

HUMANIDADES E CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS:

Perspectivas
Teóricas,
Metodológicas
e de
Investigação

Luis Fernando González-Beltrán
(organizador)



EDITORA
ARTEMIS
2023

VOL III

HUMANIDADES E CIÊNCIAS SOCIAIS:

Perspectivas
Teóricas,
Metodológicas
e de
Investigação

Luis Fernando González-Beltrán
(organizador)



EDITORA
ARTEMIS
2023

VOL III



O conteúdo deste livro está licenciado sob uma Licença de Atribuição Creative Commons Atribuição-Não-Comercial NãoDerivativos 4.0 Internacional (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0). Direitos para esta edição cedidos à Editora Artemis pelos autores. Permitido o download da obra e o compartilhamento, desde que sejam atribuídos créditos aos autores, e sem a possibilidade de alterá-la de nenhuma forma ou utilizá-la para fins comerciais.

A responsabilidade pelo conteúdo dos artigos e seus dados, em sua forma, correção e confiabilidade é exclusiva dos autores. A Editora Artemis, em seu compromisso de manter e aperfeiçoar a qualidade e confiabilidade dos trabalhos que publica, conduz a avaliação cega pelos pares de todos manuscritos publicados, com base em critérios de neutralidade e imparcialidade acadêmica.

Editora Chefe	Prof. ^a Dr. ^a Antonella Carvalho de Oliveira
Editora Executiva	M. ^a Viviane Carvalho Mocellin
Direção de Arte	M. ^a Bruna Bejarano
Diagramação	Elisangela Abreu
Organizador	Prof. Dr. Luis Fernando González-Beltrán
Imagem da Capa	Bruna Bejarano, Arquivo Pessoal
Bibliotecário	Maurício Amormino Júnior – CRB6/2422

Conselho Editorial

Prof.^a Dr.^a Ada Esther Portero Ricol, *Universidad Tecnológica de La Habana “José Antonio Echeverría”*, Cuba
Prof. Dr. Adalberto de Paula Paranhos, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Agustín Olmos Cruz, *Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México*, México
Prof.^a Dr.^a Amanda Ramalho de Freitas Brito, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Ana Clara Monteverde, *Universidad de Buenos Aires*, Argentina
Prof.^a Dr.^a Ana Júlia Viamonte, Instituto Superior de Engenharia do Porto (ISEP), Portugal
Prof. Dr. Ángel Mujica Sánchez, *Universidad Nacional del Altiplano*, Peru
Prof.^a Dr.^a Angela Ester Mallmann Centenaro, Universidade do Estado de Mato Grosso, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Begoña Blandón González, *Universidad de Sevilla*, Espanha
Prof.^a Dr.^a Carmen Pimentel, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Catarina Castro, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal
Prof.^a Dr.^a Cirila Cervera Delgado, *Universidad de Guanajuato*, México
Prof.^a Dr.^a Cláudia Neves, Universidade Aberta de Portugal
Prof.^a Dr.^a Cláudia Padovesi Fonseca, Universidade de Brasília-DF, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Cleberton Correia Santos, Universidade Federal da Grande Dourados, Brasil
Prof. Dr. David García-Martul, *Universidad Rey Juan Carlos de Madrid*, Espanha
Prof.^a Dr.^a Deuzimar Costa Serra, Universidade Estadual do Maranhão, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Dina Maria Martins Ferreira, Universidade Estadual do Ceará, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Edith Luévano-Hipólito, *Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León*, México
Prof.^a Dr.^a Eduarda Maria Rocha Teles de Castro Coelho, Universidade de Trás-os-Montes e Alto Douro, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Eduardo Eugênio Spers, Universidade de São Paulo (USP), Brasil
Prof. Dr. Eloi Martins Senhoras, Universidade Federal de Roraima, Brasil
Prof.^a Dr.^a Elvira Laura Hernández Carballido, *Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Hidalgo*, México



Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Emilas Darlene Carmen Lebus, *Universidad Nacional del Nordeste/ Universidad Tecnológica Nacional, Argentina*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Erla Mariela Morales Morgado, *Universidad de Salamanca, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Ernesto Cristina, *Universidad de la República, Uruguay*
Prof. Dr. Ernesto Ramírez-Briones, *Universidad de Guadalajara, México*
Prof. Dr. Fernando Hitt, *Université du Québec à Montréal, Canadá*
Prof. Dr. Gabriel Díaz Cobos, *Universitat de Barcelona, Espanha*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Gabriela Gonçalves, Instituto Superior de Engenharia do Porto (ISEP), Portugal
Prof. Dr. Geoffroy Roger Pointer Malpass, Universidade Federal do Triângulo Mineiro, Brasil
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Gladys Esther Leoz, *Universidad Nacional de San Luis, Argentina*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Glória Beatriz Álvarez, *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*
Prof. Dr. Gonçalo Poeta Fernandes, Instituto Politécnico da Guarda, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Gustavo Adolfo Juarez, *Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, Argentina*
Prof. Dr. Guillermo Julián González-Pérez, *Universidad de Guadalajara, México*
Prof. Dr. Håkan Karlsson, *University of Gothenburg, Suécia*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Iara Lúcia Tescarollo Dias, Universidade São Francisco, Brasil
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Isabel del Rosario Chiyon Carrasco, *Universidad de Piura, Peru*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Isabel Yohena, *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*
Prof. Dr. Ivan Amaro, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Iván Ramon Sánchez Soto, *Universidad del Bío-Bío, Chile*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Ivânia Maria Carneiro Vieira, Universidade Federal do Amazonas, Brasil
Prof. Me. Javier Antonio Albornoz, *University of Miami and Miami Dade College, Estados Unidos*
Prof. Dr. Jesús Montero Martínez, *Universidad de Castilla - La Mancha, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. João Manuel Pereira Ramalho Serrano, Universidade de Évora, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Joaquim Júlio Almeida Júnior, UniFIMES - Centro Universitário de Mineiros, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Jorge Ernesto Bartolucci, *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*
Prof. Dr. José Cortez Godinez, Universidad Autónoma de Baja California, México
Prof. Dr. Juan Carlos Cancino Diaz, Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México
Prof. Dr. Juan Carlos Mosquera Feijoo, *Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Juan Diego Parra Valencia, *Instituto Tecnológico Metropolitano de Medellín, Colômbia*
Prof. Dr. Juan Manuel Sánchez-Yañez, *Universidad Michoacana de San Nicolás de Hidalgo, México*
Prof. Dr. Juan Porras Pulido, *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*
Prof. Dr. Júlio César Ribeiro, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Leinig Antonio Perazolli, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Brasil
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Livia do Carmo, Universidade Federal de Goiás, Brasil
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Luciane Spanhol Bordignon, Universidade de Passo Fundo, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Luis Fernando González Beltrán, *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, México*
Prof. Dr. Luis Vicente Amador Muñoz, *Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Espanha*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Macarena Esteban Ibáñez, *Universidad Pablo de Olavide, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Manuel Ramiro Rodriguez, *Universidad Santiago de Compostela, Espanha*
Prof. Dr. Manuel Simões, Faculdade de Engenharia da Universidade do Porto, Portugal
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Márcia de Souza Luz Freitas, Universidade Federal de Itajubá, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Marcos Augusto de Lima Nobre, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Brasil
Prof. Dr. Marcos Vinicius Meiado, Universidade Federal de Sergipe, Brasil
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Mar Garrido Román, *Universidad de Granada, Espanha*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Margarida Márcia Fernandes Lima, Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto, Brasil
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª María Alejandra Arecco, *Universidad de Buenos Aires, Argentina*
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Maria Aparecida José de Oliveira, Universidade Federal da Bahia, Brasil
Prof.^ª Dr.^ª Maria Carmen Pastor, *Universitat Jaume I, Espanha*



Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria do Céu Caetano, Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria do Socorro Saraiva Pinheiro, Universidade Federal do Maranhão, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª MªGraça Pereira, Universidade do Minho, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria Gracinda Carvalho Teixeira, Universidade Federal Rural do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª María Guadalupe Vega-López, *Universidad de Guadalajara, México*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maria Lúcia Pato, Instituto Politécnico de Viseu, Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Maritza González Moreno, *Universidad Tecnológica de La Habana, Cuba*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Mauriceia Silva de Paula Vieira, Universidade Federal de Lavras, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Ninfa María Rosas-García, Centro de Biotecnología Genómica-Instituto Politécnico Nacional, México
Prof.ª Dr.ª Odara Horta Boscolo, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Osbaldo Turpo-Gebera, *Universidad Nacional de San Agustín de Arequipa, Peru*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Patrícia Vasconcelos Almeida, Universidade Federal de Lavras, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Paula Arcoverde Cavalcanti, Universidade do Estado da Bahia, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Rodrigo Marques de Almeida Guerra, Universidade Federal do Pará, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Saulo Cerqueira de Aguiar Soares, Universidade Federal do Piauí, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Sergio Bitencourt Araújo Barros, Universidade Federal do Piauí, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Sérgio Luiz do Amaral Moretti, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Silvia Inés del Valle Navarro, *Universidad Nacional de Catamarca, Argentina*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Solange Kazumi Sakata, Instituto de Pesquisas Energéticas e Nucleares (IPEN)- USP, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Stanislava Kashtanova, *Saint Petersburg State University, Russia*
Prof.ª Dr.ª Teresa Cardoso, Universidade Aberta de Portugal
Prof.ª Dr.ª Teresa Monteiro Seixas, Universidade do Porto, Portugal
Prof. Dr. Valter Machado da Fonseca, Universidade Federal de Viçosa, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Vanessa Bordin Viera, Universidade Federal de Campina Grande, Brasil
Prof.ª Dr.ª Vera Lúcia Vasilévski dos Santos Araújo, Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Paraná, Brasil
Prof. Dr. Wilson Noé Garcés Aguilar, *Corporación Universitaria Autónoma del Cauca, Colômbia*
Prof. Dr. Xosé Somoza Medina, *Universidad de León, Espanha*

Dados Internacionais de Catalogação na Publicação (CIP) (eDOC BRASIL, Belo Horizonte/MG)

H918 Humanidades e ciências sociais [livro eletrônico] : perspectivas teóricas, metodológicas e de investigação: vol. III / Organizador Luis Fernando González-Beltrán. – Curitiba, PR: Artemis, 2023.

Formato: PDF

Requisitos de sistema: Adobe Acrobat Reader

Modo de acesso: World Wide Web

Inclui bibliografia

Edição bilíngue

ISBN 978-65-81701-13-0

DOI 10.37572/EdArt_151223130

1. Ciências sociais. 2. Humanidades. I. González-Beltrán, Luis Fernando.

CDD 300.1

Elaborado por Maurício Amormino Júnior – CRB6/2422



PRÓLOGO

En este tercer volumen de Humanidades y Ciencias Sociales: Perspectiva teóricas, Metodológicas y de Investigación, seguimos en la línea de ofrecer trabajos de diferentes disciplinas que, desde sus propias trincheras, intentan el análisis de diferentes aspectos del ser humano, desde el enfoque en el propio individuo, hasta su contexto tanto inmediato como a gran escala, de la escuela que lo forma hasta la ciudad que lo cobija. Pretendiendo, como ya es usual, que el lector curioso encuentre en un solo lugar, lo que le llevaría una enorme labor en los buscadores de temas científicos. Sin perder el foco sobre lo que es inherente al humano, la variedad de autores, de metodologías, de idiomas, de países representados aquí, le dan un mayor valor a la síntesis que intentamos lograr.

La obra presenta 17 investigaciones agrupadas en 4 secciones: iniciamos con el tema A) Alumnos en su contexto escolar. La escuela tiene una importancia innegable en la socialización de los alumnos, por ello se tratan los distintos Procesos educativos, en sus diferentes entornos, tanto físicos como situacionales, así se analizan los problemas del trabajo infantil, los contextos rurales, la autorregulación en el aprendizaje, las habilidades intrapersonales, las competencias investigativas, el Aprendizaje Basado en Proyectos, el pensamiento crítico y alumnos con discapacidades. Es la sección que agrupa más capítulos, con 7.

Continuando con la escuela, vemos también la otra cara de la moneda, con el tema B) Docentes en formación, con dos estudios. También aquí vemos como los profesores se enfrentan a varios retos, por lo que aquí se trata la Planeación estratégica, la situación de docentes con estrés, su entrenamiento, y su ejecución cuando dedican su trabajo a los adultos, en situaciones de Formación a lo largo de la vida.

La tercera sección C) Empresas: Presente, pasado y futuro, revisa el siguiente contexto al que se enfrentan los estudiantes: el trabajo. Iniciamos con un vistazo al pasado, revisando la política de las empresas en el siglo de oro español; el presente con la internalización de empresas; y el futuro tratando cuestiones como, en primer lugar, los intangibles en la sociedad del conocimiento, y en segundo lugar, el diseño estratégico y la ejecución en manejo de proyectos a nivel empresarial.

Finalizamos con una sección D) Ciudades: Arquitectura, diseño, construcción y política. Un contexto físico macro, pero también un entorno Social y Cultural. Iniciamos con la utopía del momento, cómo diseñar ciudades verdes, la infraestructura para vivir bien. Seguimos con lo más concreto, tanto en términos verbales como en términos literales, cómo reforzar el concreto de los edificios que nos alojan. Le sigue otro tópico de urbanismo: recursos humanos en la construcción. Y para cerrar, un poco de política,

cómo en Europa se está manejando la Migración, la crisis de refugiados, un problema que se está agudizando en todos los continentes.

Intentamos haber representado lo más actual de las Humanidades y las Ciencias Sociales, y esperamos seguirlo haciendo en el futuro inmediato.

¡Les deseamos a todos una agradable lectura!

Luis Fernando González-Beltrán
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México (UNAM)

SUMÁRIO

ALUMNOS EN SU CONTEXTO ESCOLAR

CAPÍTULO 1.....1

TRABAJO INFANTIL NO PERMITIDO E IMPLICACIONES EN MÉXICO

Abelardo Rodríguez López

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231301

CAPÍTULO 2.....25

LOS PROCESOS LECTORES CRITICALESALES EN LA RURALIDAD

Ivonne Caviedes Giraldo

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231302

CAPÍTULO 3..... 34

JUGANDO HACIA EL FUTURO: EL IMPACTO DE LOS ESPORTS EN EL DESARROLLO DE HABILIDADES INTRAPERSONALES EN IBAGUÉ

John Jairo Ariza López

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231303

CAPÍTULO 4.....42

INVESTIGACIÓN DE LA AUTORREGULACIÓN CÓMO MEJORARLA EN EL ÁMBITO ACADÉMICO Y SU RELACIÓN CON LA INTERNACIONALIZACIÓN

Giuseppe Francisco Falcone Treviño

Zaida Leticia Tinajero Mallozzi

Joel Luis Jiménez Galán

Sergio Rafael Hernández

Karina Ornelas Garza

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231304

CAPÍTULO 5.....97

PRESENCIA DE LA COMPETENCIA DE PENSAMIENTO REFLEXIVO Y CRÍTICO EN CURRÍCULOS DE ENFERMERÍA DEL PERÚ

Sonia Olinda Velasquez Rondon

Margarita Velasquez Oyola

Loida Pacora Bernal

Gloria Isabel Angles Angles

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231305

CAPÍTULO 6..... 106

INTEGRANDO TEORÍA Y PRÁCTICA: APRENDIZAJE BASADO EN PROYECTOS EN EL DESARROLLO DE COMPETENCIAS INVESTIGATIVAS EN LA EDUCACIÓN SUPERIOR

Miguel Enrique Valle Vargas
Cecilia del Carmen Costa Samaniego
María José Sarmiento Costa
Freddy Paúl Cueva Erazo
Digna Isabel Jimenez Jimenez

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231306

CAPÍTULO 7 118

GUÍA PARA LA REDACCIÓN DEL PORTAFOLIO DEL ESTUDIANTE

José Ángel Meneses Jiménez
Eugenia Mercedes Landa Morante
Angélica Noemí Taboada Morales
Victoria Cecilia Tipismana Herrera
Karin Rocío Leiva Huisa

