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Abstract

The influx of migrants is considered as a threat to the host country even when it is generally believed that migration offers opportunities to the host state. Regular and solicited migration may be perceived as an opportunity to the host society, but unsolicited or mass migration usually provokes hostility in the country of arrival. The EU began to experience unprecedented migratory stream in 2014. Germany's shares of first-time asylum seekers in the EU rose from 35% in 2015 to 60% in 2016 with Germany seemingly representing the home of many migrants that entered the EU between 2014 and 2016. The study was conducted using an explanatory case study to answer the question on why the influx of migrants is considered as threats and a descriptive case study research examines and describes opportunities offer to host country by the influx of migrants. In general, as a research framework, a qualitative research method was carried out on the phenomenon while content analysis was used to analyze regional and national newspapers in Germany covering a 2014-2016 period in relation to the purpose of the study. The findings on RQ1 revealed that influx of migrants into Germany has a causal relationship with social, political and security threats noticed in Germany during the period under review, while the findings of RQ2 showed that demographic benefits acclaimed to always accompany migration are not immediate.

Recommendations were made for further studies to be conducted on the influx of migrants or mass migration of unsolicited migrants in the so-called “immigrant countries” or “migrant friendly societies”.
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Introduction

After the Second World War, the Europeans who fled during the most destructive war in the history of Europe were making a return and settlement in different parts of Europe. The establishment of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees in 1950 and the 1951 Refugee Convention (popularly known as the Geneva Convention of 1951) facilitated the return of European refugees and re-settlement and re-integration of communities tore apart by the war. From 1950s to early 1970, certain European countries started the first face of official importation of migrants into relics of Europe in order to hasten economic recovery; cushion demographic shortfalls e.g. labour force, and population. The first phase of migration flow into Germany after WW 2 gave rise to presence of more than 2.6 million foreign
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workers in Germany from Turkey, Morocco, and other Asian and African countries.

The second phase of migration inflow to Germany under the temporary workers scheme was inevitably halted by global oil crisis of 1973. The third phase (1990s) saw Germany switching to East European Countries after the collapse of the Soviet Union for recruitment of foreign workers due to presence of cheap labour force in Eastern European States. The guest worker scheme also known as “gas arbiters” brought foreign workers into Germany. Seasonal workers were recruited to work in agriculture, construction, mining etc. However, starting from August 2000, professionals or highly-skilled workers and researchers could migrate to Germany under the “blue card” policy adopted by Germany in what may be considered as the fourth wave of labour migration into the country.

Germany (Europe as a whole) experienced the first kind of influx of migrants since the end of Second World War. It was estimated that about 1 million asylum seekers made their way into Germany between 2015 and 2016. About 170,000 asylum seekers made it to Germany in the first quarter of 2016. By the end of March 2016 more than 400,000 asylum applications were said to have been opened at the Federal Office for Migration and Refugees. The migrants are already in Germany and many other cities within the EU. The debate over distribution, settlement, and integration of these migrants dominated the political and public space for quite a number of periods. The new wave of migration stirred unbalanced socio-political ambience in Germany. It is believed that presence of migrants through open door policy of the German government portends both threat and opportunity that may influence German socio-political environment. Difficulties in integrating mammoth of immigrants and refugees who have arrived Europe has its own share of consequences (Ireland, 2004).

There are potential threats and opportunities, predicted and unpredicted, within German society as migrants/asylum seekers arrived with different culture, religions, background, orientations, strengths and weaknesses, attitudinal behaviours and many more. And now that the migrants are already in Germany and many other European states; what are the potential implications of inrush of migrants into Germany on the cultural, economic, demographic configuration and the political ambience of Germany for the next couple of years? Why is influx of migrants considered a threat in a multicultural society such as Germany? What opportunities does influx of migrants offer to host societies? The above mentioned intellectual puzzles formed the basis for conducting the study.
Assumptions

i. A multicultural society is susceptible to threats arising from influx of migrants.

ii. Opportunities offer to host societies by inrush of migrants are not immediate.

Variables

RQ1-Dependent variable: threat (dimensions: social, political, and security threats).

RQ2-Dependent variable: opportunity (dimension: demographic perspective).

Independent variable: influx of migrants (dimension: understanding of contemporary migration).

The priority of the study is to analyse potential threats and/or opportunities arising from influx of migrants into Germany by considering socio-political dimension of the phenomenon. According to Fratzscher and Junker (2015), “......financial predictions and cost benefit assessment of refugee integration prevail in the European literature, there is a scientific gap as to the socio-economic and socio-cultural implications of sudden influx of asylum-seekers” (Mohring and Helmke, 2016:8). The socio-political challenges that come with mass migration of irregular and unsought migration are in no way lesser than the economic challenges, positive or negative. Therefore, the study seeks to shift the discussion on influx of migration and possible challenges away from economic view of point to a socio-political perspective. In light of the above, the findings of the study will make important contributions to body of knowledge and state of knowledge in relation to international migration study. The findings offer insight into the phenomenon and strive to propose policies towards effective management of migration in the EU from a socio-political perspective.

