.060	-0.523	-20.132	0.000	1.000	1.000
6. Number of Immigrants in Country	-0.339	0.061	-0.146	-5.600	0.000	1.000	1.000
2. Qualification of Immigrants	-0.261	0.061	-0.112	-4.315	0.000	1.000	1.000
4. Prejudices in relation to the Other	0.163	0.061	0.070	2.678	0.008	1.000	1.000
5. Equality	-0.145	0.061	-0.062	-2.392	0.017	1.000	1.000
Dependent Variable: *Immigrants take jobs away in country or create new jobs*							

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

Table 5 shows the final model (step 6) where the PCs correlate with the dependent variable concerning the pillar of culture (*Country´s cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants*). The Model Summary (not exhibited in this paper) shows a final adjusted r-square of 0.294 which means that the 6 predictors account for 29.4% of the variance in the opinion about the positioning of immigrants.

TABLE 5. *"Country´s cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants"*
variable regressed on PCs. Born in Spain

Step 6	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
	B	Standard error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
Principal Components							
(Constant)	6.152	0.064		96.546	0.000		
1. Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants	-1.073	0.064	-0.442	-16.861	0.000	1.000	1.000
6. Number of Immigrants in Country	-0.411	0.064	-0.169	-6.440	0.000	1.000	1.000
3. Primary and Secondary Relations with Immigrants	-0.406	0.064	-0.167	-6.373	0.000	1.000	1.000
4. Prejudices in relation to the Other	0.360	0.064	0.148	5.632	0.000	1.000	1.000
2. Qualification for Immigrants	-0.291	0.064	-0.120	-4.569	0.000	1.000	1.000
5. Equality	-0.236	0.064	-0.097	-3.707	0.000	1.000	1.000
Dependent Variable: *Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants*							

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

The strongest predictor, Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants, is the same as in the other models (Tables 3 and 4 above). The third PC is Primary and Secondary Relations developed with Immigrants (Allport´s, 1954, Contact Theory support the closeness to avoid prejudice and discrimination; Pettigrew 1998; Pettigrew et al. 2011; however, there are also reviews that do not fully support the contact research, such as, McCledon 1974; Hopkins et al. 1997; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). The fifth PC is Qualification for Immigrants.

Table 6 shows the final model (step 6) where the PCs correlate with the dependent variable concerning the economy in Spain (*Immigration bad or good for country´s economy*). The Model Summary (not exhibited in this paper) shows a final adjusted r-square of 0,319 which means that the 6 predictors account for 31,9% of the variance in the opinion about the positioning of immigrants.

TABLE 6. *"Immigration bad or good for country's economy"* **variable regressed on PCs. Born in Spain**

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
Step 6	***B***	***Standard error***	***Beta***			***Tolerance***	***VIF***
Principal Components							
(Constant)	5.114	0.061		83.934	0.000		
1. Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants	-1.212	0.061	-0.514	-19.900	0.000	1.000	1.000
6. Number of Immigrants in Country	-0.347	0.061	-0.147	-5.688	0.000	1.000	1.000
2. Qualification of Immigrants	-0.257	0.061	-0.109	-4.223	0.000	1.000	1.000
4. Prejudices in relation to the Other	0.252	0.061	0.107	4.129	0.000	1.000	1.000
5. Equality	-0.225	0.061	-0.095	-3.669	0.000	1.000	1.000
3. Primary and Secondary Relations with Immigrants	-0.165	0.061	-0.070	-2.717	0.007	1.000	1.000
Dependent Variable: *Immigration bad or good for country's economy*							

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

The strongest predictor, Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants, is the same of the other models (Tables 3, 4 and 5 above).

Table 7 shows the final model (step 6) where the PCs correlate with the dependent variable *Immigrants make country worse or better place to live*. The Model Summary (not exhibited in this paper) shows a final adjusted r-square of 0.399 which means that the 12 predictors account for 39.9% of the variance in the opinion about the positioning of immigrants.

