



SCIENTIFIC OASIS

## Journal of Intelligent Decision Making and Granular Computing

Journal homepage: [www.jidmag.org](http://www.jidmag.org)  
ISSN: 3042-3759

JIDMGC

Journal of Intelligent Decision Making and Granular Computing

Scientific Oasis

ISO 10

<http://www.jidmag.org>

# Differences in Attitudes Towards Immigrants Across Countries

Ahmet Aytekin<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of International Trade and Business, Faculty of Political Sciences, Samsun, Türkiye

### ARTICLE INFO

#### Article history:

Received 3 February 2026  
Received in revised form 24 March 2026  
Accepted 15 April 2026  
Available online 18 April 2026

#### Keywords:

Migration; Immigration; Immigrant;  
Taxonomy Method; Multi-Criteria Decision Making

### ABSTRACT

The phenomenon of migration is closely linked to people's desire for a better life, where factors such as employment, education, health, housing, and security play a crucial role. However, perceptions of immigration in settled societies have been negatively affected by events such as the September 11 attacks and subsequent economic difficulties. This study examines attitudes toward immigrants across countries using responses from the World Values Survey (WVS). The Taxonomy method is applied to rank countries based on how positively immigrants are perceived, using ten evaluation criteria, including the impact of immigration on development, employment, cultural diversity, crime, asylum policies, terrorism risk, support for the poor, unemployment, social unrest, and immigration policy preferences. The results indicate that China, Vietnam, Australia, Andorra, and New Zealand exhibit the most positive attitudes toward immigrants, while Jordan, Iraq, Türkiye, Colombia, and Malaysia rank the lowest.

## 1. Introduction

Migration is the movement of people from their established regional locations and communities to settle in another location and community. Migration can occur within a country's borders or internationally. This study will examine the international migration dimension. The terms migrant, asylum seeker, and refugee have different meanings for migrants. Migrants generally describe individuals who voluntarily migrate for better living conditions due to economic circumstances. Individuals in this group who lack legal permission in their country of migration are called illegal/undocumented migrants. Furthermore, in the first two decades of the 21st century, migration largely stemmed from civil wars and conflicts. In this context, the number of communities forcibly displaced from their countries of origin due to wars and other situations beyond their control is rapidly increasing. Among these communities, those who hold statuses recognized under international agreements in their country of migration are called refugees, while those who have not yet obtained this status are called asylum seekers [1,2].

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [ahmet.aytekin@samsun.edu.tr](mailto:ahmet.aytekin@samsun.edu.tr)

<https://doi.org/10.31181/jidmgc21202636>

© The Author(s) 2026 | [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Migration is a phenomenon directly related to individuals' search for a better life. Factors such as employment, education, health, and security are at the forefront of this search for a better life. However, the September 11 attacks and the subsequent economic crises negatively impacted perceptions of immigration. These negative perceptions have also led to the rise of far-right politicians who espouse fascist views to influence national governance [3–6].

Human mobility and migration may be ancient phenomena that affect practically every community on the planet. But they have undergone significant changes over time. We can better understand how migration is changing by examining changes in scale, direction, demography, and frequency. This will help us develop effective policies, programs, and operational responses on the ground [7].

Migration is also important for research on sustainability and environmental protection because of its implications. When migration enhances well-being without exacerbating structural inequalities or increasing unequal burdens on environmental resources, it can potentially contribute to sustainability transitions [8]. The following section will address the recent regional migration and immigration policies pursued by countries.

Hungary ranks first among European countries that openly oppose moderate immigration policies. Estonia and the Czech Republic follow. Fear of unemployment, security concerns, and a loss of national identity are cited as the primary reasons for anti-immigrant sentiment in European countries. Germany, a driving force within the EU, has advocated, under the Dublin Convention, that asylum claims be evaluated by the country of first entry. Due to increased migration flows after 2015, Germany has called for an equitable distribution of asylum seekers across Europe. Italy, Malta, and Greece, particularly those used as transit countries for migrants from Africa and Asia, support Germany's proposal for migrant distribution and quotas. Meanwhile, Eastern European countries are unwilling to accept Germany's proposals. Furthermore, Western European countries such as Denmark and the United Kingdom have attempted to implement strict measures to curb migrants and asylum seekers. Another important point is the criticism that if immigrants are dispersed, they will become isolated and their adaptation problems will deepen [3,9,10].