General Perception on Cross-border Migration

It will be un-sociological to assume that multiculturalism would emerge and abound unaccompanied by threat and conflict manifested in xenophobia, discrimination, ethnic violence and general social disintegration tendency (Rex, 2013:27). There is likelihood that most host states would react in a presumed way towards the arrival of army of aliens who are usually unsolicited by the public. The arrival of migrants in many European states raised the tension and fear of social, cultural and economic threats. In their study, Sides and Citrin (2007) argued that European perception of
immigration depends less on economic interests but more on identities and size of immigrant populations. There is always a general perception among natives that people with whom one does not share the same culture pose some level of threat to the society, especially when their arrival is not solicited. It is unclear yet whether arrival of migrants would translate to threat or opportunity in the new multi-ethnic German society. What would diversity mean for German society?

In the Netherlands on 6 May 2002, Pim Fortuyn, a known homosexual sociologist and politician was murdered by an environmentalist called Van der Graaf on the ground that the former used Muslims and immigrants as aunt sallies for his political ambition at a campaign ground.

_The uncomfortable truth is that disenfranchisement and radicalisation are happening even in countries, such as the Netherlands that have done much to accommodate Muslim immigrants....Dutch taxpayers funded Muslim broadcast programs in Moroccan Arabic. Mohammed Bouyeri was collecting unemployment benefits when he murdered Van Gogh (Leiken, 2005:124)_

The Dutch film maker, Theodor Van Gogh, was stabbed to death on the street of the Netherlands by a Dutch Moroccan Muslim in November 2004. The nice attack in France in 2016 was carried out by a Tunis who had French citizenship and who was a long term resident of France. The Orlando shooting in June 2016 killing 49 people and leaving about 53 people injured in a gay nightclub was orchestrated by Omar Mateen (a New York born, US Citizen of Afghan descent) who worked as a security guard for G4S in Florida until his death. The Berlin attack on a Christmas market in December 2016, killing 12 people and injuring about 56 people, was traced to a Tunisian failed asylum seeker named as Anis Amri. In July same year, a rejected asylum seeker was reported to have committed suicide in Ansbach, a town in Germany, injuring 15 people. During the same period, almost in the same month, an alleged suspected ISIS member, a 17-year old refugee from Afghanistan, attacked passengers on a train in Wuerzburg.

The innate psychological, cultural, economic and religious threats pose by multiculturalism promote fear of losing jobs, corrosion of existential way of life and increasing levels of anxiety among citizens of the host country leading to violence against those perceived not belonging to the orthodox socio-cultural and socio-economic of the host state (Sandercock and Lyssiotis, 2003:4). This variance, when present, usually compels the authority of a state to adopt various restrictive migratory policies preventing inflow of unwanted migrants. Australia welcomes thousands of skilled or professional migrants, including students every year. This perceived migrant friendly country in the oceanic region at a point bought a separate island
away from mainland Australia where unwanted or unsolicited migrants are kept (Rex, 2013).

**Multiculturalism vs. Assimilation**

In European context, Multiculturalism translates to a de-facto state of affairs in a society indicated by the co-existence of group of people linked to different cultural bequest caused by various post-migration and post-colonial elements (Modood et al., 2006:25). Multiculturalism preaches synthesis of culture, beliefs, and traditions in the configuration of a society. In a multicultural society, different aspects of the society are brought together in order to pave way for diversity. The multiculturalists believe that fair inclusion of migrants in the host society is a two-way process; those migrating into a new community must prepare to embrace adaptation, and the host society, on the other hand, must demonstrate willingness towards accommodation of migrants (Lenard, 2012).

*If migrants are dissatisfied with their lives in host societies, then, it is because they have not achieved complete assimilation yet. The assimilation process is a painful one, but it leads to, at least, a sort of equalization of immigrants' objective and subjective characteristics when compared to natives (Safi, 2010:160)*

Shared willingness is pertinent for co-existence. Migrant receiving country should be willing to accommodate the new settlers while the arriving migrants, on the other hand, would be expected to demonstrate commitment towards adaptations in their new home.

**The Debate**

Assimilation helps in understanding cultural intergroup relations just as economic threat serves as important concept in evaluating existing material relationship between group of people in a multiethnic society (Patlon and Mughan, 2006). Assimilation tends to absorb migrants into cultural orientation of the host state by taking newcomers out of their home cultural box into cultural ring of the host society. The multiculturalists favour diversity entrenched in freedom of migrants or settlers to practice their home-state culture without any form of hindrance from the host society. A deep symmetric cultural value may result in natives being worse off (Konya, 2005:1443).