Table 7. *" Immigrants make country worse or better place to live"* variable regressed on PCs. Born in Spain

Step 6	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
	B	*Standard error*	*Beta*			*Tolerance*	*VIF*
Principal Components							
(Constant)	5.245	0.053		99.896	0.000		
1. Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants	-1.263	0.053	-0.583	-24.047	0.000	1.000	1.000
2. Qualification of Immigrants	-0.263	0.052	-0.122	-5.019	0.000	1.000	1.000
5. Equality	-0.254	0.052	-0.117	-4.845	0.000	1.000	1.000
3. Primary and Secondary Relations with Immigrants	-0,241	0.052	-0.111	-4.587	0.000	1.000	1.000
6. Number of Immigrants in Country	-0.237	0.052	-0.109	-4.514	0.000	1.000	1.000
4. Prejudices in relation to the Other	0.193	0.053	0.089	3.652	0.000	1.000	1.000
Dependent Variable: *Immigrants make country worse or better place to live*							

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

The strongest predictor, Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants, is the same of the other models (Tables 3, 4, 5 and 6 above), it is also positively correlated to the dependent variable.

As a conclusion for all the Tables above exposed (from Table 3 to Table 7), the statistical relations between the PCs and the dependent variable are negative, except in the case of the Prejudices in relation to the Other that, in all Tables, is positive. The opinions of Rs regarding the social positioning of immigrants in the main pillars of the social order are supported by almost the same latent variables. The opinions of Rs is formed very homogenously and, therefore, have equal foundations. The only differences are based on the different questions posed, i.e., if the question is about jobs, economy or culture, the dependent variable regresses on the latent variable Qualification for Immigrants. If the dependent variable is concerning crime, Qualification for Immigrants is not regressing.

3.2. The immigrant's perspective

The social positioning of immigrants equation would not be complete if immigrants´ (*not born in Spain*) viewpoint would not be taken into account. How do immigrants perceive their social positioning in Spain? Which predictors best explain the closeness of immigrants to our country and, therefore, to the social order in Spain?

First, a PCA was carried out to reduce the number of predictors of the social positioning of immigrants in the social order in Spain from their own point of view. The key factors obtained were, 1. Trust and Satisfaction with Public Institutions, 2. Political Citizenship, 3. Active Citizenship, 4. Agency versus Structure, 5. Equality, 6. Income and Employment, 7. Freedom, 8. Perception of the Immigrant, 9. Basic Job, and 10. Refugees. 10 PCs explain at least up to 73,96% of the variation of all variables.

Table 8 below shows immigrants´ opinion about their social positioning in Spanish social order continuum measured by regressing the dependent variable *"Feel close to country"* on the PCs for immigrants. The result is that the strongest predictors of the social positioning are PCs numbers 4. Agency versus Structure and 2. Political Citizenship.

Table 8. *"Feel close to country"* variable regressed on PCs. Not-born in Spain

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
Step 2	*B*	*Standard error*	*Beta*			*Tolerance*	*VIF*
(Constant)	1.559	0.076		20.392	0		
4. Agency versus Structure	-0.216	0.078	-0.332	-2.786	0.007	0.999	1.001
2. Political Citizenship	-0.159	0.077	-0.246	-2.065	0.043	0.999	1.001
Dependent Variable: *Feel close to country*							

Source: Compilation with data from ESS Spain, Round 7, 2014.

The main inference of this Table is the importance of Agency versus Structure, which is related to the freedom (or lack of freedom) to carry out personal decisions without fear and with the only limitation of the law (Pettit 2007; Cachón Rodríguez 2009) and to the power to influence policy decisions (Political Citizenship). The Beta coefficient is negative, -0,332, which means that the more the Agency the closer immigrants feel to the Country. The other latent variable, Political Citizenship, has

also a negative relation to *"Feel close to Country"* (Mezzadra 2005; De Lucas 2003; Cachón Rodríguez 2009). The negative value of the coefficient may be interpreted in the sense that the stronger the Political Citizenship the closer to the country. Both factors are, then, essential to understand the social positioning of immigrants, from their own perspective.