Canada accepts immigrants through a points system based on specific criteria such as age, education, length of residence, language proficiency, and taxpayer status. The primary goal of Canada's immigration system is to minimize the country's employment gap. However, while Canada's immigration policy offers benefits for immigrants, it is restrictive toward refugees, who involve large population movements. From 1990 to 2019, the US had the largest immigrant population in the world. The US accepts immigrants through employment, asylum, and investment. However, the US uses a Green Card system, including a lottery, for immigrant admission. Mexico is seen as a corridor for Central American immigrants. It has been reported that migrants, often engaged in irregular migration, are subjected to extortion, forced labor, and various acts of violence while using this corridor. Furthermore, there is a significant flow of migration from Mexico to the US. Similarly, it has been reported that Mexican migrants migrating to the US have been subjected to adverse actions, including deaths, violence, and violations of their rights. The US administration has increased border security measures to prevent irregular migration since 1993. In Mexico, migrant shelters have been established in poor areas of cities to accommodate newly arrived Central American migrants and those sent back from the US [11–13]. Meanwhile, Central and South American countries are trying to stop migration to the US and Canada [14].

Australia, a country in Oceania, welcomes immigrants for education, business, investment, and employment. 44% of Australia's population consists of immigrants, representing 270 different ethnic backgrounds. In this context, it is worth noting that Australia has a multicultural policy. Furthermore,

it has been stated that Australia has a more tolerant society than the rest of the world regarding race, religion, and culture [12].

Japan, one of the developed Asian countries, experienced a labor shortage in certain sectors such as agriculture and forestry after 1980 and attempted to address this problem through immigration policies. In this context, recent generations of Japanese who immigrated to Brazil and Peru have returned to Japan. Additionally, numerous countries, such as China and Korea, have also been sending migrants to Japan. In Japan, the prevailing belief is that immigrants cannot adapt to the host society's language, culture, and lifestyle. However, accepting immigrants is seen as the quickest and most appropriate solution to address the labor shortage caused by Japan's aging population [15]. South Korea, another Asian country, has experienced increasing immigration since the 1990s, driven by the economic growth and prosperity it has achieved over the last 50 years. South Korea has two distinct immigration approaches for skilled and unskilled foreign workers. It has been stated that immigration requirements are more lenient for skilled workers. Like Japan, South Korea has a rapidly aging population and a low birth rate. In this context, it is a sound approach for South Korea to accept immigrants to meet its employment needs. Furthermore, there has been an increasing trend of marriage migration in South Korea, and the country is increasingly adopting a multicultural structure [16].

Russia, which for a long time hosted the largest number of immigrants after the United States, has lost this distinction due to developments since 2014. Russia has been experiencing a difficult economic period due to the Crimean Crisis with Ukraine and the subsequent international sanctions. This situation has directly impacted migration flows. Prior to this period, Russia was a country that received significant permanent and temporary labor migration [17].

It has been noted that most of the migration within Africa occurs within the continent. The primary motivation for these movements is economic opportunities and, naturally, better living conditions. However, reasons for migration include poverty, social factors such as education, obligations to relatives such as marriage or inheritance practices, discrimination, persecution, conflict, security concerns, political factors, population density, and disease patterns. Among the countries receiving the most migration within Africa are South Africa, the Ivory Coast, Nigeria, Kenya, and Ethiopia [18].

When examining recent international migration movements specifically for Türkiye, it is observed that since the start of the Syrian civil war in 2010, the country has experienced a surge in refugee activity, transforming it into a predominantly immigrant-receiving country. Furthermore, Türkiye serves as a corridor for irregular migration from Asia. Among the reasons for this increased irregular migration to Türkiye are its location, the growing tendency to migrate to neighboring countries due to the harsh anti-immigrant policies of European countries, and the country's better living conditions compared to those of neighboring countries. Furthermore, Türkiye is defined as a country of immigration, emigration, and transit under its international agreement with the EU. Furthermore, under international agreements, Türkiye only accepts those arriving from Europe as refugees, while those arriving from outside Europe are considered conditional refugees until they migrate to third countries. In other words, the concept of refugees is not explicitly addressed. However, since the beginning of the Syrian civil war, Türkiye has accepted more than three million immigrants through its open border policy. Türkiye has striven to provide numerous services to this migrant community, including education, healthcare, and other services. It has been reported that Syrian refugees face difficulties in adapting to legal, economic, and socio-cultural issues. Generally, the problems faced by refugees and immigrants in Türkiye include discrimination, social exclusion, inequality, unregistered employment, and being blamed for the rise in unemployment, divorce, and illness [1,4,19,20].

Recent studies also highlight the increasing negative attitudes towards immigrants. Helbling and Meierrieks [21] examined the relationship between migration and terrorism and stated that there is no strong and universally valid evidence that migration directly increases terrorism. However, it appears that terrorist events can influence anti-immigrant attitudes and political preferences in societies, and can also lead states to adopt more restrictive immigration policies. Nevertheless, it is stated that the effect of such restrictive policies on reducing terrorism remains limited.