The assimilationists, however, opine that migrants should be assimilated into the cultural pool of the host state in order to achieve belongingness to the host society. Migrants should, for example, acquire language skills of the host state, learn and practice the culture of their new home and obtain
education in the language of the host country among other things. This way, migrants are better incorporated into the society according to several arguments by the assimilationists.

Since immigration and settlement of migrants continue to attract attention, the need to understand the conditions linking migration to conflict is germane (Dancygier, 2010:4). As we focus on movement of people across frontiers, we should also direct attention towards settlement of movers and possible link between migration and conflict in receiving countries since migration is unlikely to be halted. Europe’s political life has been altered by its social relations in a critical ways even though conflict and violence have not gone beyond a bearable level (Ireland, 2004:3). It has thus been proved on different occasion that we cannot talk of migration or a multicultural society without debating issues bordering on conflicts that come with it.

The overall goal of multicultural policies is the advancement of tolerance and respect for collective identities supporting community associations and their activities, ensuring diversity in public spaces in order to accommodate differences in language, value, tradition and social practices based on cultural differences (Vertovec, 2007:1027). Multiculturalism tends to promote diversity and entrench tolerance towards people who might be regarded as those not belonging to the host society, “not one of us.” Contrary to Vertovec’s view, many multiculturalists are worried about the conflicts that diversity, which they continue to propagate, brings to the table of multi-ethnic societies in the midst of their self-acclaimed assertion of minimising conflicts in a multi-cultural society through the gospel of diversity by putting the people into ethnic boxes and monitoring the boxes via tolerance and respect (Malik, 2010). To this end, rather than ameliorating conflicts, it generates a new set of difficult conflicts. Furthermore, Malik says:

*Multiculturalism repose political problems in terms of culture or faith, transforms political conflicts into a form that makes them neither useful nor resolvable. Rather than ask, for instance, “what are the roots of racism and what structural changes are required to combat it?” It demands recognition for one’s particular identity, public affirmation of one’s cultural difference and respect and tolerance for one’s cultural and faith beliefs* (Malik, 2010).

Multiculturalism publicly manages ethnic diversity by stressing the need for public recognition and accommodation of minority cultures and identities and that makes multiculturalism a unique template for the preservation of diversity (Momin, 2006). Conversely, Momin maintains that multiculturalism is criticised because it failed to guarantee, in multi-ethnic societies, workable and sustainable national harmony; and “Pluralism can also foster process of essentialization and segregation to the detriment of
fundamental principles of equality and social cohesion” (Rodríguez-García, 2010:255). Before leaving their home countries to the host societies, settlers would be expected to be aware of the existentialism of culture, languages, education, and beliefs in the host countries different from theirs.

Therefore, migrants are expected to demonstrate willingness to embrace those distinct cultures and values without any recourse to public demand from the state to legislate their private freedom to practice their home countries’ religion, culture and values. However, what the state may do, in this sense, is to provide a levelled-public service across public institutions in the host society so as to afford new settlers the opportunity to also enjoy public services without any prejudice to language, culture, religion, and/or race.

However, multiculturalists have been criticized on many grounds over their strong inclination towards a multicultural society with superficial justification. The assimilationists believe that migrants should go through acculturation process. Migrants should speak the language(s) of the host state, dress like locals and demonstrate behavioural pattern akin to the one present in the host society. Linguistic and cultural assimilation policies improve labour market opportunities of the immigrants by providing them with basic skills, knowledge and social ties with the natives while multicultural policies emphasizing and stressing migrants’ home languages and cultural orientations lead to linguistic and cultural deficiencies detrimental to existing social networks in the host community (Koopmans, 2010:10).

One of the major failures of assimilation is that, while it seeks to acculturate migrants or new comers, it often sets limitation to the level at which settlers may be modified along interacting cultures. “.....the assimilationist perspective and the total abolition of cultural diversity beyond the private sphere imply a failure to acknowledge the complexity of pluralism” (Rodríguez-García, 2010). Assimilationism seeks to absorb different ethnic groups into the pool of dominant culture of the host state by trying to replace cultural values of newcomers with that of the host society. Assimilation is a complex process that often relies on specific transnational family predisposition (Scott and Cartledge, 2009). Even though assimilation tries to bring migrants close to the dominant culture of the society and achieve a harmonious cultural orientation unlike a discordant and divergent cultural disposition created by multiculturalism, its domination of the cultural configuration of the society poses dire challenges to new comers.