In sum, two core factors compose the photograph of the self-image of immigrants regarding their social positioning. First, Agency versus Structure reveals itself as fundamental for immigrants self-positioning and, second, an active participation at the political level (Political Citizenship) is the other key factor in the self-image and self-positioning of immigrants.

The main symmetry between the opinions of Spanish population and immigrants regarding the social positioning of immigrants in the Spanish social order is self-evident. The Permissiveness to enter the country (*born in Spain*) is a political decision that, together with the Treatment that the Public Institutions give to immigrants (*born in Spain*), constitutes two important reasons for immigrants (*not born in Spain*) to consider Political Citizenship a key factor for their social positioning in Spain. However, as Favell suggests (1998), immigration and the related citizenship questions are a political issue that can, if it unsettles any of the other social, class or regional divisions that characterize these societies, rapidly throw into doubt much broader assumptions about the bases of social and political integration in a nation: its moral and cultural identity.

The strength of immigrants to influence social and political decisions (Agency) is a key factor to merit a fair and just social positioning within the Spanish social order.

An important conclusion of the analyses developed above is that it does not seem to be a Hobbesian social order problem nor a clash of civilizations, but a completely different challenge that has to do with perception of social positioning of immigrants and the way perception is formed; and also it has to do with distribution, equality, and social justice (Rawls 1971).

4. Conclusions

The perception of the Spanish population about the social positioning of immigrants in the Spanish social order continuum is paradoxical. But we can conclude that there is not a war of all against all (a Hobbesian social order problem), nor a clash of civilizations, but (simplifying) two parts in a constant and permanent process of social positioning (as Burgess suggested, a society permanently organizing and disorganizing), in which one of the parts, receiving society, has more power than the other, immigrants (Heckmann 2006; Penninx 2004). Interestingly, Hobbes accused Christian religion as the *most frequent praetext of Sedition, and Civil Warre,*

in Christian Common-Wealth. According to Hobbes, outside Christendom there were no civil wars about religion.

In this study, PCA and SR models were used to evaluate the social positioning of immigrants in Spain. These statistical tools have provided more objective interpretation of the factors behind the perception of respondents regarding social positioning of immigrants in the Spanish social order.

From the point of view of the Spanish society (*born in Spain*), it is clear that Permissiveness and Institutional Treatment of Immigrants is the most determinant parameter responsible for social positioning of immigrants in Spain.

If the sense of group position is a norm and an imperative (Bobo 1999), do the newcomers know which is their place (Elias and Scotson 1976)? It seems that they do because they have realized that the main way to be strongly positioned in the Spanish society is achieving independence (Agency) and political power (Political Citizenship).

Ethnic dilemmas, dealt with in the right way, can be a resource of social progress and diversity. Failure to achieve the right framework for them, however, will lead to an increase in intolerance and xenophobia among majority populations and a loss of "moral social order" (Favell 1998). The utopia should be to construct a more capacious sense of *we*, a reconstruction of diversity that does not bleach out ethnic specificities, but creates overarching identities that ensure that those specificities do not trigger the allergic *hunker down* reaction (Putnam 2007).

5. References

Ahmed, S. 2004. The Cultural Politics of Emotion. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Alba, R. 1999. "Immigration and the American Realities of Assimilation and Multiculturalism". Pp. 3-16, In R.Münz, y W. Seifert, (Eds.) Inclusion or Exclusion of Immigrants, Demography aktuell, 14.

Alba, R., and Nee, V. 1999. "Rethinking Assimilation Theory". Pp. 137-160, In Hirschmann, Kasinitz y DeWind (Eds.), The Handbook of International Migration: The American Experience. New York: Russel Sage Foundation.