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231307

DOCENTES EN FORMACIÓN

CAPÍTULO 8..... 126

EVALUACIÓN DEL NIVEL IMPACTO DE ESTRÉS DE DOCENTES-TUTORES EN LA ACCIÓN TUTORIAL PARA LA PROPUESTA DE FORMACIÓN EN INNOVACIÓN TUTORIAL CASO: UNIVERSIDAD AUTÓNOMA DE CAMPECHE

Susana Friné Moguel Marín
Lorena Arceo Balam
Carlos Alberto Pérez Canul
Miguel Angel Vargas Toledo
Cindy Janette Gómez Rosado
Thania del Carmen Tuyub Ovalle
Giselle Guillermo Chuc

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231308

CAPÍTULO 9.....137

PERSPECTIVAS TRANSDISCIPLINARES EN LA FORMACIÓN A LO LARGO DE LA VIDA EN ESPAÑA

Manuel Martí-Puig
Emma Dunia Vidal Prades
Abraham Cerveró-Carrascosa

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_1512231309

EMPRESAS: PRESENTE, PASADO Y FUTURO

CAPÍTULO 10.....153

LAS EMPRESAS DE SAAVEDRA FAJARDO EN LA ÉPOCA PRE-WESTFALIA

Jaume Baldiri Alavedra Regàs

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313010

CAPÍTULO 11..... 161

SCRUTINISING SPANISH WINE FIRMS: AN INTEGRATED VIEW OF THEIR INTERNATIONALISATION PROCESS

Noelia Jiménez-Asenjo de Pedro
Diana A. Filipescu

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313011

CAPÍTULO 12..... 198

INTANGIBLES PARA EL PROCESO DE DISEÑO EN EL MARCO DE LA SOCIEDAD DEL CONOCIMIENTO

Ruth Matovelle Villamar
Lourdes Ulloa López

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313012

CAPÍTULO 13.....208

COMPLEXITY, DESIGN AND PROJECT COMPLETION: A STUDY OF CLINICAL TRIALS

Metin Onal Vural

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313013

CAPÍTULO 14.....230

NATURE, TECHNOLOGIES, AND LIVING INFRASTRUCTURE- A THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE FOR FUTURE CITIES

Mustapha El Moussaoui

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313014

CAPÍTULO 15.....243

SISTEMATIZAÇÃO DAS TÉCNICAS DE REPARAÇÃO E REFORÇO DO BETÃO ARMADO EM EDIFÍCIOS

Fernando G. Branco

Jorge Morarji dos Remédios Días Mascarenhas

Maria de Lurdes Belgas da Costa Reis

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313015

CAPÍTULO 16.....267

WORK PERFORMANCE AS PART OF A CONSTRUCTION PROJECT - PROVIDING HUMAN RESOURCES AND PRODUCTIVITY MANAGEMENT

Daniela Dvornik Perhavec

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313016

CAPÍTULO 17284

THE MIGRATION GOVERNANCE OF THE REFUGEE CRISIS AND THE “CRACKS” IN THE COMMON EUROPEAN IDENTITY: THE CASE STUDY OF THE ISLAND LESVOS IN GREECE

Alexandra Makridou

Frangopoulos Yannis

 https://doi.org/10.37572/EdArt_15122313017

SOBRE O ORGANIZADOR.....299

ÍNDICE REMISSIVO 300

CAPÍTULO 17

THE MIGRATION GOVERNANCE OF THE REFUGEE CRISIS AND THE “CRACKS” IN THE COMMON EUROPEAN IDENTITY: THE CASE STUDY OF THE ISLAND LESVOS IN GREECE

Data de submissão: 24/11/2023

Data de aceite: 06/12/2023

Alexandra Makridou

Aristotle University

Department of Spatial

Planning and Development

Thessaloniki-Greece

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-9370-8576>

Frangopoulos Yannis

Aristotle University

Department of Spatial

Planning and Development

Thessaloniki-Greece

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5049-6014>

ABSTRACT: As a response to the refugee crisis of 2015, the European system of migration governance focused on the implementation of inadequate policies with “top down” informal planning and ‘ad hoc’ type interventions. Therefore, a different treatment between first host and relocating countries was highlighted, which created inequalities between the Member States of European Union (EU). At national level (especially at the gates of Europe; Greece, Italy), the pursued spatial planning policies resolve the urgent needs of the refugee crisis, nevertheless increase socio-spatial

inequalities and exacerbate social reactions at refugee camps. The mismanagement of the refugee issue, both at European and national level, gradually degrades the perception of the common European identity of EU citizens and encourages xenophobic reactions and introversion not only against refugees but also against the European institutions that embody the common European ideal of an open and democratic Europe. Hence, the need to reconsider European identities through a critical review of the migration governance system and its impact on the sense of belonging is more urgent than ever. This paper attempts to highlight the cracks that have emerged in European identity and the common European ideal of democracy, equality and justice through the management of the refugee crisis by European institutions and Member States. Employing qualitative research, based on media and document analysis, the paper briefly presents the case study of Lesbos, through which it attempts to highlight how national migration policies impose a “top-down” planning, preventing any effort for “bottom-up” actions, thus intensifying conflicts at the local level. To this end, it adopts a socio-spatial approach, with the logics of production (top-down planning) and appropriation (bottom-up mobilizations) of space.

KEYWORDS: Migration governance. Top-down planning. Refugee crisis. Common European Identity.

1 INTRODUCTION

The large refugee arrivals that the European Union (EU) received in 2015 required the urgent development of policies both for the rapid settlement of asylum seekers and their equal distribution among the EU member states. The massive displacement of people from the South to the North (King et al., 2017), following the Arab Spring uprisings, has raised strong concerns in the EU member states (Ribeiro, 2022). Ayaz and Wadood (2020) argue that two main current perceptions of the refugee crisis have emerged; on the one hand, that of the political left, which emphasized assistance and aid to refugees; and on the other hand, that of the political right, which stressed the need to develop firm policies and tighter border controls to ensure the safety of the European citizens. The crucial geopolitical issue of the refugee crisis has divided the political attitudes of the EU member states between the left and the right (Prooijen et al., 2017), while, as developments have shown, it has caused a broader anti-democratic shift, significantly strengthening xenophobic parties and the concept of “fortress Europe”, with the media playing an important role (Takou, 2023).

The research aim of this article is to highlight the cracks that have emerged within the European identity and the common European ideal of democracy, equality and justice through the management of the refugee crisis by the European institutions and the Member States. Furthermore, with the case study of Lesvos, it attempts to highlight how national migration policies impose a “top-down” planning, preventing any effort for “bottom-up” actions, leading to local conflicts.

To achieve the research objective, a micro-macro sociological approach is adopted at European, national, regional and local level, employing Lefebvre's (1991) and Remy's (2005) socio-spatial theories. The triple code of reading the society-space relationship proposed by Lefebvre includes (Lefebvre, 1991; Papadimitriou and Frangopoulos, 2018): a) collective spatial representations, i.e. perceptions of refugees and camps rooted in the subconscious of individuals and influenced by the predetermined systems of meanings shaped by the European policies, national governments and media; b) spatial practices, i.e. both the top-down processes of policy making and spatial planning of camp sites and the bottom-up attitudes and reactions of social groups towards refugees and refugee accommodation units characterized often as NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) at local level; c) the spaces of representation, which are symbolized by the Europe as a symbolic geographical area of democracy, justice and equality. In this article, therefore, space is not simply approached as the physical background where human practices evolve, but as a concept intercepting the processes of defining both material and immaterial relations, at the level of structures and representations.

For a comprehensive analysis of the governance of the refugee issue at European, national and local level along with the causes and reasons for the Member States' reactions to European policies, we employ Remy's (2005) approach that introduces two different aspects of socio-spatial analysis: a) logics of space production and b) logics of space appropriation. More specifically, the logics of space production refer to the entire 'top-down' process of migration policy making and planning of the refugee accommodation facilities within the framework of migration governance. The logics of the appropriation of space concern the stands of the EU member states and the "bottom-up" actions of demonstrations against the EU migration governance.

