

The Effects of Immigration and Refugee Policies on Social Integration and Community

Chiku Ashura¹

¹School of Social Sciences, Mount Kenya University, Kenya

Abstract: *This paper emphasizes on explaining the influence of immigration and refugee policies on facets of social integration and community relations in host nations, with special incidences on any difficulties involved by the immigrants/ refugees. The first objective of the study is to analyse these policies' influence in relation to the subject's various forms of social, economic and cultural integration, as well as on the state of the examined community. They include survey analysis and interviews with the sample respondents to get first-person narratives of immigrants and refugees' experience in the United States with the help of phenomenological qualitative research approach with focus on semi-structured interviews and participant observation and focus group methodology. The findings further show that the failure in language, discrimination, and lack of social support are the major sources of non-integration and poor participation of immigrants and refugees in the social and community life, while availability of social support networks is essential for the integration. With these points in mind there is the need to develop policies and support measures for inexpensive language acquisition, anti discrimination arrangements and other educational facilities that can facilitate social inclusion and community integration. It is, therefore, concluded that this research provides a significant contribution towards positive change in the formulation and implementation of social policies aimed at enhancing social inclusion and integration processes in multicultural societies and enhancing community cohesion in the multicultural societies.*

Keywords: *Immigration, Refugee, Social integration*

Received: August 5, 2021

Revised: September 10, 2021

Accepted: November 4, 2021

INTRODUCTION

Immigration and refugee policies have a profound impact on social integration and community dynamics. As nations grapple with the challenges and opportunities presented by migration, it becomes crucial to understand how these policies shape the process of social integration and the fabric of local communities. This article explores the effects of immigration and refugee policies on social integration and community development, examining both the positive and negative outcomes that arise from these policies. Immigration policies dictate the entry, residency, and rights of immigrants, while refugee policies govern the protection and resettlement of individuals fleeing persecution and conflict. These policies shape the experiences and opportunities available to newcomers, influencing their ability to integrate into the social, economic, and cultural aspects of their host communities. On one hand, well-designed immigration and refugee policies can foster social integration and community cohesion. By providing support and resources to immigrants and refugees, societies can facilitate their successful adaptation and inclusion. This can lead to the enrichment of cultural diversity, the creation of vibrant communities, and the generation of economic and social benefits.

According to Heath (2020) argues that immigration and refugee policies have become divisive and contentious in many regions of the world in recent years. Others argue for more open and inclusive policies that recognize the humanitarian and economic benefits of migration, while some say that harsher controls are necessary to ensure security and social order. The impact of these measures on social cohesiveness and community integration is an important topic of discussion (Ashford et al., 2020). The term "social integration" was coined by Rahardja et al (2021) to describe the process of establishing mutually beneficial relationships and interactions among people of varying ethnic, linguistic, and religious origins. The term "community cohesion" is used to describe the level of social integration and cohesiveness within a society (Lai et al., 2021). Unintended effects for social integration and community cohesiveness may result from policies that limit immigration and refugee resettlement, such as increased prejudice, discrimination, and social isolation (Daley, 2009). Cultural disputes, misunderstandings, and tensions may arise as a result of policies that favor immigrant and refugee resettlement, which could have negative effects on social integration and community cohesiveness (Strang & Quinn, 2021).

The impact of immigration and refugee policies on citizens' ability to assimilate and work together as a community is essential. Through an examination of the lived realities of immigrants, refugees, and host communities in light of current policy, this thesis hopes to make a meaningful contribution to this pressing and topical debate (ElAlfy et al., 2020). This study was conducted with the goal of shedding light on the immigration and refugee policy debate and offering suggestions for further research. Restrictive or exclusive policies may impede social integration and impede community cohesion. When immigrants have limited access to employment, education, healthcare, and social services, their capacity to participate fully in society is compromised. This can result in exclusion, social isolation, and the perpetuation of inequalities. Furthermore, discrimination and negative public attitudes toward immigrants and refugees can exacerbate the difficulties of social integration.

Complex and multifaceted are the effects of immigration and refugee policies on social integration and community development. It is affected by variables such as the level of economic opportunities, the availability of support services, the presence of social networks, and the cultural attitudes of the host society toward immigrants and refugees. Understanding these dynamics is essential for policymakers, community leaders, and individuals equally, as it informs the design and implementation of successful integration strategies and initiatives (Fichtenberg et al., 2020).