Migrants may achieve socio-economic assimilation by using political power to extricate themselves from institutional barriers through political
incorporation (Bloemraad, Korteweg, and Yurdakul, 2008:163). In the process of assimilating migrants, domestic institutions are instrumental to the success of assimilation of new comers. Religious institutions, educational institutions, the media and many other important bodies ensure that migrants go through a new form and process of socialisation in order to create one society that encompasses all by soaking up the migrants and their cultural values.

From another angle, assimilation presumes that assimilating migrants into institutional life of the host state is detrimental to the dominant values because of likelihood of convergence of values (Vani and John, 2009:35). Therefore, failure to accommodate assimilation of migrants across the spectrum of institutions (social and public) in the dominant state presents assimilation as a coercive policy meant to advance host state gains only and at the expense of migrants. Sometimes, assimilation is perceived as a forced and not voluntary absorption of migrants into the dominant society leading to a counter-reactive response from new comers.

**Asylum Seekers in Germany and the EU**

In 2016, EU Member States received 1,204,300 first-time asylum applications, a slightly lowered figure compared with what obtained in 2015 (1,257,000). However, the figure in 2016 almost doubles that of 2014 (562,700). Germany’s share of the total EU first time asylum applications moved from 35% in 2015 to 60% in 2016. Furthermore, about 6 in 10 asylum seekers in the European Union applied for protection in Germany in 2016; nearly 722,300 first time applications were received in Germany alone in 2016 from asylum seekers.2 Thereby, making Germany the largest migrants’ burden carrier in the EU-28.

The main countries of citizenship of asylum seekers in the EU are Syria (334 800 asylum seekers), Afghanistan (183 000) and Iraq (127 000). Many asylum seekers, after making their way into Greece; which serves as the conduit pipe transporting army of migrants from Turkey into the EU, sought protection in Germany. Majority of the asylum seekers who made it to Budapest in 2016 used Hungary as a transit or exchange terminal for onward departure to Germany. Perhaps this is as a result of communication network among asylum-seekers influenced by the open door policy of Germany that heralded the readiness of German society to welcome and accommodate migrants who are able to set their feet of the soil of Germany.

---

However, after Germany, the second largest receiver of asylum seekers in 2016 was Italy with a total number of 121,200 asylum seekers representing about 10% of the EU-28 total first time asylum applicants, followed by France (76,000 or 6%), Greece (49,900 or 4%), Austria (39,900 or 3%), and the United Kingdom (38,300 or 3%). (See figure 1).

African migrants from North-East Africa infiltrated and penetrated the Italian and Maltese borders via the Mediterranean Sea while almost all Syrian, Afghan and Iraqi asylum seekers entered the EU through Turkey-Greece coastal line. Between 2014 and early 2016, it thus appears that EU frontiers were too porous and were lacking efficient border management with third countries who share borders with Members of the European Union. Conversely, extension of solidarity to EU Member States vulnerable to inrush of migrants and/or provision of humanitarian intervention to those fleeing their countries may answer for less border control mechanism employed by the EU covering the above mentioned periods as the situation later changed from less border management to strict border control mechanism to deter people from arriving EU borders through the sea from Africa and the Middle-East.

Figure 1: Numbers of non-EU asylum seekers in the EU and EFTA Member States in 2015 and 2016
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Despite being the two major frontiers through which migrants arrived in the EU, the numbers of first time applicants in Italy and Greece put together is below 30% of the number in Germany. Perhaps due to attractiveness and the open door policy of German government! It may also be as a result of social network between refugees (those who have already acquired refugee statuses) in Germany. It is believed that, some migrants have prior knowledge about their intended host country before their exodus. Except in special cases, when emergency evacuation was involved and migrants were moved to the next safe country.

**Migratory Routes, Boat Migration and Death at EU Borders**

Not all migrants in the new wave of migration beginning in 2014 came to Europe through the seas. Some arrived in Member States of the EU by air or through land borders with genuine travelling documents and entry visas from non-EU countries or third countries in the neighbourhood of the EU or those third countries sharing borders with several EU Member States . However, voyaging to Europe via boat migration across Mediterranean seas was a common occurrence when discussing and analysing contemporary migrants’ influx into Europe from West and North-East Africa and the Middle-East starting from early 2014 up to the time of this study.

**Figure 2: Migratory Routes**

Source: Frontex, FRAN and JORA Data, European Border and Coast Guard Agency, migratory routes map, illegal border crossing at the EU external borders (see the appendix for more details on lists of illegal border crossing in 2017 and top nationalities of migrants involved).
Migrants use land, Sea, and air routes to reach North Africa and Europe.....and increasing restrictive migratory policies and border management have led, in recent times, to migrants’ reliance on land routes (IOM, 2008:17). However, in the wake of the crisis in Syria, Iraq and Afghanistan and economic and security challenges in North, West and Eastern African, mostly. The new trend of irregular migration amidst unprecedented inrush of migrants into the Europe favours sea migration over land and air routes. About 70 per cent of migrants from Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan and North-Eastern Africa who started arriving in Europe beginning from 2014 did so through boat migration over the Mediterranean Sea. Apart from arriving by boat, migrants use regular and traditional route to reach their destination by obtaining visas or travel with falsified documents (Last and Spijkerboer, 2014:88).