In methodological terms, qualitative research with document analysis was conducted. The paper is structured as follows. First, the European response to the refugee crisis is explained, followed by a critique of the EU's management of the refugee issue featuring the cracks that emerged in the common European identity. Also, a conceptual framework of migration governance is presented. Then, the brief analysis of the case study is discussed, before drawing general conclusions.

2 THE EU RESPONSE TO THE REFUGEE CRISIS

The EU introduced a Common European Asylum System (CEAS) at the end of the 20th century, starting with the 1951 Geneva Convention at the end of the Second World War which established ground rules and principles for the protection of refugees in the Member States. The CEAS consists of an institutional framework relating to asylum procedures, reception conditions and recognition of refugees, and is implemented through the European Asylum Support Office (EASO) (EASO, 2016). In addition, it includes two main regulations: Eurodac and Dublin. The first creates a common database with the fingerprints of all asylum seekers in EU Member States, while the second defines the country of first reception as responsible for the management of asylum seekers¹.

In fact, the Dublin resolution with the "first country of entry" criterion - as crucial for determining which Member State is responsible for processing asylum applications - leads to a shift of responsibility, rather than a sharing of it. Therefore, regional EU countries (especially Greece and Italy) bear a huge disproportionate effort compared to the rest of central Europe (Maldini & Takahashi 2017). Member States on the frontline of the refugee crisis have thus emphasized on border controls to reduce refugee arrivals on their territories. In addition, it is reported that various Member States have often adopted restrictive policies aimed at preventing illegal immigration and limiting the ability of asylum

¹ See https://home-affairs.ec.europa.eu/policies/migration-and-asylum/common-european-asylum-system_en

seekers and refugees to settle in these countries². According to Eurostat statistics, some countries such as Estonia, Lithuania and Portugal rejected all asylum applications in 2015, while Latvia, Hungary and Poland showed first instance rejection rates above 80%³.

In 2015, to assist frontline Member States, the European Commission introduced the hotspot policy (Niemann & Zaun 2018; Bousiou & Papada, 2020). These facilities, also known as refugee camps, were created as temporary spaces in an attempt to provide shelter to refugees, asylum seekers and other types of migrants (European Commission, 2015b). They functioned as identification centers, as they were the first reception facilities for refugees at the external borders of EU countries (Mentzelopoulou & Luyten, 2018). The main objective of the hotspot plan was to manage refugee arrivals and prevent border closures from the Balkan and northern countries (Triandafyllidou, 2015).

Although the hotspots were sited in cross-border areas of the front line countries, in order to assist in the emergency management of newly arriving populations, they were not supported by an comprehensive spatial planning. Their siting was carried out “top-down” with “ad hoc” interventions and often without informing the host communities (Sabchev, 2022; Tsavdaroglou & Lalenis, 2023). This fact, along with the huge population that these units had to accommodate, led to the emergence of local NIMBY reactions, which in most cases were perceived by local governments as racist attitudes (Makridou & Frangopoulos, 2021; Makridou, 2021). Specifically, in the case of Greece, a survey conducted on the island of Lesbos in 2016 showed that 55.9% of the local community agrees that hotspots should be ‘closed areas for a short-time stay of the migrants and the refugees for the period of their registration and identification’ (Rondos et al., as cited in Matusz et al., 2021, p. 11). However, after eight years of Europe’s greatest ever refugee crisis, the term “temporary duration” of hotspots is questionable and causes distress both within them and in the host communities of these facilities (Ayaz και Wadood, 2020).

A critical point in the evolution of refugee management was the official closure of the Balkan Road on 7 March 2016, which blocked the passage through the Greek - North Macedonian border to European countries (Germany etc.). Whereas the challenge faced by the countries of first reception of refugees (Greece, Italy) was enormous, Greece was urged to deal with the immediate risk of hosting tens of thousands of refugees, even temporarily (Triandafyllidou, 2015). Throughout 2016, some EU Member States’ political elites and population in Central and Eastern Europe were openly dismissive of resettling refugees and asylum seekers. Countries from the Visegrad Group (Czech Republic,

² See <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/29/germany-tightens-borders-as-finland-joins-sweden-in-deporting-refugees>

³ See https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Asylum_statistics

Hungary, Poland, and Slovakia) demonstrated indifference for the management of the refugee crisis (Ribeiro, 2022). The negative response of Hungarian Prime Minister, Viktor Orbán, to the EU's calls for the reception of refugees, who stressed the “zero refugee policy” (Bayer, 2016), was illustrative.

In March 2016, an agreement between the EU and Turkey was reached, which provided for the reduction of refugee arrivals in the first reception countries (Greece, Italy) with the return of arriving populations not qualified for international protection to Turkey. This agreement was strongly criticised (Havlova & Tamchynova, 2016; Kourachanis, 2018; Saatçioğlu, 2020) as despite leading to a significant reduction in refugee arrivals in the EU, it was stigmatized by a form of ‘forced negotiation’ for any upcoming threats to release mass migrants and asylum seekers (Greenhill, 2016) from Turkey. Specifically for the Greek case, the difficulty of the judicial authorities in examining asylum cases led to the burden on the first reception centres (Ayaz & Wadood, 2020) and in extension the islands of the North Aegean. As Gerald Knaus⁴ pointed out

“expectations that a country with the highest number of asylum applications per capita in the whole EU could quickly decide who would stay and who would leave were unrealistic” (Deutsche Welle, 2021).

In this way, and in conjunction with the Dublin Regulation, Greece was turned into a place of concentrated refugees destined for return (Karamanidou & Schuster, 2012).

3 “FORTRESS” EUROPE & THE “CRACKS” IN THE COMMON EUROPEAN IDENTITY

The refugee crisis demonstrated that the EU was not well equipped to manage the issue holistically and to “act as a unified actor in this area” (Riberio, 2022, p. 123). The EU's failure to develop a common policy to deal with the massive refugee arrivals has resulted the rising of insecurity in its Member States, which were in panic situation (Hatton, 2016). The reality of the events that took place in 2015 highlighted the implementation of a collage of 28 different asylum systems which produced uneven results (Trauner, 2016), with a typical example the unequal distribution of asylum seekers between EU Member States. In this context the Dublin regulation created intense conflicts. Khiabany (2016, p. 1) states that the “overwhelming institutional response by ‘liberal’ states has been, and remains, depressingly illiberal”.

According to Connon (2018) the majority of European citizens did not approve of the way the EU handled the refugee crisis. There was strong criticism of the fact that some EU Member States treated asylum seekers in a very unfair way, which was against European and International law (Human Rights Watch 2018). This was to some extent

⁴ The European Stability Initiative's (ESI) founding chairman.

due to the fact that the central-northern EU countries that had a developed asylum and international protection system, such as Sweden, Germany, Norway and the United Kingdom, were better prepared to receive refugees, unlike the Mediterranean Member States, such as Bulgaria and Greece, which were the first to receive mass refugee arrivals and were in the initial stages of developing an institutional framework for international protection and asylum. Differences in economic growth levels among the EU member states were also important, greatly influencing the way refugees were managed in their territories (Ayaz & Wadood, 2020; Karamanidou, 2021). For example, on the one hand, economically strong and robust Member States had a positive attitude towards hosting refugees, as they aimed to integrate them into the labour market (e.g. German case see OECD, 2017). On the other hand, countries that were still facing economic recession could not properly manage refugees, who were seen as a threat to the competitive labour market (e.g. Greek case see Karamanidou, 2021). Lastly, the policy of siting hotspots in economic weak countries with an inadequate institutional framework regarding protection and asylum, in the frontline of the refugee arrivals was considered a failure, as it did not work in a context of equal management, resettlement and inclusion of newly arrived populations (Bris & Bendito, 2017; Kourachanis, 2018; Bousiou & Papada, 2020).