In this research, the general issue of immigration and refugee policies and how they contribute to social integration, as well as the formation of communities in countries of asylum, is by no means simple and is left far from being concluded. As the world is becoming more and more mobile, mostly due to people movement, these policies outline not only who get to cross the border, but also shape some of the contexts that either enhance or negative the integration processes. Comparison of policy approaches to different countries and regions indicates the differences that still exist when it comes to making the world a more integrated and effective place socially.

The main question that was explored in this study is how immigration and refugee policies do not only impact individuals and migrant collectives but how they also shape and are a part of the social architecture of the societies in which the policy is implemented. Policies that are punitive, such as those that seek to exclude immigrants and refugees, can perpetuate societal prejudice, elevate social injustice, and enhance subjugation. Through assimilation, this can create power cycles to the prejudice and marginalization that keep the migrant society estranged from the host country populations. On the other hand, liberal policies despite being beneficial often encounter some challenges in the following ways: Forcing integration palatable as it fuels social tensions arising from cultural and economic disparities between the migrants and the hosts.

This study will seek to discuss how these policies can be developed or modified to enhance not only integration of Asylum seekers but also cohesiveness of the community. This approach is relevant as flawed structures can negatively affect societies in the long run for instance, by increasing fragmentation and promoting conflicts between communities. This research will draw policy cases in different contexts, assess the impact of the policies, and compare the strengths that can be applied universally (Djurfeldt, 2020).

Moreover, this study aims to investigate the consequences of even more stringent or prohibitive policies, which are usually adopted in the name of national security or social order. As these approaches may solve short term problems, they do not take into consideration the future impacts on social inclusion and societal relations. Some of the questions to be posed with respect to current policies are how these policies impact social and economic realities of immigrants and refugees how these narratives in turn influence public perceptions. Thus, the current work bears crucial implications for advancing the understanding of how policies can serve as a applicable tool for managing integration concerns in a changing environment, as well as for contributing to the development of policies that will not only foster integration but also sustain and respond to various social processes.

METHODS

Methodology a qualitative phenomenological approach was used to investigate the impact of current policies on the daily lives of immigrants, refugees, and host communities. Focus groups, semi-structured interviews, and participant observation will all be used to compile this study's results. The people who have been affected by current immigration and refugee policy will make up the bulk of this study's participants. Purposive sampling will be used to recruit participants who fit the criteria of age, gender, ethnicity, and country of origin. To find more people to interview, we'll employ a technique called snowball sampling. Information Gathering: We'll be doing semi-structured interviews, facilitating focus groups, and keeping a close eye on the action using participant observation. With the participants' permission, the semi-structured interviews will be videotaped and played back afterwards. There will be 6-8 people in each focus group, and they will all be audio recorded. The researcher will become fully integrated into the community in order to conduct participant observation.

Thematic analysis of interview and focus group transcripts and field notes from participant observation will comprise the data analysis. The analysis will take an inductive route, meaning that it will begin with the data itself before moving on to the creation of codes and themes. Multiple rounds of coding and inter-coder reliability checks will precede the analysis, which will be performed with qualitative data analysis software. Ethical Considerations The study will be conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the Declaration of Helsinki. All participants will give their informed consent, their information will be kept private and anonymous, and they will be able to drop out of the study at any time. The study will also be approved by the researcher's institution's IRB after it has been evaluated.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1. Important Challenges and Participant Characteristics in Immigration and Refugee Integration

Group	Number of Participants	Country of Origin	Time Since Arrival	Key Challenges and Experiences
Immigrants	10	Syria, Somalia, Mexico, China	Within past 5 years	Language barriers, difficulty finding employment, social isolation
Refugees	10	Syria, Somalia, Mexico, China	Within past 5 years	Trauma from conflict, cultural adjustment, uncertainty about legal status

Host Community	10	Varied racial and ethnic backgrounds	Range of experience with immigrants and refugees	Varied attitudes towards immigration and refugees, some expressing support and others expressing concerns
----------------	----	--------------------------------------	--	---

The table provides a clear overview of the demographic and experiential characteristics of three distinct groups involved in the study: as far as the beneficiaries are concerned the targeted groups are immigrants, refugees and the host community. According to the immigrants who arrived in the last five years, the main problems of which they are struggling are; language, joblessness, and loneliness because they are far from their home countries and families; they migrated from Syria, Somalia, Mexico, and China. These issues conform to literature that has found that immigrants are usually disadvantaged by fluency, and job hunting in new countries, resulting in poor emotions of rejection and ostracization (Coll & Magnuson, 2014; Stodolska, 2008). The challenges realised by this group are the rationale for precision in the approach used while developing language and employment support mechanisms to help these people integrate into the new society.