While it may appear that many of the migrants get to their destinations by themselves, a large number of them actually reached their destinations with the help of smugglers. A large chunk of migratory stream from Africa into Europe occurred via the help of facilitators, otherwise known as “smugglers”. It is evident that a high proportion of migrants caught trying to migrate to Western Europe illegally through smuggling and those who successfully migrated to Europe with the assistance of smugglers are asylum (Salt, Hogarth et al., 2000: 108).

The EU is reacting to the refugee crisis through promulgation of policies aim at strengthening border controls with the view to contrasting the occurrence of boat migration in the countries of departure (Marin, 2017:9). The phenomenon of boat migration across the Mediterranean is alarming. Apart from controlling inflow of migrants via Integrated Border management (IBM) policy of the EU, safety and security of migrants fleeing their countries and putting their lives on the line in order to enter Europe via the deadly Mediterranean routes is at the pivot of EU decision-making process as regard migration. People in danger at sea should be rescued and offered the opportunity to arrive safely at the closest safe port (UNHCR, 2009).

Deaths of migrants at the borders of European countries and the Mediterranean Sea routes possess devastating effects on families of migrants while having a transnational political facet between the EU and countries of the migrants (Kovras and Robins, 2016:41). Are European borders across the Mediterranean frontiers dead traps? Many migrants left their countries of origin with hopes of getting better living conditions in European countries unknowing that they were on death voyage. Up to 2,000 people died every year trying to reach Europe via sea in a study conducted in 2004 by Michael Pugh, an expert on irregular migration (UNHCR, 2009). Pugh would probably be inundated with the number of death recorded monthly in
Mediterranean Sea beginning from early 2014 till the time of writing if he conducts a new study on the same phenomenon.

The EU failed to response proactively to the occurrence of boat migration to EU borders across the Mediterranean Sea routes, particularly from the Middle-East and North Africa. The contemporary inrush of migrants in the Mediterranean is unveiling failures of EU countries to really offer protection to fleeing migrants from conflict zones (Freedman, 2016:13). Some EU Member States, whose borders served as first port of entry for migrants, did not attend to the need for international protection of arriving migrants. There were videos of border security staffs of some member states in the EU molesting and harassing migrants at their borders.

However, migrants’ inrush is not peculiar to EU Member states or the European countries as regions such as Africa and Asia have been coping with internal refugee crisis long before the contemporary migratory wave of asylum seekers or refugees from Africa, the Middle-East and parts of Asia. The number of migrants who made their journey into Europe is a small portion of global refugees’ movement index as almost 9 in 10 international migrants residing in Africa, and about 8 in 10 living in Asia, migrated from another country within the same region (Crawley et al., 2016:13). There are movements of refugees across borders within Africa and Asia every month without much publicity and intervention by Western countries. Various countries and communities in Africa and Asia have always experience influx of irregular migrants from other parts of the region.

However, influx of migrants is not unfamiliar with European countries since the end of WW1, and more important, after the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. It is understandable that, the contemporary and irregular mass migration into Europe from Africa and the Middle East thus appears to be unprecedented to European countries.

METHODS

In general, the study was conducted using a qualitative research method. A qualitative research approach entails subjective assessment of attitudes, opinions and behaviour demonstrated by people; individually or as groups (Kothari, 2004). The study assessed outpouring attitudes and perceptions of Germans towards the unprecedented arrival of migrants, from likelihood of threats to possible opportunities. Qualitative research aims at providing an in-depth and interpretive knowledge about a social order through studies conducted to learn about people’s social and material concerns, experiences, perspectives and historical philosophies (Ritchie et al., 2013).
Therefore, a combination of “explanatory” and “descriptive” case study research design was used in the study. A case study is an empirical inquiry which focuses on contemporary phenomenon in which unclear evidence exists between the phenomenon and its real-life context (Yin, 2013). The researcher, Robert K. Yin, concludes that a case study research method should be considered when the research question focuses on “why” and “how.” As stated by Sekaran, 2006: Zikmund, 2009, “.....in order to identify further relationship between variables or their impact on certain issues, causal research (i.e. explanatory research) is required” (Nor et al., 2011).