A further factor for the failure of the EU to provide a unified response to the refugee issue is that the dominant hegemonic discourse as well as the developed policies were based on the securitization and the strengthening of nationalist sentiment (Piguet, 2019; Fontana, 2021). In particular, the term “Fortress Europe” stigmatized the EU’s stance (Takou, 2023), which was characterized by the militarization of the external borders and the EU-Turkey agreement. As a consequence, the debate on refugee rights, protection and asylum, solidarity and inclusion has been marginalized (Ayaz & Wadood, 2020). Some scholars’ critics stress that in order to normalize the imposition of securitization measures, tactics were applied to stigmatize solidarity-based humanitarian interventions with phenomena of “crimmigration” (Carrera et al., 2018). Notably, Gionco & Kanics (2022, p. 9) report that

“at least 89 people were criminalized in the EU between January 2021 and March 2022... for actions including providing food, shelter, medical assistance, transportation and other humanitarian aid to migrants in dire conditions; assisting with asylum applications; and rescuing migrants at sea”

According to Lucassen (2017), four factors led the EU to the political crisis. The first was related to the lack of interest in migration and integration of colonial and labour migrants of the 1970-80 (e.g. Morocco, Tunisia, Egypt and from Pakistan, Iran and other Asian and African countries see Penninx, 1986). The second refers to the growing social

inequality and generalised pessimism in relation to globalisation. The third emphasises the real and growing fear of Islam and Islamic terrorism (see Borell, 2020). Finally, the fourth concerns the rise of radical right-wing populist parties (see Bergmann et al., 2021).

Although refugee arrivals in 2015 in the EU represented only 0.2% of its total population, the refugee crisis has been a cause for redefining the sense of belonging (Nougayrède, 2016; Triandafyllidou, 2018). The constant projection of the conflicts resulting from the problematic management of the refugee issue, combined with the dominance of far-right rhetoric, affected the collective spatial representations (Lefebvre, 1991) of European citizens, who began to question their identity. Hence, the reality was that the EU did not have a refugee crisis, but the refugees were found faced with a crisis of the European identity in EU (Ayaz & Wadood, 2020). Also, Ceccorulli (2021, p. 50) states that

“the most resounding consequence has been the EU’s affected image as a promoter of human rights, side-lining any expectations regarding the promotion of a human rights-centered conception of justice in the field of migration”

observing a crisis of the European ideals.

4 CONCEPTUALISING MIGRATION GOVERNANCE AND THE EMERGENCE OF BOTTOM-UP APPROACHES

In the perspective of the logics of space production (Remy, 2005) regarding the management of the refugee issue, an attempt is made to conceptualise migration governance and to highlight contemporary approaches that emphasise ‘bottom-up’ strategies, partly incorporating the logics of appropriation of space. Triandafyllidou (2020, p. 3) introduces a definition of migration governance arguing that it goes beyond the boundaries of government to identify the interaction and networking between public and private actors in both horizontal (non-hierarchical) and vertical (hierarchical) ways in migration governance and refugee-migrant integration processes. Therefore, it is observed that refugee movements demonstrate dynamics that tend to reform the traditional links between governments, international organisations and regional integration actors (Pannizon & Riemsdijk, 2019).

The dominant perception of the governmental migration framework remains Western-centric and focuses on deals and agreements between states and international organisations (e.g. EU-Turkey agreement) (Niemann & Zaun, 2018), while it is important to focus on the role played by the different stakeholders (Cuttita, 2022). The exclusive involvement of elite member states (resettlement countries) in defining the migration governance framework has been strongly criticised (Geddes et al, 2017). Therefore, there

is a real need to decentralise approaches to migration governance and to share power among a wider range of actors, including ‘bottom-up’ actors (Rother, 2022), who are often ignored and marginalized (Cuttitta, 2022).

In contemporary studies, there is a growing interest in the local dimension of migration governance (Lacroix, 2021). Research focuses on the local level for the development of social inclusion policies, where local governments have a dominant role in their formulation and implementation. Noteworthy is the approach of Capoino (2010) who states that despite the differences that municipalities in the EU may have, the local level contributes significantly to defining the actual conditions for the implementation of local migration policy. Based on this position, Bendel (et al., 2019) highlights the importance of the local dimension in the development of asylum policy in order to be effective and accepted by local communities.

The conflict between national and local migration policies (Emilsson, 2015) is based on the fact that several EU Member States have not developed national migration policies until recently (Bendel et al., 2019). The outbreak of the refugee crisis in 2015-2016 created a complex framework of responsibilities and implementation of measures, leading to conflicts between the different spatial levels (European, national, regional, local). Lacroix (2021) argues that there is a hidden distribution of responsibility for refugee management, the central state mechanism focuses on limiting refugee arrivals by imposing strict control and securitization measures, while municipalities take action to host and accommodate the refugee population by developing their own social inclusion strategies. In addition, regional and local authorities are called upon to manage local reactions of residents to refugee camps, which are more intense when they involve large units for mass concentration of refugee population.

The need for immediate assistance and effective practices in addressing refugee issues in 2015-2016 led to the revival of formal and informal civil society organisations, which for the first time participated dynamically in urban planning processes (Bendel et al., 2019). In this context, city networks emerged as a consequence of the long-standing decentralization to local governments for the management of the migrant population, the “top-down” influence of international and global organizations (EU, UNHCR, etc.) and the “bottom-up” mobilizations of the Municipalities that faced increasing difficulties between the accommodation of refugees and their safe management (Lacroix, 2021).

The contribution of city networks in the management of the refugee phenomenon was particularly important, as in several cases dysfunctions of the governmental framework of migration were identified. In addition, the implemented policies were critically evaluated, because they did not contribute to the proper social integration of the vulnerable refugee

groups but in fact turned out to serve state interests. A typical example is the EUROCITIES (2015) statement that condemned the repatriation of unrecognised asylum seekers to the sending countries, highlighting cases of exclusion from public services, which was not in line with international human rights and equality law.

However, although there is a 'shift' to the local level for the management of the refugee issue, it seems necessary to investigate the power relations between the various spatial levels. Specifically, with regard to migration policies, the power of each municipality often depends on its autonomy and its conformity with national policies, as when it comes to refugee arrivals the central state mechanism seems to intervene. Emilson (2015) in her analysis discusses the examples of Denmark and Sweden and highlights the intervention of the central state mechanism in issues of integration of refugees. Thus, she highlights that the use of compulsive, economic and regulatory institutions increases the control and influence of the central government at the local level, preventing the implementation of multilevel governance with vertical partnerships, which weakens the development of local inclusion policies. Therefore, a key factor in the research of local policy making is the projection and examination of the context of municipalities and the unequal power relations between the different levels of government. Overall, there is a need to interpret the different scales of migration governance, both the complex relations between spatial levels (international, national, local) (Ambrosini, 2021) and the action of different actors, public or private (horizontal dimension) (Campomori & Ambrosini, 2020).

5 THROWN EUROPEAN IDENTITIES: THE CASE STUDY OF LESVOS

The massive concentration of refugees in small frontline communities (e.g. Lampedusa and Ventimiglia in Italy, Lesbos in Greece, Grande-Synthe, and Calais in France) caused high pressures on often weakened local public services. More specifically, local governments were called upon to manage both the resettlement of a large amount of new arrivals and the mitigation of local concerns. The influx of refugees created significant economic and socio-cultural impacts, which were sometimes perceived positively (e.g. enhancing local economy) and sometimes negatively (e.g. fear of Islam) by the local communities, thus affecting the local culture and the way of life of the local population (Cremaschi, 2019).

The island of Lesbos was one of the first areas in Europe to host thousands of refugees in hotspots (Triandafyllidou, 2015). At the outbreak of the refugee crisis, despite the massive arrivals of refugees, a positive climate of solidarity and compassion prevailed. In fact, the voluntary movement of Greek citizens in Lesbos was a symbol of assistance to

refugees and was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize (Schoenbauer, 2016), *“the people of the Aegean defended the values of our civilization”* (Savourdou, 2016). The island was visited twice by Pope Francis, specifically in 2016, who acknowledged the hospitable attitude of the Greeks and stressed that *“Greece has been an example of humanity”* (Smith, 2016). However, during his second visit in 2021 he seemed to be disappointed with the situation five years later on the island with the construction of camps and criticized the European and national migration policy, stating that *“it is distressing to hear of proposals that common funds be used to build walls as a solution”* (Vatican News, 2021).