Irregular migration has gained disproportionate visibility in the media and political agenda, particularly since the 2000s, and has become central to political debates in Europe following the 2015 “migration crisis.” Despite this, the numerical share of irregular migrants in the global population is quite limited, at approximately 1%. This indicates that the perceptual and political impacts of irregular migration are more decisive than its volume [22].

Tsegay [23] examines the multidimensional nature of migration by addressing the concept of international migration, its causes, and effects through a comprehensive literature review. The study focuses on the push and pull factors that trigger migration, as well as the conceptual ambiguities and academic debates surrounding the definition of “migrant.” It emphasizes that personal and structural dynamics must be considered together to understand migration.

Cantat *et al.*, [24] critically evaluate the conceptualization of migration as a “crisis.” The authors argue that characterizing migration as a crisis is a discursive tool used to legitimize security-oriented policies and trigger negative attitudes towards migrants.

The determinants of migration also vary. Adserà *et al.*, [25], examining the decisive role of linguistic proximity in international migration, state that sharing a common language or a low linguistic distance increases migration flows. The study emphasizes that language proficiency not only increases labor market integration and earnings but also facilitates non-economic processes, such as understanding local attitudes towards migrants and participation in social networks.

In summary, the literature demonstrates that different migration movements occur in different geographies. In this context, the intense refugee movement originating from Syria and its impacts are prominent in the Middle East and Europe. In Africa, local conflicts and hopes for a better life are driving factors for intra-continental migration. In developed Asian countries such as Japan and South Korea, it is understood that aging populations and low birth rates are creating a labor shortage, thereby increasing migrant mobility. In the Americas, the US and Canada are the main targets for migration, while Mexico carries a significant burden as a transit corridor. Russia’s recent economic problems have led to a decline in migration. Australia, a country in Oceania, is considered a multicultural society.

The following section will explain the general characteristics and process steps of the Taxonomy method, a multi-criteria decision-making method used in country evaluation. The third section will present the application findings, and finally, the study will conclude with a discussion of the results.

## 2. Methodology

Decision making is the totality of processes, such as selection, classification, ranking, design, and elimination, undertaken to reach a definitive conclusion regarding the solution of a problem. The decision-making process generally includes the stages of problem definition, alternative identification, criteria determination, solution method selection, implementation, and conclusion. Multi-criteria decision making is the totality of processes involved in evaluating multiple criteria and alternatives during the decision-making process. Numerous methods are used in multi-criteria decision-making problems. Some of these methods are mathematical programming-based multi-objective decision-making methods used to solve design problems. Furthermore, decision problems generally involve attributes. These attributes are considered as criteria in solving the decision

problem. In this context, many multi-criteria decision-making methods are used in multi-attribute decision-making problems and are also referred to as multi-attribute decision-making methods. In this study, the concept of multi-criteria decision-making is adopted, as the term ‘criterion’ serves as an umbrella.

Among the multi-criteria decision-making methods used to solve selection and ranking problems, the most well-known are AHP (Analytical Hierarchy Process), TOPSIS (Technique for Order Preference by Similarity to Ideal Solution), PROMETHEE (Preference Ranking Organization Method for Enrichment Evaluation), and ELECTRE (Elimination and Choice Expressing Reality). However, the structure of the decision problem and the decision maker’s preferences are decisive in selecting the method. In this study, the Taxonomy Method will be used to rank the alternatives. This method was chosen for its straightforward process steps and the effective results it yields in country-related evaluations [26]. The general characteristics and process steps of the Taxonomy Method will be discussed in the following subsection.

### 2.1 Taxonomy Method

The Taxonomy Method was first developed by Adanson in 1763 and expanded by Polish scientists in the second half of the 20th century. The Taxonomy Method can be used to rank, classify, and compare alternatives based on their merits relative to the criteria. However, the method has two different application formats: Helwig’s Taxonomy Method and Non-model. Helwig’s Taxonomy Method will be used in this study. The procedure steps for this method are provided in the following section [26,27].

Step 1. Constructing the decision matrix: A decision matrix contains  $j$  criteria in its columns,  $i$  alternatives in its rows, and elements  $(x_{ij})$  in the corresponding cells. The decision matrix  $X$  is shown in Equation (1), where  $i = 1, \dots, m$  and  $j = 1, \dots, n$ .

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & \cdots & x_{1n} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{1m} & \cdots & x_{mn} \end{bmatrix}_{m \times n} \quad (1)$$

Step 2. Normalization of the decision matrix: The normalization process reflects the decision maker’s preferences by de-uniting criteria with different units of measurement and making them comparable. The normalization process, as outlined in Equation (2) in the Taxonomy Method, is performed.

$$z_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij} - \mu_j}{s_j} \quad (2)$$

In Equation (2),  $z_{ij}$  represents the normalized values,  $\mu_j$  represents the mean value of the  $j$ -th criterion,  $s_j$  represents the standard deviation value of the  $j$ -th criterion, and  $m$  represents the number of alternatives.