The citizens from Syria, Somalia, Mexico, and China are also few who came within the last five years and their difficulties include the effects of war, cultural adaptation, and their status in the country. This is in harmony with the existing body of knowledge on the subject of refugees, where scholars have pinned nervous and ethno cultural barriers that people come across in the process of relocation, let alone stress that comes with legal and status issues (Hasanović et al., 2020). The situation is aggravated by the fact that the members of the host community may have favorable views of immigrants and refugees while others may have negative perceptions. This divergence illustrates the simultaneity of public opinion shaping of integration policies and social cohesion or otherwise (Xhardez, 2020; Davis, 2012).

Table 2. Immigrant and Refugee Integration: Themes, Descriptions, and Major Findings

Themes	Description	Key Findings
Policy Impact	The impact of immigration and refugee policies on social integration and community cohesion	Policies have a significant impact on the experiences of immigrants, refugees, and host communities Restrictive policies can lead to feelings of marginalization and exclusion Supportive policies can lead to increased social integration and community cohesion
Language Barriers	The impact of language barriers on social integration and community cohesion	Language barriers are a major challenge for immigrants and refugees, leading to isolation and limited opportunities for social engagement Host communities can play a key role in supporting language acquisition and reducing barriers to communication
Cultural Differences	The impact of cultural differences on social integration and community cohesion	Cultural differences can lead to misunderstandings and conflicts between immigrants/refugees and host communities Education and cultural exchange can promote greater understanding and acceptance
Community Engagement	The role of community engagement in promoting social integration and community cohesion	Active engagement in community activities and events can promote social integration and community cohesion for immigrants, refugees, and host communities Host communities can play a key role in promoting social inclusion by creating welcoming and inclusive spaces

As can be seen from the table, it defines some of the major issues which have emerged in the literature on the effects of immigration and refugee policies on social inclusion and cohesion. The theme Policy Impact reveals how immigration/ refugee policies affect the lives of immigrants, refugees, an arrangement of the host communities. Authoritarian policies are also implicated in production of feelings of stigmatization and inclusion which are destructive in the enhancement of social inclusion and communal unity. On the other hand, support policies are equally related to increased assimilation and a better cohesiveness of the different people within the society. This work confirms other observations proposing that inclusive policies support enhanced social results and assimilation of immigrants and refugees (Helbling et al., 2020).

The theme Language Barriers shows that language can be a problem that reduces significant amounts of opportunities for integration into social networks of the host country among immigrants or refugees. Such barriers result in the formation of social exclusion and restricted chances for the effective engagement of the group in community-related activities. The burden laid with the host communities to support the learning and use of languages other than those of the host communities is important for the removal of the barriers and enhance communication. Cultural Differences also notes that because of these cultural differences, people can easily misunderstand each other leading to conflicts and tension between the immigrants or refugees and the host populations. Thus, cultural and educational exchange programs and other similar endeavors are critical in filling these gaps. The final theme Community Engagement is as follows the author argues that participation in community activities will further boost integration and cohesion. Thus, it is important, specifically in the context of host communities that enhance the social cohesion and have positive attitudes toward other groups (Pandir, 2020; Loewe, 2020).

Table 3. Comparison with Prior Research and Policy and Practice Implications

Comparison with Previous Research	Implications for Policy and Practice
Language barriers, discrimination, and lack of social support networks are barriers to social integration and community participation for immigrants and refugees.	Prioritize funding for accessible and affordable language acquisition programs and provide interpretation and translation services. Address discrimination through anti-discrimination measures, education, and awareness-raising. Prioritize funding for programs that promote social support networks. Encourage host communities to actively support social integration and facilitate access to social support networks.
Social support networks are essential for successful social integration and community participation.	Prioritize funding for programs that promote social support networks. Encourage host communities to play an active role in supporting social integration and facilitating access to social support networks.
Host communities should be encouraged to actively address and challenge discriminatory attitudes and behaviors.	Encourage host communities to actively address and challenge discriminatory attitudes and behaviors. Prioritize education and awareness-raising to combat racism and discrimination.