The constant pressure on the island with refugee camps hosting huge refugee populations (RSA, 2023), especially after the burning of the largest camp in Europe (Moria), slowly drained the energy of local communities to offer assistance. Local communities were caught in a “dead end” of imposing “top-down” refugee camps without any information and consultation (Tsavdaroglou & Lalenis, 2023). Thus, experiencing a “burn out”, the residents of Lesvos activated defense mechanisms, such as desensitization to the refugee issue, the repulsion of otherness and the adoption of the tendency to “blame the victim”, i.e. the refugees for the problems arising from their misorganization. These have taken the form of N.I.M.B.Y. phenomena against refugee camps and have been expressed in public discourse, particularly through calls for participation in planning and decision-making processes. Characteristic are the words of the 43 year old fisherman who was a symbolic face of the solidarity attitude of the island as he was one of the candidates for the Nobel Peace Prize *“no one cares, neither for the refugees nor for us...we carry this burden without creating it”* (Papadopoulos, 2020). As we highlighted in previous research, the logics of production of space regarding the refugee issue produce local NIMBY reactions. However, when these, as logics of appropriation of space (Remy, 2005), are not taken into account by state policies and stigmatised as ‘irrational’, protesters often hook into far-right groups, adopting a xenophobic rhetoric (Makridou & Frangopoulos, 2021; Makridou, 2021).

6 CONCLUSION

This article attempted to highlight that the implementation of an unequal management of the refugee issue between EU member states, led to a failure of management, a crisis of institutions and democratic processes and values in the EU. Furthermore, it highlights the gap between economically poorer countries and powerful countries that refuse to take responsibility for the reception and resettlement of refugees, while deconstructing the sense of a Europe of unity and justice. Incomplete and

unbalanced European policies have in turn led to the implementation at national level of top-down policies with 'ad hoc' interventions in spatial planning of refugee camps, without any participatory democratic process with the local communities receiving the refugees. As such, it is perceived that at local level municipalities face the reality of migration policies as they are called to implement them (Capoino, 2010). The case study of Lesvos can be conceptualized as an example of a lower dynamic region, N. Aegean, in the front line of the refugee crisis, where European citizens feel thrown into the common European idea and wronged by the European Institutions. Hence, the common European Vision and Identity is stroked by the top-down policy making in terms of refugee administration and a need for a local turn is observed.

The result of this conflict has been the lack of trust and reciprocity of European citizens towards the European institutions. It is therefore observed that the lack of a democratic governance framework in the migration governance of the refugee crisis (Guiraudon, 2018) led to the adoption of conflictual social practices at national, regional and local level, which "cracked" the common European vision, as a collective socio-spatial representation (Lefebvre, 1991).

The established immigration policies and the way they are implemented at European and National level make it difficult for refugees to be socially integrated and accepted (Andreouli et al., 2017). As a result, the common European idea of a Europe accessible and open to all is dispelled and the sense of belonging is diminished. So now more than ever we need to redefine European migrant strategies with a focus on equality between Member States, cohesion and integration policies as they are the constituent materials of our common European identity.

REFERENCES

- Ambrosini, M. (2021). The battleground of asylum and immigration policies: a conceptual inquiry. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 44(3), 374-395. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2020.1836380>
- Andreouli, E., Figgou, L., Kadianaki, I., Sapountzis, A., & Xenitidou, M. (2017). "Europe" in Greece: Lay constructions of Europe in the context of Greek immigration debates. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 158-168. DOI: 10.1002/casp.2301
- Ayaz, A., & Wadood, A. (2020). An Analysis of European Union Policy towards Syrian Refugees. *Journal of Political Studies*, 27(2), 01-19.
- Bayer, L. (2016). Hungary's 'zero refugee' strategy. Retrieved from: <https://www.politico.eu/article/hungary-zero-refugee-strategy-viktor-orban-europe-migration-crisis/>
- Bendel, P., Schammann, H., Heiman, C., & Stuner, J. (2019). A Local Turn for European Refugee Politics, Recommendations for Strengthening Municipalities and Local Communities in refugee and asylum policy of the EU. [e-paper] *Heinrich Böll Foundation*. Retrieved from: https://eu.boell.org/sites/default/files/e-paper_a_local_turn_for_european_refugee_politics.pdf?dimension1=zora2020

- Bergmann, J., Hackenesch, C., & Stockemer, D. (2021). Populist Radical Right Parties in Europe: What Impact Do they Have on Development Policy? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 59(1), 37–52. DOI: 10.1111/jcms.13143
- Bousiou, A., & Papada, E. (2020). Introducing the EC Hotspot Approach: A Framing Analysis of EU's Most Authoritative Crisis Policy Response. *International Migration*, 58(6). doi: 10.1111/imig.12689
- Bris P., & Bendito, F. (2017). Lessons Learned from the Failed Spanish Refugee System: For the Recovery of Sustainable Public Policies. *Sustainability*, 9. doi:10.3390/su9081446
- Campomori, F., & Ambrosini, M. (2020). Multilevel governance in trouble: the implementation of asylum seekers' reception in Italy as a battleground. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 8(22). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-020-00178-1>
- Caponio, T. (2010). Conclusion: making sense of local migration policy arenas. In T., Caponio, & M., Borkert. (Eds.), *The Local Dimension of Migration Policy-Making*, (pp. 161-195). Amsterdam University Press.
- Carrera, S., Vosyliute, L., Smialowski, S., Allosopp, J., & Sanchez, G. (2018). Fit for purpose? The Facilitation Directive and the criminalisation of humanitarian assistance to irregular migrants: 2018 update. Study Requested by the Policy Department for Citizens' Rights and Constitutional Affairs committee of the European Parliament. Available at: https://cadmus.eui.eu/bitstream/handle/1814/60998/IPOL_STU%282018%29608838_EN.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y
- Ceccorulli, M. (2021b). Italy and Migration: Justice on this Side of the Mediterranean. In M. Ceccorulli, E. Fassi & S. Lucarelli (Eds.), *The EU Migration System of Governance - Justice on the Move* (pp. 119–145). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Connor, P. (2018). *A majority of Europeans favor taking in refugees, but most disapprove of EU's handling of the issue*. Retrieved from Pew Research Center: <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2018/09/19/a-majority-of-europeans-favor-taking-in-refugees-but-most-disapprove-of-eus-handling-of-the-issue/>
- Cremaschi, M. (2019). Practical plans: refugees, spatial design, and a workshop of planning. *Transactions of the Association of European Schools of Planning*, 3, 55-71. doi: 10.24306/TrAESOP.2019.01.005
- Cuttitta, P. (2022). Over Land and Sea: NGOs/CSOs and EU Border Externalisation Along the Central Mediterranean Route. *Geopolitics*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14650045.2022.2124158>
- Deutsche Welle, 2021. Five years since the EU-Turkey Refugee Agreement. Retrieved from: <https://bit.ly/3R16238>
- Emilsson, H. (2015). A national turn of local integration policy: multi-level governance dynamics in Denmark and Sweden. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 3 (7), 1-16. DOI 10.1186/s40878-015-0008-5
- EUROCITIES (2015): EUROCITIES statement on asylum in cities. Retrieved from: <https://integratingcities.eu/blog/eurocities-adopts-statement-on-asylum-in-cities/>
- European Asylum Support Office (2016). Introduction to the Common European Asylum System (CEAS) for the Courts. Retrieved from: <https://data.europa.eu/doi/10.2847/695557>
- European Commission. (2015b). Establishing provisional measures in the area of international protection for the benefit of Italy, Greece and Hungary. Retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/HTML/?uri=CELEX:52015PC0451&from=5en>