– 2004. "Assimilation und Einwanderung in den USA". In *IMIS Beiträge* 23, 21-40.

Allport G. W. 1954. The Nature of Prejudice. Nueva Jersey: Garden City. Doubleday.

Balzcaq, T. 2005. "The three faces of securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context". *European Journal of International Relations,* 11 (2) 171-201.

Bigo, D. 1994. "The European Internal Security Field". Pp. 161-173, in M. Anderson y M. den Boer (Eds). *Policing Across National Boundaries.* Pinter Publications.

Blumer, H. 1958. "Race Prejudice as a Sense of Group Position". *Pacific Sociological Review* 1, 3-7.

Bobo, L. 1999. "Prejudice as Group Position: Microfoundations of a Sociological Approach to Racism and Race Relations". *Journal of Social Issues,* 55 (3), 445-472.

Bourdieu, P. 1998. Practical reason. Palo Alto, CA: Standford University Press.

Bourdieu, P., and Passeron, J-C. 1990. Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture. London: Sage.

Bower, G. H. 1991. "Mood Congruity of Social Judgments". Pp. 31-53. In Joseph P. Forgas (Ed.), Emotion and Social Judgments, Oxford: Pergamon Press.

Brader, T., Valentino, N., and Suhay, E. 2008. "What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threat". *American Journal of Political Science*, 52, 959–978.

Brown, W. 1995. States of Injury: Power and Freedom in Late Modernity. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Burgess, E. W. 1925. The Growth of the City: An Introduction to a Research Project. Pp. 47-62. In Robert E. Park y otros (Ed.), *The City*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Buzan, B., and Waever, O. 2003. Regions and powers: the structure of international security *(Vol. 91).* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cachón Rodríguez, L. 2009. En la "España inmigrante: entre la fragilidad de los inmigrantes y las políticas de integración". *Papeles del CEIC*, 45.

Cartwrigth, D. 1979. "Contemporary social psychology in historical perspective". *Social Psychology Quaterly,* 43, 82-93.

Cherribi, S. 2010. In the House of War. Dutch Islam Observed. New York: Oxford University Press.

Curran, M. J. 2003. Across the Water, the Acculturation and Health of Irish People in London. Dublin: Trinity College, Psychology Department.

D'Appollonia, A. C., and Reich, S. 2008. Immigration, Integration, and Security: America and Europe in Comparative Perspective. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Demertzis, N. 2006. Emotions and populism. Pp. 103-122. Pp. In S. Clarke, P. Hoggett and S. Thompson (Eds.) *Emotion, Politics and Society*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Díez Nicolás, J. 2004. Las dos caras de la inmigración. Ministerio de Trabajo y Asuntos Sociales, Subdirección General de Información Administrativa y Publicaciones.

– 2009. "Construcción de un índice de Xenofobia-Racismo". *Revista del Ministerio de Trabajo e Inmigración*, 80. Migraciones Internacionales.

Elias, N., and Scotson, J. L. 1976. The Established and the Outsiders. London: Sage.

Evans, G., and Nee, A. 2002. "Explaining ethnic polarization over attitudes towards minority rights in Eastern Europe: a multilevel analysis". *Social Science Research*, 31 (4) 653-680.

Favell, S. 1998. Philosophies of Integration. Immigration and the Idea of Citizenship in France and Britain. London, UK: MacMillan Press Ltd.

Freeman, G. P. 1986. "Migration and the Political Economy of the Welfare State". *Annals of the American Academy of Political Social Science,* 485, 51-63.

–2004. "Immigrant Incorporation in Western Democracies". *The International Migration Review*, 38 (3) Conceptual and Methodological Developments in the Study of International Migration, 945-969.

– 2006. "National models, policy types, and the politics of immigration in liberal democracies". *West European Politics*, 29 (2) Immigration Policy in Europe: The Politics of Control. Published online http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01402380500512585.