Step 3. Constructing the composite matrix: Euclidean distances from each other are calculated using the normalized values of the alternatives, and the composite matrix  $C$  is created. The Euclidean distance of two alternatives  $a$  and  $b$ , where  $i = 1, a, b \dots m$ , is calculated with the help of Equation (3).

$$c_{ab} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j (z_{aj} - z_{bj})^2} \quad (3)$$

In Equation (3),  $c_{ab}$  represents the Euclidean distance of alternative  $a$  to alternative  $b$  in terms of criterion  $j$ . Furthermore,  $w_j$  is the weight value of criterion  $j$  when the criteria are weighted. After calculating the distances for all alternative pairs, the combined matrix  $C$ , shown in Equation (4), is generated. Matrix  $C$  is a symmetric matrix with diagonal elements of 0.

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} c_{11} & \cdots & c_{1m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ c_{m1} & \cdots & c_{mm} \end{bmatrix}_{m \times m} \quad (4)$$

Step 4. Homogenizing the Alternatives: In this step, the smallest distance is determined for each alternative to all other alternatives. In other words, the main diagonals in the C matrix are ignored. The smallest distance values are labeled  $H_i$  to represent the  $i$  alternatives. The  $\bar{H}$  value is obtained by taking the arithmetic mean of the  $H_i$  values. Then, the standard deviation value ( $s_H$ ) is calculated using the  $H_i$  and  $\bar{H}$  values as specified in Equation (5).

$$s_H = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m (H_i - \bar{H})^2} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ H_i - \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m H_i \right) \right]^2} \quad (5)$$

The homogeneity range of the matrix C is obtained by Equation (6), where H is shown.

$$H = \bar{H} \pm 2s_H \quad (6)$$

For each alternative (row), the minimum distance values ( $H_i$ ) are checked to see if they fall within the range specified in Equation (6). Alternatives not within this range are eliminated. Then, the mean and standard deviation values are calculated for the remaining values, and the check is repeated.

Step 5. Creating development patterns: After homogenizing the alternatives, a quality development pattern is created using normalized values. For this purpose, the development pattern for alternative  $i$  is obtained using equation (7), where  $z_{Hj}$  represents the reference (ideal) value in criterion  $j$ .

$$c_{iH} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^n (z_{ij} - z_{Hj})^2} \quad (7)$$

When determining ideal values, the optimization aspect of the criteria is considered. For criteria with a benefit-optimization aspect, the highest value is used as the reference; for those with a cost-optimization aspect, the lowest value is used as the reference.

Step 6. Ranking the Alternatives: In this step, the upper limit of the development patterns of the alternatives is first determined using Equation (8).

$$c_H = \bar{c}_{iH} + 2s_{iH} = \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m c_{iH} \right) + 2 \sqrt{\frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \left[ c_{iH} - \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m c_{iH} \right) \right]^2} \quad (8)$$

The overall evaluation value  $F_i$  is obtained by dividing the development pattern values of the alternatives by the upper limit. For this purpose, Equation (9) is used.

$$F_i = \frac{c_{iH}}{c_H} \quad (9)$$

The solution to the problem is completed by ranking the alternatives from smallest to largest according to their  $F_i$  values.  $F_i$  values range from 0 to 1, with values closer to 0 indicating the alternative's proximity to the ideal solution, and those closer to 1 indicating its distance from the ideal.

Alternatives can be classified using the taxonomy method based on standard deviation and triple mean values. Since this study will not classify countries, these procedures will not be covered.

### 3. Results

Data for the study were obtained from the WVS database [28]. Questions 121-130 regarding immigrants in the WVS were evaluated as decision criteria. Countries' evaluation scores for each criterion were determined based on their responses to the relevant WVS question. The criteria used in the evaluation were the impact of immigrants on the country's contribution, the perspective on

the usefulness of immigrants in the workforce, cultural diversity, crime rates and immigrants, granting asylum to political refugees, immigrants and terrorism, the impact of immigration on the poor, immigrants and unemployment, social conflict, and immigration policy preferences. In determining the evaluation scores of countries according to the criteria, for questions with graded positive or negative answers, the first degree received full weight, the second half received half weight, and the weighted average was used. The criteria were given equal weight, and the results presented in Table 1 were obtained using the Taxonomy Method. The ten questions asked in the WVS were used as evaluation criteria in the Taxonomy Method.