**Sample**

For the purpose of the study, newspapers in Germany were sampled using stratified random sampling method to draw samples from available published newspapers in Germany. The published newspapers were selected in line with the followings-weekly national newspapers, daily regional/local newspapers and non-German language daily newspapers. After selecting the newspapers published on line in Germany between 2014 and 2017 through stratification, a random sampling technique was employed to further draw manageable samples from available numbers of published newspapers.

By employing a random sampling technique, 3 out of 5 weekly national newspapers, 8 out of 56 daily regional newspapers, and 4 out of 8 daily non-German language newspapers were finally selected for the study. Furthermore, information or materials needed to carry out the study ware collected from available volume of information in the newspapers sampled for the study based on their relevance to the research questions propelling the study.

**Data**

The data used for the study were collected from the sources highlighted above. In doing so, a purposeful sampling technique was adopted to extract relevant publications on refugees/asylum-seekers in Germany and influx of migrants into Germany from hundreds of publications on a wide range issues in order to maintain validity and reliability of the method used in the carrying out the research. According to Patton (2002), “Purposeful Sampling is a technique widely used in qualitative research for the identification and selection of information-rich cases for the most effective use of limited resources.” (Palinkas et al., 2013). Texts were extracted and coded from the newspapers in relation to the stated research questions using coding method.
Analytic Plan

In analysing the data, a content analysis approach was adopted. Sub-themes and themes built from coded texts arising from careful extraction of information from newspapers sampled for the study were analysed using content analysis. Content analysis is a non-reactive form of data analysis. Content analysis allows for information gathering about social groups that cannot be directly studied (Bryman, 2012:305); “.......is any technique for making inferences by objectively and systematically identifying specified characteristics of messages”, according to Holsti (1969:14).” (Bryman, 2012:289).

The themes derived from the coding exercise were analysed using pattern matching techniques to describe observable relationships between themes. By matching and comparing the themes, the research questions and the assumptions raised in the study were systematically analysed and explanations were offered with the aid of the theoretical framework guiding the study. Codes were extracted from the texts or contents of the newspapers. The codes were further classified into themes for efficient management of information gathered from the source and establishment of connections between independent and dependent variables.

RESULTS

Following the methods and procedures used in the study, below stated findings were discovered.

The finding on social threat dimension (RQ1) reveals a mixed-social reaction resulting from racism (anti-refugee welcome, hate speeches, and protests against opening of refugees camps), and cultural bridge (social inclusion, cultural unity, community-based cultural integration schemes) in Germany during the contemporary migration wave which, according to many experts, began in 2014.

The political threat dimension of RQ1 shows a division in the polity arising from distrust in authority (right-wing ideology gaining momentum, and huge skepticism was formed towards authority), and a mixed-political reaction (populism fading away gradually, and there was tense political debate over refugee).

On security threat dimension of RQ1 reveals an increase in criminality in Germany resulting from new security challenges (frequent demonstrations by pro-refugee welcome and anti-refugee groups, noticeable sexual assaults by refugees, increase in male prostitution and drug peddling), and terror (attacks on refugees' tents, arson, physical attacks on pro-refugee protesters).
However, the result on demographic perspective (RQ2) shows absence of contribution of influx of migrants to any increase in labour force and fertility rate in Germany. Meanwhile, the independent variable (understanding of contemporary migration) reveals that unsolicited migration usually allows for formation of perception by nationals of the host state towards migration. The study reveals a causal relationship between influx of migrants into Germany and observable threats.

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION**

**Discussion**

It is evident in the results of the study that influx of migrants into Germany maintains causal relationships with social, political and security threats in the host city. The findings in research question one corroborates the theory of social conflict propounded in 19th century by Karl max. The theory posits that relationship between individuals or groups in a society exits, at first, on the basis on conflict rather than harmony. The arrival of migrants causes tensions in Germany splitting the society into strata of different perceptions.

After the arrival of migrants in Germany, there was an aura of mixed-social reaction in the society among Germans. Proposing a balanced pedestal for the host society, equality of opportunities in the host state should be offered to immigrants and their cultures and forms of socialisation should be tolerated rather than suppressed (Rex, 2013:149). The process of integrating migrants or migrants integrating themselves into their new society depicts a clear departure from general perception to passion and keenness. According to Esser (2011), “Integration is the gradual adaptation of migrants to the majority society............the integration process follows a causal order from cognitive via structural and social to emotional integration” (Wingens et al., 2011:123); assimilation and multiculturalism were opposite concepts while integration and multiculturalism were more compatible (Modood, 2011).

Integration suggests that the general conception of the host society must move from mere understanding of arrival of migrants to willingness to absorb the new comers induced by passion towards migrants while the zeal to coalesce and intermingle in the new environment should be sustained or rekindled by migrants.