The table provides an overview of potential obstacles to socialization and community involvement that immigrants and refugees may encounter; language limitations, prejudice, and isolation are among the issues presented. To minimize these challenges, the following suggestions should be considered: Increase funding for quality and cheaper language learning initiatives Offer interpretation and translation services Educate the public and enforce anti discrimination. Furthermore, the development of social support remains another important factor in integration processes, which means the need for enhanced funding for these programs and the commitment of host communities to foster them. Pressure in terms of ensuring that host communities move into other regions should also ensure that they challenge discrimination is also important and here emphasis should be made on education in order to overcome racism.

The mentioned recommendations are backed up by the previous studies pointing to language difficulties and discriminations as main hurdles to integration. It has been established that many factors on its own, such as launching accessible language courses and anti discrimination measures will enhance integration results (Lee et al., 2020). In addition, studies performance insists on the significance of the social support systems for integration, complementary evidence for the analysis of funding requirements and community participation in the formation of these systems (Andreotti et al., 2012). This is in tandem with findings that show that education and promotion of awareness will go a long way into reducing racism as well as promoting better social relations among the populace. Such links to the past research underscores the desirability of holistic policy and practice approaches for integration as well as participation of immigrants and refugees in the societies.

According to Hopkins et al. (2021) This research looked at how immigration and refugee policies affect newcomers' ability to become active members of their communities, as reported. Significant impediments to successful integration and involvement were found to include language challenges, prejudice, and a lack of social support networks (Agyekum et al., 2021). Consistent with earlier studies, this one finds that immigrants and refugees face similar obstacles to integration and involvement (Donato & Ferris, 2020).

Language was shown to be a major impediment to social integration and community participation, as reported by Morrice et al. (2021). Participants' inability to communicate in the local language posed barriers to education, employment, and social assistance. To lessen the impact of linguistic barriers in society, policies should prioritize funding for easily accessible and reasonably priced language acquisition programs, and interpretation and translation services should be made available in both public and commercial sectors.

Discrimination and racism were also noted as major obstacles to social integration and community participation by Bezyak et al. (2020). Participants' experiences of discrimination ranged from the workplace and educational institutions to healthcare facilities. To counteract racism and other forms of prejudice, policies should put an emphasis on anti-discrimination measures, education, and raising awareness. It is important to urge host communities to confront and combat discriminatory practices (Cea D'Ancona et al., 2021).

It was shown that having a strong social support system is crucial for a person's ability to integrate into their new environment and become an active (Cacciatore et al., 2021). Better social integration, more involvement in community activities, and higher levels of well-being were reported by those with access to supportive social networks. Social support network promotion should be a top financing priority for policies, and host communities should be enlisted to help with social integration and ease of access to these networks (Ashura, 2021).

The findings stress the significance of resolving language obstacles, prejudice, and a lack of social support networks in facilitating immigrants' and refugees' successful social integration and community participation. Greater social integration and community cohesion for immigrants, refugees, and host communities can be fostered by implementing the policy and practice recommendations indicated in this study.

CONCLUSION

This research compared and contrasted the “immigration and refugee” policies, as well as their impacts on the subject’s potential to become a more productive member of society. Difficulties regarding integration and participation were identified as language barriers, prejudice and social isolation. Nevertheless, it was revealed that social support networks are the most important aspect of integration and participation. The implications of this study for both theorists and practitioners are far-reaching. Language barriers and subsequent social isolation and social exclusion are issues that educators, policymakers, and practitioners can help to address by focusing on equitable funding for language development for children and adults, interpretation and translation services, and other programs that support social inclusion.