**Table 1**  
 Ranking of Countries from Positive to Negative Attitudes Towards Immigrants

Country	Rank	Estimated Number of Refugees and Asylum Seekers (2000)	Estimated Number of Refugees and Asylum Seekers (2019)	Percentage of Migrants in the Population (2000)	Percentage of immigrants in the population (2019)
Andorra	2	0	0	64.45	58,47
Argentina	7	2371	7.515	4.18	4,94
Australia	3	71246	96.295	23.10	29,95
Bangladesh	39	21919	932.334	0.77	1,34
Bolivia	34	354	775	1.10	1,36
Brazil	21	0	96.010	0.39	0,38
Myanmar	27	0	0	0.21	0,14
Chile	9	344	10.346	1.16	4,96
China	5	293705	322.383	0.04	0,07
Taiwan ROC	24				0,02
Colombia	45	235	8.390	0.28	2,27
TRNC and Northern Cyprus	29	97	16.165	8.49	16,01
Equator	37	958	104.185	1.19	2,20
Ethiopia	32	197959	891.990	0.92	1,12
Germany	10	906000	1.399.669	11.05	15,72
Greece	30	9032	83.110	10.03	11,57
Guatemala	42	726	388	0.41	0,46
Hong Kong SAR	22	979	103	40.40	39,57
Indonesia	18	142562	13.789	0.14	0,13
Iran	19	1851844	979.519	4.27	3,23
Iraq	47	127787	290.673	0.90	0,94
Japan	11	3752	33.395	1.32	1,97
Kazakhstan	23	20579	807	19.26	19,97
Jordan	48	1571234	2.928.724	37.63	33,13
South Korea	38	52	11.727	0.52	2,27
Kyrgyzstan	28	10995	430	7.92	3,12
Lebanon	43	379894	1.558.615	18.03	27,19
Macau SAR	14	0	5	56.29	62,39
Malaysia	44	50487	151.291	6.31	10,74
Mexico	12	18451	19.385	0.54	0,83
New Zealand	1	4923	1.877	17.59	22,34
Nicaragua	13	332	736	0.60	0,64
Nigeria	20	7270	10.535	0.40	0,63
Pakistan	36	2001466	1.396.619	2.94	1,50
Peru	33	694	196.133	0.25	2,41
Philippines	17	196	672	0.41	0,20
Puerto Rico	6	0	0	9.68	9,10
Romania	26	1685	5.370	0.61	2,39
Russia	35	26956	128.139	8.13	7,98
Serbia	31	484403	32.327	9.68	9,35
Vietnam	4	15945	0	0.07	0,08
Zimbabwe	16	4195	15.948	3.45	2,81
Tajikistan	15	15597	2.956	4.82	2,94
Thailand	41	104965	111.457	2.00	5,22
Tunisia	25	448	737	0.38	0,49
Türkiye	46	3103	3.787.207	2.03	7,04

**Table 1**  
 Continued

Country	Rank	Estimated Number of Refugees and Asylum Seekers (2000)	Estimated Number of Refugees and Asylum Seekers (2019)	Percentage of Migrants in the Population (2000)	Percentage of immigrants in the population (2019)
Egypt	40	18019	289.150	0.27	0.50
USA	8	894552	929.762	12.36	15.40
World		16.503.717	28711526	2,8	2.83
Africa		3.698.535	7299284	1,9	1.86
Asia		9.185.166	16013658	1,3	1.32
Europe		2.472.899	3595669	7,8	7.84
Latin America and the Caribbean		44.176	607263	1,3	1.26
North America		1.019.706	1086344	12,9	12.92
Oceania		83.235	109308	17,1	17.06
High-Income Countries		3.021.424	4734790	9,3	9.26
Middle-Income Countries		10.700.261	18498707	1,3	1.34
Upper-middle-income countries		5.619.443	11347870	1,5	1.52
Lower-middle-income countries		5.080.818	7150837	1,2	1.16
Low-Income Countries		2.782.032	5478028	1,9	1.95
No Income Group		0	1	18,7	18.7

Table 1 presents the ranking results, along with the share of immigrants in each country's population and the estimated number of refugees for 2000 and 2019. Except for Taiwan, where immigration rates were obtained from the national database, immigration statistics for countries were obtained from the UN database [29,30]. Furthermore, missing data in two criteria for China were imputed by averaging Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Macau. However, Italy and Canada, which play a significant role in migration flows, and India, which holds a significant share of the global population, were not included in the study because the aforementioned questions were not asked within the WVS. According to 2019 data, the countries with more than 50% of their population being immigrants are Andorra and Macau SAR. The countries with the lowest immigration rates are Taiwan and China. Furthermore, according to 2019 data, Türkiye hosts the largest number of asylum seekers and refugees, followed by Jordan. Countries hosting the fewest immigrants and refugees include Andorra, Myanmar, Puerto Rico, Vietnam, and Macau SAR.