- Fontana, I. (2021). The human (in)security trap: how European border (ing) practices condemn migrants to vulnerability. *International Politics*, 59, 465–484. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41311-020-00268-y>
- Geddes, A., & Hadj-Abdou, L. (2017). Changing the path? EU migration governance after the 'Arab spring'. *Mediterranean Politics*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13629395.2017.1358904>
- Gionco, M., & Kanics, J. (2022). Resilience and resistance in defiance of the criminalisation of solidarity across Europe. Retrieved from: https://picum.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/CriminalizationStudy_EN_web.pdf
- Greenhill, K., M. (2016). Open Arms Behind Barred Doors: Fear, Hypocrisy and Policy Schizophrenia in the European Migration Crisis. *European Law Journal*, 22(3), 317-332.
- Guiraudon, V. (2018). The 2015 refugee crisis was not a turning point: Explaining policy inertia in EU border control. *European Political Science*, 17(1), 151-160.
- Havlova, R., & Tamchynova, K. (2016). The Uncertain Role of the EU Countries in the Syrian Refugee Crisis. *Insight Turkey*, 18(2), 85-106.
- Hatton, T., J. (2016). The migration crisis and refugee policy in Europe. In F. Fasani (Eds.), *Refugees and Economic Migrants: Facts, policies and challenges* (pp. 15-26). Centre for Economic Policy Research Press.
- Human Rights Watch. (2018, March 6). Greece: 13000 Still Trapped on Islands. Retrieved from: <https://www.hrw.org/news/2018/03/06/greece-13000-still-trapped-islands>
- Karamanidou, L., & Schuster, L. (2012). Realizing One's Rights Under the 1951 Convention 60 Years on: A Review of Practical Constraints on Accessing Protection in Europe. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 25(2), 169–192.
- Karamanidou, L. (2021). Migration, Asylum Policy and Global Justice in Greece. In M. Ceccorulli, E. Fassi & S. Lucarelli (Eds.), *The EU Migration System of Governance - Justice on the Move* (pp. 89–117). New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Khiabany, G. (2016). Refugee crisis, imperialism and pitiless wars on the poor. *Media, Culture & Society*, 1–8. DOI: 10.1177/0163443716655093
- King, R., Hatziprokopiou, P., & Pratsinakis, M. (2017). *Beyond Migration Binaries and Linear Transitions: The Complexification of Greece's Migratory Landscape at Times of Crisis*. Sussex: Sussex Centre for Migration Research.
- Kourachanis, N. (2018). Asylum Seekers, Hotspot Approach and Anti-Social Policy Responses in Greece (2015–2017). *Int. Migration & Integration*, 19, 1153–1167. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-018-0592-y>
- Lacroix, T. (2021). Migration-related city networks: a global overview. *Local Government Studies*. DOI: 10.1080/03003930.2021.1938553
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space*. Translated from French by Donald Nicholson Smith. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lucassen, L. (2017). Peeling an onion: the “refugee crisis” from a historical perspective. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2017.1355975>

Makridou, A. (2021). *Spatial Governance, sociology approaches & phenomena N.I.M.B.Y. in the siting of migrant-refugee camps in Greece: Policies, social representations and practices* (master thesis). Retrieved from: <https://ikee.lib.auth.gr/record/335785/?ln=el>

Makridou, A., & Frangopoulos, I. (2021). Migrants - Refugees Camps: A diachronic Challenge for Spatial Planning & Social N.I.M.B.Y. as a claim of participatory planning from 'bottom up' approaches in Greece. In *AESOP Online Conference Adapting Planning: Rethinking Planning Practices, Gdansk 12-14 July 2021* (pp. 121-124). Gdansk: Association of European Schools of Planning (AESOP)

Maldini, P., & Takahashi, M. (2017). Refugee Crisis and the European Union: Do the Failed Migration and Asylum Policies Indicate a Political and Structural Crisis of European Integration? *Communication Management Review*. DOI:10.22522/CMR20170223

Matusz, P., Aivaliotou, E., & Przytuła, S. (2021). Multiple faces of the migration crisis. In S. Przytuła & Ł. Sulkowski (Eds.), *Integration of migrants into labour market in Europe. National, organizational and individual perspective* (pp. 3-14). Emerald. DOI:10.1108/S1877-636120200000025002

Mentzelopoulou, M., & Luyten, K. (2018). Hotspots at EU external borders. Retrieved from: [https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/623563/EPRS_BRI\(2018\)623563_EN.pdf](https://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/BRIE/2018/623563/EPRS_BRI(2018)623563_EN.pdf)

Niemann, A., & Zaun, N. (2018). EU Refugee Policies and Politics in Times of Crisis: Theoretical and Empirical Perspectives. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 56(1), 3-22. DOI: 10.1111/jcms.12650

Nougayrède, N. (2016). Refugees aren't the problem. Europe's identity crisis is. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2016/oct/31/refugees-problem-europe-identity-crisis-migration>

OECD (2017). Finding their Way. LABOUR MARKET INTEGRATION OF REFUGEES IN GERMANY. Retrieved from: <https://www.oecd.org/els/mig/Finding-their-Way-Germany.pdf>

Pannizon, M., & Riemsdijk, M. (2019). Introduction to Special issue: 'migration governance in an era of large movements: a multilevel approach. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(8), 1225-1241. DOI: 10.1080/1369183X.2018.1441600

Papadimitriou, E., & Frangopoulos, I. (2018). *Environmental Inequality, Space, cultural Representations and social Practices*. Thessaloniki: Tziolas.

Penninx, R. (1986). International Migration in Western Europe Since 1973: Developments, Mechanisms and Controls. *The International Migration Review*, 20(4), 951-972.

Piguet, E. (2019). The 'refugee crisis' in Europe: Shortening Distances, Containment and Asymmetry of Rights – A Tentative Interpretation of the 2015–16 Events. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(2). doi:10.1093/jrs/feaa015

Refugee Support Aegean (2023). What is happening in the refugee camps today structures on the Aegean islands. Retrieved from: <https://rsaegean.org/el/ked-nisia-aigaiou/>

Remy, J. (2005). Space and Sociological Theory. Problematics of Research. *Aeihoros*, 4(1), 196-213.

Ribeiro, I., M. (2022). The European Union's response to the Mediterranean 'refugee crisis': The normalisation of securitization. In G., Daniele, M., J., Ramos, & P., F., Neto (Eds.), *Border crossings in and out of Europe* (pp. 118 – 131). Centro de Estudos Internacionais do Instituto Universitário de Lisboa.

Rother, S. (2022). Global migration governance from below in times of COVID-19 and "Zoomification": civil society in „invited “ and „invented “ spaces. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00275-9>

- Papadopoulos, J. (2020). Uncertainty and division in refugee Lesvos. Retrieved from: <https://www.kathimerini.gr/investigations/1068032/avevaiotita-kai-dichasmos-sti-lesvo-tis-prosfygias/>
- Pope Francis on Lesvos: Stop this shipwreck of civilization* (05 December 2021). Retrieved from: <https://www.vaticannews.va/en/pope/news/2021-12/pope-francis-on-lesbos-stop-this-shipwreck-of-civilization.html>
- Prooijen, J., W., Krouwel, A., P., M., & Emmer J. (2017). Ideological Responses to the EU Refugee Crisis: The Left, the Right, and the Extremes. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617731501>
- Saatçioğlu, B. (2020). The EU's response to the Syrian refugee crisis: a battleground among many Europes. *European Politics and Society*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23745118.2020.1842693>
- Sabchev, T. (2022). The role of local political leadership in the reception of forced migrants: evidence from Greece. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 10(3), 306-326.
- Savourdou, B., 2016. Proposal for Nobel Peace Prize to three persons-symbols of aid to refugees in the Aegean. Retrieved from: <https://www.ertnews.gr/eidiseis/ellada/protasi-gia-nompel-irinis-se-tria-prosopa-simvola-tis-arogis-stous-prosfiges-sto-egeo/>
- Schoenbauer, R. (2016). Volunteers who saved lives on Lesvos nominated for Nobel Peace Prize. Retrieved from: <https://www.unhcr.org/news/stories/volunteers-who-saved-lives-lesvos-nominated-nobel-peace-prize>
- Takou, E. (2023). Towards the Legalisation of Pushbacks and Inhuman Treatment in Greece The Case of Evros/Meriç Border. In F., Perocco (ed.), 2023. *Migration and Torture in Today's World*. Venice: Venice University Press, (pp. 161-176).
- Smith, H. (2016). Germany tightens refugee policy as Finland joins Sweden in deportations. Retrieved from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/29/germany-tightens-borders-as-finland-joins-sweden-in-deporting-refugees>
- Trauner, F. (2016). Asylum policy: the EU's 'crises' and the looming policy regime failure. *Journal of European Integration*, 38(3), 311-325. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2016.1140756>
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2015). *Turning the Refugee Crisis into an Opportunity? Current Challenges For Greece and Suggestions for Action*. European University Institute, San Domenico di Fiesole.
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2018). A "Refugee Crisis" Unfolding: "Real" Events and Their Interpretation in Media and Political Debates. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 16(1-2), 198-216. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15562948.2017.1309089>
- Triandafyllidou, A. (2020). Decentering the Study of Migration Governance: A Radical View. *Geopolitics*, DOI: 10.1080/14650045.2020.1839052
- Tsavdaroglou, C. & Lalenis, K. (2023). Post-democratic governance in refugee camps versus newcomers' architectural housing commons in Athens and Thessaloniki. *The Journal of Architecture*, 28(1), 50-74.