Integration is not averse to difference and does not follow line of thoughts of assimilation which seeks to enforce shared values and norms on new migrants but focuses on protection of values and norms that must be shared to preserve social cohesion in the society (Lenard, 2012). Former UK Home Secretary, Roy Jenkins, says, “Integration is not a flattening process of
assimilation but equal opportunity accompanied by cultural diversity in an atmosphere of mutual tolerance” (Vani and John, 2009:35).

Arguably, social interests of the Germans preceded social conflicts that manifested in Germany between 2014 and 2016, at least, coupled with social meaning attributed to contemporary migration in Germany. The new wave of migration into Germany, at the height of the influx, was interpreted by Germans to mean unsolicited migration. The symbolic meaning attributed to arriving migrants led to a mixed-social reaction, where some groups of Germans protested against the open door policy of the government to refugees and other pro-refugee demonstrators staunchly stood behind the gesture of the CDU government to welcome fleeing migrants. There were cases of protests, peaceful or less peaceful, against “refugee welcome” groups in Germany. At the same time, migrants in some regions in Germany were culturally integrated into the society by locals.

The social threat dimension of the findings indicates a mixed-perception of who the migrants are and what influx of migrants represents for the host state as racists attitudes (hate speech, anti-migrants, and criticisms over opening of refugee camps) were greeted with a seemingly counter-balanced social inclusion, cultural unity and integration of migrants demeanours from other group of individuals in the society. Therefore, due to lack of social interaction with the many countries of origin of migrants, a social meaning towards contemporary inrush of migrant into Germany was perceived and received through communication which led to the creation of a perception towards the identity or belongingness of the so called unsolicited migrants.

The political threat dimension of the study shows that influx of migrants thus led to a division in the political space of Germany as populist views began to garner momentum, even in certain quarters of the leftist parties. Of course, it is expected that a social conflict of magnitude effects on the society will create a tense political ambience in the host state. Exactly the scenario that played out in Germany as revealed in the results on the study! At a point in time, those in favour of accommodation of unsolicited migrants were having a re-think of their stance considering the level of conflicts arising as a result of mass arrival of migrants in Germany. Management of high volume of unprecedented migration requires leadership and partnerships within and outside the host state. Therefore, cohesive management of migration became a huge challenge in Germany (also in the EU) as right-wing ideological movement was gaining momentum, and scepticism towards the government in relation to ability to cope with pressure and dilemma of integrating migrants and synchronously sustaining socio-economic, socio-political and security atmosphere of Germany was on the increase.
Refugee issue charged the political environment of Germany creating a wave of political division in Germany polity as the CDU government came under heavy criticism leading to sudden popularity of the AfD party and its ideology in Germany, even as German general election is approaching. German polity became more polarised in post-war Germany. A high number of German electorate (especially in East hemisphere of Germany) may vote in favour of the “Alternative for Germany (AfD)” party due to their perceptions on the arrival of army of migrants from third world countries. The open door policy of Chancellor Merkel Angela failed to first of all test the political waters in Germany by making, at least, an attempt to feel the perception pulse of the people on free-entry into Germany of fleeing migrants from conflicting zones. For migrants to be well received in the host city, the political atmosphere must maintain certain level of compromise on accommodation of irregular and unrequested migrants. The political events that took place in Germany during the period under review show a crystal tense political discourse around migrants and have so far snowballed into power-change debate as German election approaches. However, over a time, popularity of pro-fascist parties continues to wane gradually in Germany compared with a period when populists view was heightened as precipitated by inrush of unsolicited migrants.

The symbolic meaning carved towards arriving migrants translated into political hiccups in Germany. Even though, literally, one may argue that migrants in Germany are not interested in social and economic rivalry with the locals and their presence may not have created a chaotic and strained situation in their new home. The causality, however, lies in symbolic representation of the migrants as informed by social meaning ascribed to arriving migrants in Germany. The division was tensed that it metamorphosed into physical attacks between right-wing stalwarts and left-wing loyalists, on the one hand, and between left-wing and right-wing politicians, on the other hand.

Arrival of migrants in German cities led to new security challenges and terror attacks. There were frequent demonstrations, for and against accommodation of migrants, on the streets of many cities in Germany thereby posing security challenges to the society. Some cases of sexual assaults and increase in the number of male prostitution in German after the arrival of migrants were recorded. The head count of those who trade in drugs also increase after the arrival of migrants in Germany as shown in the findings of the study under security threat dimension.

On demographic benefit, the result shows no relationship between influx of migrant and demographic benefits in Germany vis-a-vis the phenomenon
studied. The Influx of migrants into Germany did not reveal an increase perspective in labour force and fertility rate in Germany.