The top five countries with positive attitudes toward immigrants are New Zealand, Andorra, Australia, Vietnam, and China. Excluding Andorra, a geographically small country, there are no European countries among the top-ranked countries. The recent rise of far-right movements and anti-immigrant policies in Europe may be related to this situation. Furthermore, two developed Oceanian countries, New Zealand and Australia, which boast multicultural societies, are in the top spots. The proportion of immigrants in Vietnam and China's populations has remained relatively unchanged over the past two decades, remaining at a low rate of 0.08%. The bottom five countries are Jordan, Iraq, Türkiye, Colombia, and Malaysia. The number of refugees and asylum seekers in these countries has increased over the past two decades. It is particularly noteworthy that the bottom three countries have received significant immigration in the last decade due to the Syrian civil war. As shown in Table 1, Türkiye hosts 3,787,207 refugees, while Jordan hosts 2,928,724 refugees. These two countries host approximately one-quarter of the world's refugee/asylum seeker population. Considering that Türkiye and Jordan's economic structures have been supporting this large refugee and refugee population for over a decade, the reasons for the negative attitudes toward immigrants can be more accurately understood.

Table 2 presents the distribution of responses to the WVS questions for the top five, bottom five, and two middle-ranked countries. An examination of the statistics in Table 2 reveals that the top-ranked countries have a significantly more positive view of immigration than those in the bottom.

For example, 4% of Colombian respondents believe that immigrants contribute positively to the country’s development, while this figure is 45.5% in Andorra. This may be because the majority of Andorra’s population is made up of immigrants. On the other hand, multicultural countries are known to have positive attitudes toward immigrants [12]. Colombian respondents have more negative attitudes toward immigrants than those in the countries in Table 2, believing that immigrants increase crime rates and cause social conflict. Meanwhile, 60% of Malaysian respondents believe that immigrants cause social conflict.

**Table 2**  
 Distribution of Responses Regarding Immigrants in Selected Countries in the Ranking

Questions [Migrants]	Ranking Obtained Using the Taxonomy Method		1	2	3
	Response (%)	WVS Question	New Zealand	Andorra	Australia
Impact on the country’s development	Quite a lot	Q121	37.7	45.5	20.1
Completion of useful tasks in the workforce	Accept	Q122	54.4	63.0	46.6
Strengthening cultural diversity	Accept	Q123	69.3	81.1	69.9
Increasing crime rates	Accept	Q124	12.8	20.2	34.6
Political refugees should be granted asylum	Accept	Q125	56.1	26.6	52.7
Increases terrorism risks	Accept	Q126	23.0	21.9	41.5
(Acceptance of migrants) helps the poor build new lives	Accept	Q127	77.7	79.2	81.1
Increases unemployment	Accept	Q128	19.5	27.9	35.4
Leads to social conflict	Accept	Q129	24.0	36.0	43.9
Immigration policy preference	Anyone who wants to can come	Q130	2.2	4.6	6.4
	People can come as long as there are current jobs	Q130	49.2	65.6	45.0
	Strict limits should be placed on the number of foreigners who can come here	Q130	42.0	26.3	45.9
	People from other countries should be prevented from coming here	Q130	0.9	1.1	1.8

In light of the results presented in Table 1 and the statistics presented in Table 2, one of the main concerns regarding immigrants in Türkiye and Jordan is the fear of rising unemployment. The fact that both countries have relatively large refugee/asylum seeker populations relative to their economic structures has negatively impacted their attitudes toward immigrants. Despite generally positive attitudes toward immigrants, Vietnamese respondents favor restrictions on the number of immigrants entering the country. Approximately one-quarter of Turkish and Iraqi respondents believe that foreigners should be banned from entering the country. This may also be related to the regional migration and economic crises these countries have experienced over the past two decades.