SOBRE O ORGANIZADOR

Luis Fernando González-Beltrán- Doctorado en Psicología. Profesor Asociado de la Facultad de Estudios Superiores Iztacala (FESI) UNAM, Miembro de la Asociación Internacional de Análisis Conductual. (ABAI). de la Sociedad Mexicana de Análisis de la Conducta, del Sistema Mexicano de Investigación en Psicología, y de La Asociación Mexicana de Comportamiento y Salud. Consejero Propietario perteneciente al Consejo Interno de Posgrado para el programa de Psicología 1994-1999. Jefe de Sección Académica de la Carrera de Psicología. ENEPI, UNAM, de 9 de Marzo de 1999 a Febrero 2003. Secretario Académico de la Secretaría General de la Facultad de Psicología 2012. Con 40 años de Docencia en licenciatura en Psicología, en 4 diferentes Planes de estudios, con 18 asignaturas diferentes, y 10 asignaturas diferentes en el Posgrado, en la FESI y la Facultad de Psicología. Cursos en Especialidad en Psicología de la Salud y de Maestría en Psicología de la Salud en CENHIES Pachuca, Hidalgo. Con Tutorías en el Programa Alta Exigencia Académica, PRONABES, Sistema Institucional de Tutorías. Comité Tutorial en el Programa de Maestría en Psicología, Universidad Autónoma del Estado de Morelos. En investigación 28 Artículos en revistas especializadas, Coautor de un libro especializado, 12 Capítulos de Libro especializado, Dictaminador de libros y artículos especializados, evaluador de proyectos del CONACYT, con más de 100 Ponencias en Eventos Especializados Nacionales, y más de 20 en Eventos Internacionales, 13 Conferencia en Eventos Académicos, Organizador de 17 eventos y congresos, con Participación en elaboración de planes de estudio, Responsable de Proyectos de Investigación apoyados por DGAPA de la UNAM y por CONACYT. Evaluador de ponencias en el Congreso Internacional de Innovación Educativa del Tecnológico de Monterrey; Revisor de libros del Comité Editorial FESI, UNAM; del Comité editorial Facultad de Psicología, UNAM y del Cuerpo Editorial Artemis Editora. Revisor de las revistas "Itinerario de las miradas: Serie de divulgación de Avances de Investigación". FES Acatlán; "Lecturas de Economía", Universidad de Antioquía, Medellín, Colombia, Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencia Psicológica (PSIENCIA). Buenos Aires, Revista "Advances in Research"; Revista "Current Journal of Applied Science and Technology"; Revista "Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies"; y Revista "Journal of Pharmaceutical Research International".

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3492-1145>

ÍNDICE REMISSIVO

A

Aprendizaje basado en proyectos 106, 108, 109, 111, 112, 113, 115, 117, 146

Aprendizaje internacional 42, 43, 44, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56

Autorregulación del aprendizaje 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 51, 53, 54, 55, 56, 59, 67, 93, 94

B

Betão 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 266

Born-global 161, 163, 176, 184, 186, 189, 193

Brecha de género 1, 21

Burnout 126, 127, 130, 131, 132, 133, 136

C

Common European identity 284, 286, 288, 294

Competencias investigativas 106, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117

Complexity 167, 183, 208, 210, 211, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 228, 229, 282

Construction project 267, 268, 269, 270, 277, 278, 279, 280, 281, 282

Coordination 167, 208, 209, 210, 211, 213, 214, 216, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229

Critico 27, 29, 36, 46, 67, 71, 74, 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105

Currículo 25, 40, 74, 97, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104, 107, 110, 141, 143, 144

D

Descomposición probit 1

Determined system 267, 275, 281, 285

Diplomacia 153, 154, 155, 157

Diseño estrategico 198

E

Edifícios 243, 244, 245, 246, 255, 258, 261, 263, 265

Educación de adultos 137

Enfermería 94, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 104, 105

Entrenamiento en habilidades autorregulatorias 42, 43, 45, 48, 72, 73, 75, 76, 78, 80, 81, 86

Escolas 4, 30, 97, 101, 102, 103, 135

ESports en Educação 34

Estrés 37, 46, 94, 126, 127, 128, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136

Evaluación y retroalimentación 118, 119, 124

F

Formación a lo largo de la vida 137, 140

Formación de personas adultas 137, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 150, 151, 152

Formación de profesores 25, 28

Formación docente 25, 106, 117

G

Gradual theory 161, 165

H

Habilidades intrapersonales 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40

Human resources 177, 267, 269, 272, 273, 277, 278, 280, 282

I

Innovación 40, 116, 124, 126, 128, 134, 135, 140, 198, 202, 203, 204, 206, 207

Intangibles empresariales 198, 200, 201, 202, 203, 206

Interculturalidad 43

Internationalisation process 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192

Investigación formativa 106

L

Lectura y escritura 25, 29

Living infrastructures 230, 231, 234

M

Metodología 43, 45, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 62, 63, 64, 67, 68, 73, 74, 79, 80, 82, 83, 87, 89, 90, 93, 94, 95, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 132, 137, 145, 146, 195, 200, 201, 202, 204, 207

Metodologías activas 106, 108, 146, 152

Migration governance 284, 286, 290, 291, 292, 294, 296, 297, 298

Monarquía hispánica 153

N

Network theory 161

O

Organization design 208

P

Paz perpetua kantiana 153, 155

Pensamiento reflexivo 97, 98, 99, 101, 102, 103, 104

Planeación estratégica 127

PLk 153

Policentrismo 153

Portafolio del estudiante 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124

Proceso de diseño 198, 199, 201, 203, 204, 205, 206

Productivity management 267, 272, 273, 277, 280

Project management 208, 223, 225, 268, 269, 270, 280, 281, 282, 283

R

Redacción académica 118, 119, 124

Reforço 243, 244, 246, 252, 253, 257, 260, 261, 262, 263

Refugee crisis 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 290, 291, 292, 294, 296, 297, 298

Rendimiento académico 42, 43, 45, 48, 49, 50, 73, 75, 77, 78, 80, 81, 86, 90, 91, 92, 127, 136

Reparação 243, 244, 246, 250, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 261, 262, 263

Ruralidad 13, 19, 20, 25, 28

S

Sacro Imperio Romano Germánico 153

Soberanía 153, 155

Sociedad del conocimiento 49, 92, 93, 136, 198, 200, 201, 205, 206

T

Technology 43, 165, 192, 207, 208, 209, 227, 228, 230, 235, 236, 238, 239, 242, 265, 279, 280, 281, 282, 283

Técnicas 43, 46, 48, 50, 54, 55, 56, 62, 63, 64, 65, 67, 69, 70, 71, 79, 82, 83, 84, 90, 106,

109, 111, 114, 144, 204, 243, 244, 246, 250, 254, 260, 263

Top-down planning 284, 285

Transdisciplinariedad 137, 138, 139, 145, 146, 149, 150, 151

Transfronterizo 1

Tutoría 30, 127, 128, 129, 130, 135, 136

Tutorías 31, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 132, 134, 135

U

Uncertainties 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 275

Urbanism 230

W

Well-being 230, 231, 232, 235, 239, 240

Westfalia 153, 154, 155, 158, 159

Wild urban corridors 230, 235, 239

Wine sector 161, 163, 187