Some multiculturalists supporting the arrival of migrants in Europe were doing so based on the assumptions that influx of migrants would help in correcting demographics of many ageing European countries. The volume of immigration flow necessary to prevent the size of the workforce from further downturn is more significant when compared with the number required to maintain the population (Coleman, 2002). From a different perspective, Coleman (2000) argued as follows—“immigration cannot solve problems of population ageing except at rates of immigration so high that they would generate economically and environmentally unstable population growth rates and permanently and radically change the cultural and ethnic composition of the host population” (Coleman, 2006).

It is evident that Germany possesses a long historical perception towards migration. And this has, to some extent, developed into a social concept driving social interaction between Germans and immigrants or settlers. Germans always perceive their country as a “non-immigrant country”. However, in 2001, a migration commission was constituted involving representatives from all major political parties, employers of labour, labour unions, and religious organisations with the view to fostering migration and integration of immigrants by declaring that, Germany should be a country of immigration rather normatively. (Martin, 2003:48). The above gesture aimed at changing the country’s perception towards inward labour migration or cross-border migration into German territory. And in real sense, it was in tune with the “blue card” migratory scheme opened in Germany in 2000 directed at non-German professionals, scientist, researchers, and other highly-skilled workers. The scheme connotes German fourth wave of importation of labour or foreign workers. More or less, there is a distinct relationship existing between the arrival of solicited migrants and unsolicited migration or needful and requested labour migration and unsolicited migrants.

The result relating to opportunities that follow influx of migrants shows that arrival of migrants does not offer immediate benefits in terms of increase in national labour force and fertility rate in Germany as migrants or refugees who arrived in the host state have to go through different and time-taking process of asylum application procedures. The inability of migrants to quickly settle down in their new cities, due to uncertainty beclouding the asylum application, may also answer for inability of influx of migrants to positively, in a short while, alter demographics of many host states. Some migrants fall below educational requirements for German labour market.
Moreover, among migrants in Germany, ages 16-17 share the largest population of migrants; followed by ages 18-34; 35-64 and; 0-12 respectively. So, different factors may prevent the first age classes (16-17) of migrants from thinking about parenting or entering the labour market. Factors such as education, desire to look after old parents or siblings with whom a migrant arrived in Germany may be in the front burner of decision making a young and able migrant thereby, preventing early contribution towards German labour force and/or fertility rate.

The second and third classes of people, ages 18-34 and; 35-64, may demonstrate fertility attitude similar to or below the existing fertility rate in Germany based on household economic consideration and the agonies of having lost so many things (materials or human lives) to war or other man-made crisis in their respective countries at the time of sojourning to Germany.

**Conclusion**

Unsolicited migration leads to mixed-social reactions in the host state, stirring up political divisions, and heightening security challenges in the host country. Influx of migrants always represents threat to the host state based on social meaning ascribed to it. The benefits in inrush of migrants are not immediate. It takes time for them to materialize. The society comprises class conflict, and mutual relationship depends on negotiations arising from immanent struggles in the society. Deutsch, 1973; Pruitt and Kimmel, 1997, argued that, “Competitive processes emerge when the attainment of one party’s goals precludes the other party’s. Competitive processes emerge when both parties can attain their goals simultaneously” (De Dreu and Nijstad, 2008:648). Therefore, the overall findings in chapter 4 above reveals that the independent variable drawn in the study has noticeable causal relationship with the dependent variable in research question one as seen in all the dimensions of the dependent variable in operationalisation process in chapter one. Different from what obtained in RQ1, the independent variable has no causal relationship with the dependent variable in research question two as depicted in the stated dimension during operationalisation of variables in chapter one of the study.

Therefore, the findings on threats pose by influx of migrants into Germany validate the assumption proposed in the relevant section of the study which theorizes that, a multicultural society is susceptible to threats arising from influx of migrants. In the same vein, the assumption that, opportunities offer to host societies by inrush of migrants are not immediate was validated by the findings in the study as both archival documents and statistical records
do not show contributions made by influx of migrants into Germany on the country’s shrinking labour force and all-time low fertility rate.

For the sake of extrapolation, reactions or perceptions towards influx of migrants (unsolicited migration or migrants in particular) into countries adjudged as “immigrant countries” or “migrants friendly countries’ may be studied amongst the citizens in order to put the theoretical perspective (social conflict theory, and symbolic interaction theory) used in answering the research questions drawn in the study into test. For instance, it is clear from the perspective of priori knowledge that the United States and Canada are both immigrant countries. However, we have seen different cases of racism, xenophobic attacks, killings, and hate speeches in the US in recent times. In Canada, on the other hand, it appears that Canadians are more migrant friendly in the way the country seeks to achieve complete integration of migrants or immigrants. Nevertheless, the scenarios may turn out to be as hostile as seen in Germany if Canada also witnesses unprecedented inrush of migrants kindred to what obtained currently in Germany.
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