**Table 2**  
 Continued

Questions [Migrants]	24 Taiwan ROC	25 Tunisia	44 Malaysia	45 Colombia	46 Türkiye	47 Iraq	48 Jordan	4 Vietnam	5 China
Impact on the country's development	36.3	10.8	15.5	4.0	7.0	7.8	8.8	34.2	41.7
Completion of useful tasks in the workforce	74.6	29.8	36.4	38.9	23.5	14.3	54.5	76.5	53.8
Strengthening cultural diversity	80.2	47.7	29.9	39.0	30.7	18.9	55.7	88.3	70.0
Increasing crime rates	53.5	38.9	61.0	74.8	61.2	15.1	80.5	36.2	29.7
Political refugees should be granted asylum	41.0	48.3	31.5	59.3	47.5	19.1	64.7	56.2	32.0
Increases terrorism risks	66.6	44.5	55.1	69.3	60.5	13.4	81.3	31.8	17.7
(Acceptance of migrants) helps the poor build new lives	79.3	35.1	43.2	47.0	44.2	16.5	74.2	71.1	59.4
Increases unemployment	64.5	60.8	55.7	79.1	69.9	6.8	90.2	43.5	30.9
Leads to social conflict	61.9	43.0	60.8	80.6	61.8	13.9	87.3	32.8	20.5
	2.9	10.8	4.3	6.7	5.1	6.2	6.0	11.4	4.6
Immigration policy preference	17.8	41.6	14.1	32.7	24.5	23.7	16.9	18.7	34.5
	76.3	36.0	75.9	42.9	44.2	44.9	55.9	67.6	57.9
	2.3	8.3	5.6	17.7	23.5	23.5	19.1	2.3	2.5

Efforts are being made within the international community regarding immigrants. Despite this, as seen in the examples of Türkiye and Jordan, countries that receive large amounts of immigrants and those who do migrate are left to their fate, with the exception of financial support. It is essential that the international community thoroughly address the issue beyond its financial aspects and ensure that immigrants have fair and humane living conditions.

#### 4. Conclusions

It is generally understood that people in countries hosting large numbers of refugees/asylum seekers, such as Türkiye and Jordan, have negative attitudes toward foreigners. In this context, it is believed that the relatively positive attitudes of countries with relatively small immigrant and refugee populations, such as Vietnam and China, may change if they experience the same processes as countries like Türkiye and Jordan. On the other hand, Australia and New Zealand, which have structured their populations through immigration over the past few centuries and are examples of multicultural societies, are seen as exemplary countries. The geographic locations of these countries allow them to be isolated from conflict-ridden regions such as the Middle East and Africa. In this regard, geography and the ratio of immigrants and refugees within a country influence societal behavior.

It is a well-known fact that countries have different geographical regions and economic and cultural structures. However, the primary reason people migrate is common and can be summarized as seeking better living conditions. In this context, improving people's living conditions in their current locations is one option to prevent migration. On the other hand, efforts must be increased to ensure that immigrants are accepted within the societies they migrate to, that they are not marginalized, that they are provided with equal living conditions and integration, that policies and problems against racism are not postponed, and that the migration burden of countries receiving high numbers of immigrants is shared globally. Given the growing impact of globalization, improvements in the treatment of immigrants, asylum seekers, and refugees will benefit all countries worldwide.

In conclusion, the findings underscore a fundamental inequality between countries geographically and economically isolated from large-scale migration and those at the forefront of such crises. Multicultural states such as Australia and New Zealand have not been negatively affected by recent migration crises, thanks to their historical migration patterns and geographic locations. On the other side, countries like Türkiye and Jordan bear the socio-economic burden of proximity to conflict zones. This reality necessitates a shift beyond temporary financial aid toward a global burden-sharing mechanism. Ultimately, promoting social cohesion through robust anti-discrimination policies, equal access to labor markets, and structured integration programs in host countries is not only a humanitarian obligation but a strategic requirement for long-term stability. Without such comprehensive measures, the fear of unemployment and social exclusion will continue to shape negative attitudes, weakening both the well-being of migrants and the social fabric of host countries.

### Acknowledgement

This study is a revised version of the study titled “Ülkelerin Göçmenlere Karşı Tutumlarına Göre Taksonomi Yöntemiyle Sıralanması” presented in International Symposium on Multidisciplinary Approach Towards the Disadvantaged Groups (Idgmas2020).

### Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

### References

- [1] Kara, P., & Korkut, R. (2010). Türkiye’de göç, iltica ve mülteciler. *Türk İdare Dergisi*, 467(1), 153–162.
- [2] McConnell, A. (2016). Mülteci ve Göçmen? UNHCR. <https://www.unhcr.org/cy/media/unhcr-refugee-or-migrant-tr-pdf>
- [3] Canatan, K. (2013). Avrupa toplumlarının göç algıları ve tutumları: Sosyolojik bir yaklaşım. *İstanbul University Journal of Sociology*, 3(27), 317–332.
- [4] Deniz, T. (2014). Uluslar arası göç sorunu perspektifinde Türkiye. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 181(181), 175–204.
- [5] Davis, L., & Deole, S. S. (2017). Immigration and the rise of far-right parties in Europe. *Ifo DICE Report*, 15(4), 10–15.
- [6] Czaika, M., & Reinprecht, C. (2022). Migration Drivers: Why Do People Migrate? In P. Scholten (Ed.), *Introduction to Migration Studies* (pp. 49–82). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92377-8\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92377-8_3)
- [7] McAuliffe, M., & Triandafyllidou, A. (n.d.). *World Migration Report 2022*. International Organization for Migration (IOM).
- [8] Adger, W. N., Fransen, S., Safra De Campos, R., & Clark, W. C. (2024). Migration and sustainable development. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 121(3), e2206193121. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2206193121>
- [9] Aras, İ., & Sağıroğlu, A. (2018). Avrupa aşırı sağında göçmen karşıtlığı: Fransa ve Macaristan örnekleri. *Mukaddime*, 9(3), 59–78.
- [10] Demirkan, T. (n.d.). Grafiklerle: Avrupa’da göçmen karşıtlığının en yüksek olduğu ülkeler. *BBC News Türkçe*. Retrieved <https://www.bbc.com/turkce/haberler-dunya-43392262>
- [11] Holmes, S. M. (2006). An ethnographic study of the social context of migrant health in the United States. *PLoS Medicine*, 3(10), e448.
- [12] Günay, E., Atılğan, D., & Serin, E. (2017). Dünya’da ve Türkiye’de göç yönetimi. *Kahramanmaraş Sütçü İmam Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 7(2), 37–60.
- [13] Doğan, E. T. (2018). Düzensiz göçün kentlerde “düzenlenmesi”: Meksika’da göçmen evleri. *Memleket Siyaset Yönetim*, 13(30), 141–160.
- [14] TRT Haber. (2018). Güney Amerika ülkeleri ABD’ye göçü durdurmaya çalışıyor.
- [15] Murakami, İ., & Baş, A. M. (2019). Türkiye’den Japonya’ya Göç Edenlerin Yaşam ve Emekliliğe Bakış Açıları: Tokyo Örneği. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 23(2), 287–300.
- [16] Kim, A. E. (2014). Global migration and South Korea: Foreign workers, foreign brides and the making of a multicultural society. In *Migration: Policies, practices, activism* (pp. 69–91). Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315878119-5/global-migration-south-korea-foreign-workers-foreign-brides-making-multicultural-society-andrew-eungi-kim>

- [17] Denisenko, M. (2017). Migration to Russia and the current economic crisis. *Migration and the Ukraine Crisis: A Two-Country Perspective*, 129–148.
- [18] Awumbila, M. (2017). Drivers of migration and urbanization in Africa: Key trends and issues. *International Migration*, 7(8), 1–9.
- [19] Ünal, S. (n.d.). Türkiye'nin Beklenmedik Konukları: " Öteki" Bağlamında Yabancı Göçmen ve Mülteci Deneyimi. *Journal of World of Turks*, 6(3), 65–89.
- [20] Yıldırım, S., İslamoğlu, E., & İyem, C. (2017). Suriyeli Sığınmacıların Toplumsal Kabul ve Uyum Sürecine İlişkin Bir Araştırma. *Bilgi*, 19(2).
- [21] Helbling, M., & Meierrieks, D. (2022). Terrorism and migration: An overview. *British Journal of Political Science*, 52(2), 977–996.
- [22] Spencer, S., & Triandafyllidou, A. (2022). Irregular Migration. In P. Scholten (Ed.), *Introduction to Migration Studies* (pp. 191–204). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92377-8\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-92377-8_12)
- [23] Tsegay, S. M. (2023). International migration: Definition, causes and effects. *Genealogy*, 7(3), 61.
- [24] Cantat, C., Péroud, A., & Thiollet, H. (2025). Migration as Crisis. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 69(6), 627–649. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00027642231182889>
- [25] Adserà, A., Pytlíková, M., & Rapoport, H. (2026). Language and migration. In S. Weber & V. Ginsburgh (Eds.), *The Palgrave Handbook of Economics and Language* (pp. 299–342). Springer Nature Switzerland. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-88240-1\\_12](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-88240-1_12)
- [26] Alinezhad, A., & Khalili, J. (2019). *New Methods and Applications in Multiple Attribute Decision Making (MADM)* (Vol. 277). Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-15009-9>
- [27] Jurkowska, B. (2014). The federal states of Germany—analysis and measurement of development using taxonomic methods. *Oeconomia Copernicana*, 5(3), 49–73. <https://doi.org/10.12775/OeC.2014.019>
- [28] WVSA. (2020). World Values Survey [Dataset]. <https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/>
- [29] UN. (2020). Global Migration Database [Dataset]. <https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/global-migration-database>
- [30] Ministry of the Interior National Immigration Agency Republic of China (Taiwan). (2020). Foreign Residents by Nationality [Dataset]. <https://www.immigration.gov.tw/5475/5478/141478/141380/209124/>