García Cívico, J. 2011. "Sobre el proceso de integración social del inmigrante en España. La cuestión de los indicadores". *Revista electronica del Instituto de Investigaciones "Ambrosio L. Gioja",* Año V, 7, 50-77.

Guild, E. 2006. Where is the Nexus? Some Final Considerations on Immigration, Integration and Citizenship. Conclusions Collective Conference Volume/April, Challenge, Liberty and Security.

Hage, G. 2003. Against Paranoid Nationalism: Searching for Hope in a Shrinking Society. London: Merlin Press.

Harré, R., and Davies, B. 1990. "Positioning: The discursive production of selves". *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, *20*, 43–63.

Harré, R. and Moghaddam, F. M. 2003. The Self and Others, Westport, CT: Praeger.

Heckmann, F. 2005. "National Modes of Immigrant Integration". Pp. 99-113, in Bosswick, W., Husband, C., (eds.). Comparative European Research in Migration, Diversity and Identities. HumanitarianNet, Thematic Network on Humanitarian Development Studies. Bilbao, Spain: University of Deusto.

– 2006. *Integration and Integration Policies.* European Forum for Migration Studies Institute at the University of Bamberg.

Ho, L-E. 2009. "Constituting Citizenship through the Emotions: Singaporean Transmigrants in London". *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99 (4) 788–804.

Hooghe, M., and De Vroome, T. 2015. "The Perception of Ethnic Diversity and Anti-Immigrant Sentiments: A Multilevel Analysis of Local Communities in Belgium". *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 38(1).

Humphris, R. 2014. Integration Practice: Initiatives and Innovations by Institutions and Civil Society. KING Project Applied Social Studies Unit Desk Research Paper n. 15.

Hopkins, N., Reicher, S., and Levine, M. 1997. "On the parallels between social cognition and the "new racism". *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 36, 305–329.

Huntington, S. P. 1993. "The Clash of Civilizations?" *Foreign Affairs,* 22-49.

Huysmans, J. 2000. "The European Union and the Securitization of Migration". *Journal of Common Market Studies,* 35(5), 751-777.

Inglehart, R.F., Norris, P. 2009. Muslim Integration into Western Cultures: Between Origins and Destinations. *Faculty Research Working Paper Series*, Harvard Kennedy School, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Cambridge.

– 2016. Trump, Brexit, and the Rise of Populism: Economic have-nots and cultural backlash. *Faculty Research Working Paper Series*, Harvard Kennedy School, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Cambridge.

Jackson, I. P., and Parkes, R. 2006. "Globalization and the Secularization of Immigration Policy. Competing influences on Immigration Integration Policy in Germany, France, Britain and the United States". *Human Architecture: Journal of the Sociology of Self-Knwoledge, IV, Special Issue,* 131-146.

Ke, M-c. 2007. "An Application of Fuzzy Clustering on the Analysis of Customer Needs", *Tamsui Oxford Journal of Management Sciences*, 23(2), 1-22, New Taipei City, Taiwan: Aletheia University.

Zick, A., Küpper, B., and Hövermann, A. 2011. Intolerance, Prejudice and Discrimination. A European Report. Berlin: Forum Berlin

Lodge, M., and Taber, C. S. 2005. "The Automaticity of Affect for Political Leaders, Groups, and Issues: An Experimental Test of the Hot Cognition Hypothesis" *Political Psychology* 26, 455–482.

Lucas De, J. 2003. Globalización e identidades. Claves políticas y jurídicas. Barcelona: Icaria.

McClendon, M. J. 1974. "Interracial contact and the reduction of prejudice". *Sociological Focus, 7,* 47-65.

Mears, D. P. and Kelly, W. R. 1999. "Assessments and intake processes in juvenile justice processing: Emerging policy considerations". *Crime and Delinquency*, 45(4), 508-529.