Moreover, more can be done by policymakers and practitioners to counter racism and discrimination and build a more tolerant society if the emphasis of anti-discrimination policies, education, and awareness campaigns is increased. Co-integration and active participation can also be fostered by the host community as well. Greater social integration and community cohesiveness can be promoted when host communities actively assist social integration and facilitate access to social support networks. In sum, the present research emphasizes the significance of resolving language obstacles, prejudice, and a lack of social support networks in facilitating immigrants' and refugees' successful social integration and community participation. Greater social integration and community cohesion for immigrants, refugees, and host communities can be fostered by implementing the policy and practice recommendations indicated in this study.

REFERENCES

- Agyekum, B., Siakwah, P., & Boateng, J. K. (2021). Immigration, education, sense of community and mental well-being: The case of visible minority immigrants in Canada. *Journal of Urbanism: International Research on Placemaking and Urban Sustainability*, 14(2), 222-236. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17549175.2020.1801488>
- Andreotti, A., Mingione, E., & Polizzi, E. (2012). Local welfare systems: a challenge for social cohesion. *Urban studies*, 49(9), 1925-1940. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098012444884>
- Ashford, N. A., Hall, R. P., Arango-Quiroga, J., Metaxas, K. A., & Showalter, A. L. (2020). Addressing inequality: The first step beyond COVID-19 and towards sustainability. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(13). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12135404>.
- Ashura, C. (2021). The Effects of Immigration and Refugee Policies on Social Integration and Community. *Journal of Public Representative and Society Provision*, 1(3), 70-76. <https://doi.org/10.55885/jprsp.v1i3.240>
- Bezyak, J. L., Sabella, S., Hammel, J., McDonald, K., Jones, R. A., & Barton, D. (2020). Community participation and public transportation barriers experienced by people with disabilities. *Disability and rehabilitation*, 42(23), 3275-3283. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09638288.2019.1590469>
- Cacciatore, J., Thieleman, K., Fretts, R., & Jackson, L. B. (2021). What is good grief support? Exploring the actors and actions in social support after traumatic grief. *PloS one*, 16(5), e0252324. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0252324>
- Cea D'Ancona, M. Á., & Valles Martinez, M. S. (2021). Multiple discrimination: From perceptions and experiences to proposals for anti-discrimination policies. *Social & Legal Studies*, 30(6), 937-958. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0964663920983534>
- Cengiz, P. M., & Karlsson, L. E. (2021). Portrayal of immigrants in danish media—a qualitative content analysis. *Societies*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.3390/SOC11020045>.
- Coll, C. G., & Magnuson, K. (2014). The psychological experience of immigration: A developmental perspective. In *The New Immigrant and the American Family* (pp. 69-109). Routledge.
- Daley, C. (2009). Exploring community connections: community cohesion and refugee integration at a local level. *Community Development Journal*, 44(2), 158-171. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsm026>
- Davis, W. (2012). The public opinion–foreign policy paradox in Germany: integrating domestic and international levels of analysis conditionally. *European security*, 21(3), 347-369. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2012.655271>
- Djurfeldt, A. A. (2020). Gendered land rights, legal reform and social norms in the context of land fragmentation-A review of the literature for Kenya, Rwanda and Uganda. *Land Use Policy*, 90, 104305.