Merleau-Ponty, M. 1962. Phenomenology of perception (C. Smith, Trans.). London: Routledge.

Merton, R. K. 1938. "Social Structure and Anomie". *American Sociological Review,* 3(5), 672-682.

Mezzadra, S. 2005. Derecho de fuga. Migraciones, ciudadanía y globalización. Madrid, Spain: Traficantes de sueños.

Moghaddam, F.M., Hanley, E., and Harré, R. 2003. "Sustaining intergroup harmony: An analysis of the Kissinger papers through positioning theory". Pp. 137-155, In R. Harré and F.M. Moghaddam (Eds.), *The self and others: Positioning individuals and groups in personal, political, and cultural contexts.* Westport, CT: Praeger.

Nadeau, R., Niemi, R. G., and Levine, J. 1993. "Innumeracy about minority populations". *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57(3), 332-347.

Nadler, J. 2012. "Blaming as a social process: the influence of character and moral emotion on blame". *Law and contemporary problems*, vol. 7.

Nelson, T. E., and Kinder, D. R. 1996. "Issue Frames and Group-Centrism in American Public Opinion". *Journal of Politics* 58(4), 1055-78.

Parrott, W.G. 2001. "The Nature of Emotion". Pp. 375-390, In Abraham Tesser, Norbert Schwarz, (eds.) Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Intraindividual Processes. Massachusetts: Blackwell Publishers

Parsons, T. 1937. The Structure of Social Action. A Study in Social Theory with Special Reference to a Group of Recent European Writers. New York: MacGraw Hill.

Penninx, R. 2004. Integration processes of migrants in the European Union and policies relating to integration. Presentation for the Conference on Population Challenges, International Migration and Reproductive Health in Turkey and the European Union: Issues and Policy Implications, held in Istanbul, October 11/12.

– 2006. Seminar on Immigration, Integration, and Citizenship, The Nexus in the EU. Center for European Policy Studies (CEPS) and Center for Migration Law (Radboud University of Nijmegen). Brussels, Belgium: CHALLENGE Project, Liberty and Security.

Pettigrew, T. F. 1998. "Intergroup contact theory". *Annual review of psychology*, 49 (1) 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F., and Tropp, L. R. 2006. "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 90(5), 751-783.

Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., and Christ, O. 2011. "Recent advances in inter-group contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations"*, 35 (3) 271-280.

Pettit, P. 2007. Una teoría de la libertad. De la psicología a la acción política. Madrid: Losada.

Pizarro, D. A., and Tannenbaum, D. 2011. "Bringing Character Back: How the Motivation to Evaluate Character Influences Judgments of Moral Blame". In Mario Mikulincer and Phillip R. Shaver (eds) The social psychology of morality: exploring the causes of good and evil. Washington: APA Press.

Portes, A., and Borocz. 2004. "Contemporary Immigration: Theoretical Perspectives on Its Determinants and Modes of Incorporation". *International Migration Review,* 23(3) Special Silver Anniversary Issue: International Migration and Assessment for the 90´s, 606-630.

Portes, A., and Rumbaut, R. G. 2001. Legacies: The Story of the Immigrant Second Generation. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Portes, A., Fernández-Kelly, P., and Haller, W. 2005. "Segmented assimilation on the ground: The new second generation in early adulthood". *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 28(6), 1000-1040.

Portes, A., and Zhou, M. 1993. "The New Second Generation: Segmented Assimilation and Its Variants". *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 530, Interminority Affairs in the U. S, Pluralism at the Crossroads, 74-96.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, and J., Levin, S. 2006. "Social dominance theory and the dynamics of intergroup relations: Taking stock and looking forward". *European Review of Social Psychology*, 17 (1), 271–320.

Putnam, R. D. 2007. "*E Pluribus Unum*: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-first Century. The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture". *Scandinavian Political Studies,* 30(2), 137-174.

Quillian, L. 1995. "Prejudice as a Response to Perceived Group Threat: Population Composition and Anti-Immigrant and Racial Prejudice in Europe". *American Sociological Review* 60 (4) 586-611.

Ragin, 2007. "Qualitative Comparative Analysis Using Fuzzy Sets (fsQCA)"!. In Benoit Rihoux and Charles Ragin (Eds), Chapter 5, *Configurational Comparative Analysis*, London: Sage Publications.

Rawls, J. 1971. Theory of Justice. Cambridge, UK: Harvard University Press.

Salovey, P., O´Leary, A., Stretton, M. S., Fishkin, S. A., and Drake, C. A. 1991. "Influence of Mood on Judgments About Health and Illness". In Joseph P. Forgas (ed.), Emotion and Social Judgments. Sydney, Australia: Pergamon Press.

Sayad, A. 2004. The Suffering of the Immigrant. Cambridge, U.K.: Polity.

Scheepers, P., Gijsberts, M., and Coenders, M. 2002. "Ethnic exclusionism in European countries. Public opposition to civil rights for legal migrants as a response to perceived ethnic threat". *European sociological review*, 18(1), 17-34.

Semyonov, M., Raijman, R., Tov, A. Y., and Schmidt, P. 2004. "Population size, perceived threat, and exclusion: A multiple-indicators analysis of attitudes toward foreigners in Germany". *Social Science Research*, 33 (4) 681-701.

Simon, R. J. 1987. "Immigration and American attitudes". *Public Opinion,* 10, 47–50.

Smollan, R.K. 2006. "Minds, hearts and deeds: cognitive, affective and behavioural responses to change". *Journal of Change Management,* 6 (2) 143-158.

Strabac, Z. 2011. "It is the eyes and not the size that matter. The real and the perceived size of immigrant populations and anti-immigrant prejudice in Western Europe". *European Societies,* 13 (4).

Soysal, Y. 1994. Limits to Citizenship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thompson, S., and Hoggett, P. 2012. "The affective turn in contemporary political studies". En Thompson, S. and Hoggett, P., (Eds.) Politics and the Emotions. London, UK: Continuum.

Thomas, W.I., and Thomas, D.S. 1928. The Child in America. Behavior Problems and Programs. Nueva York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc.

Tirman, J. 2004. The Migration-Security Nexus. *GSC Quarterly*, 13. (Global Security and Cooperation, Social Science Research Council http://www.ssrc.org).

Valentino, N.A., Hutchings, V. L., and White, I. 2002. "Cues that Matter: How Political Ads Prime Racial Attitudes during Campaigns". *American Political Science Review* 96(1), 75-90.

Valentino, N. A., Hutchings, V. L., Banks, A. J., and Davis, A. K. 2008. "Is a Worried Citizen a Good Citizen? Emotions, Political Information Seeking, and Learning via the Internet". *Political Psychology* 29 (2), 247-273.

Waever, O. 1995. Securitization and Desecuritization. *On Security*, 46–86. Nueva York: Columbia University Press.

Waever, O., Buzan, B., Kelstrup, and M., Lemaitre, P. 1993. Identity, Migration and the Nueva Security Agenda in Europe. Nueva York: St. Martin's Press.

Wieviorka, M. 2008. "L´intégration: un concept en difficulté". *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, 2(125). Presses Universitaires de France.

Wrong, D. H. 1961. "The Oversocialized Conception of Man in Modern Sociology". *American Sociological Review,* 25, 183-193.

– 1994. The problem of order. What unites and divides society. New York: The Free Press.

Yuval-Davis, N. 2006. "Belonging and the politics of belonging". *Patterns of Prejudice*, 40 (3) 197-214.

Zheng, C. F. 2003. One group of laws of fuzzy set produces the research wrapped up outside in the industry that designs IC. M.S. Dissertation. Department of Administration and Institute of Chung Hua University.

ARTICULOS/ARTICLES

RESEÑAS/REVIEWS