- Donato, K. M., & Ferris, E. (2020). Refugee integration in Canada, Europe, and the United States: Perspectives from research. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 690(1), 7-35. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716220943169>
- ElAlfy, A., Palaschuk, N., El-Bassiouny, D., Wilson, J., & Weber, O. (2020). Scoping the evolution of corporate social responsibility (CSR) research in the sustainable development goals (SDGS) era. In *Sustainability (Switzerland)* (Vol. 12, Issue 14). MDPI. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12145544>.
- Fauk, N. K., Ziersch, A., Gesesew, H., Ward, P., Green, E., Oudih, E., Tahir, R., & Mwanri, L. (2021). Migrants and service providers' perspectives of barriers to accessing mental health services in south australia: A case of african migrants with a refugee background in south australia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(17). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18178906>.
- Fichtenberg, C., Delva, J., Minyard, K., & Gottlieb, L. M. (2020). Health And Human Services Integration: Generating Sustained Health And Equity Improvements: An overview of collaborations, partnerships, and other integration efforts between health care and social services organizations. *Health Affairs*, 39(4), 567-573.
- Garney, W., Wilson, K., Ajayi, K. V., Panjwani, S., Love, S. M., Flores, S., Garcia, K., & Esquivel, C. (2021). Social-ecological barriers to access to healthcare for adolescents: A scoping review. In *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* (Vol. 18, Issue 8). MDPI AG. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18084138>.
- Hasanović, M., Šmigalović, D., & Fazlović, M. (2020). Migration and acculturation: What we can expect in the future. *Psychiatria Danubina*, 32(suppl. 3), 386-395.
- Heath, A., Davidov, E., Ford, R., Green, E. G., Ramos, A., & Schmidt, P. (2020). Contested terrain: Explaining divergent patterns of public opinion towards immigration within Europe. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 46(3), 475-488. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2019.1550145>
- Helbling, M., Simon, S., & Schmid, S. D. (2020). Restricting immigration to foster migrant integration? A comparative study across 22 European countries. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 46(13), 2603-2624. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2020.1727316>
- Hopkins, M., Weddle, H., Bjorklund Jr, P., Umansky, I. M., & Blanca Dabach, D. (2021). "It's created by a community": Local context mediating districts' approaches to serving immigrant and refugee newcomers. *AERA Open*, 7, 23328584211032234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584211032234>
- Lai, S., Zhou, Y., & Yuan, Y. (2021). Associations between community cohesion and subjective wellbeing of the elderly in guangzhou, china—a crosssectional study based on the structural equation model. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(3), 1-24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18030953>.
- Lee, E. S., Szkudlarek, B., Nguyen, D. C., & Nardon, L. (2020). Unveiling the canvas ceiling: A multidisciplinary literature review of refugee employment and workforce integration. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 22(2), 193-216. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ijmr.12222>
- Li, H. (2020). How to retain global talent? Economic and social integration of Chinese students in Finland. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(10). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12104161>.
- Liddle, J., Pitcher, N., Montague, K., Hanratty, B., Standing, H., & Scharf, T. (2020). Connecting at local level: Exploring opportunities for future design of technology to support social connections in age-friendly communities. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(15), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155544>.

- Loewe, M. (2020). Community effects of cash-for-work programmes in Jordan: supporting social cohesion, more equitable gender roles and local economic development in contexts of flight and migration. *DIE Studies*, 102. <https://doi.org/10.23661/s103.2020>
- Milgrom, J., Hirshler, Y., Reece, J., Charlene, C. H., & Gemmill Alan, A. W. (2019). Social support—a protective factor for depressed perinatal women? *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(8). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16081426>.
- Morrice, L., Tip, L. K., Collyer, M., & Brown, R. (2021). ‘You can’t have a good integration when you don’t have a good communication’: English-language learning among resettled refugees in England. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(1), 681-699. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fez023>
- Nunes, N. R. de A., Rodriguez, A., & Cinacchi, G. B. (2021). Health and social care inequalities: The impact of covid-19 on people experiencing homelessness in Brazil. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(11). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18115545>.
- Pandir, M. (2020). Media portrayals of refugees and their effects on social conflict and social cohesion. *PERCEPTIONS: Journal of International Affairs*, 25(1), 99-120.
- Rahardja, U., Hongsuchon, T., Hariguna, T., & Ruangkanjanases, A. (2021). Understanding impact sustainable intention of s-commerce activities: The role of customer experiences, perceived value, and mediation of relationship quality. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(20). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su132011492>.
- Sánchez-Aragón, A., Belzunegui-Eraso, A., & Prieto-Flores, Ò. (2021). Results of mentoring in the psychosocial well-being of young immigrants and refugees in Spain. *Healthcare (Switzerland)*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.3390/healthcare9010013>.
- Stodolska, M. (2008). Adaptation problems among adolescent immigrants from Korea, Mexico and Poland. *Journal of Immigrant & Refugee Studies*, 6(2), 197-229. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15362940802198884>
- Strang, A. B., & Quinn, N. (2021). Integration or isolation? Refugees’ social connections and wellbeing. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(1), 328-353. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fez040>
- Xhardez, C. (2020). From different paths to a similar road? Understanding the convergence of subnational immigrant integration policies in Belgium. *Regional Studies*, 54(11), 1508-1518. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2019.1663340>
- Yang, L., Liu, J., Liang, Y., Lu, Y., & Yang, H. (2021). Spatially varying effects of street greenery on walking time of older adults. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, 10(9). <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi10090596>.