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Abstract

Most research on refugee integration focuses on attitudes toward refugees among the members of the host society and processes underlying refugee integration. Consequently, little is known on the antecedents of refugees’ intentions to return home or migrate to another country. The present research investigates whether positive and negative contact with Turks are related to Syrian refugees’ migration decisions via perceived discrimination, identification with the host society, and life satisfaction. Using a sample of Syrian adults (*N* = 285), we found that positive contact with Turks was associated with reduced return intentions via perceived discrimination and identification with the host society and with reduced intentions to migrate from Turkey to the Western countries via life satisfaction. Negative contact was only associated with increased return intentions via perceived discrimination. This study underscores the role of intergroup contact to better understand migration decisions of refugees and potential underlying mechanisms to explain this association.
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Influence of Intergroup Contact on the Intentions to Return and Migrate to the West

By the end of 2019 26 million individuals have been forced to leave their country of origin and to live in another country as refugees. Understandably, most research on refugees almost exclusively focuses on refugee mental health and well-being (Okazaki et al., 2019), and factors promoting or hindering refugee integration (Echterhoff et al., 2019). Consequently, little is known on why and how refugees decide to return home or migrate to another country.

Here, we focus on the psychological processes that influence the voluntary return intentions and willingness to migrate to another country among Syrian refugees in Turkey. More specifically, we explore how positive and negative interactions with the host society influence decisions to return to home or to another country via perceptions of discrimination, identification with the Turkish society, and life satisfaction. In what follows, we first survey the extant research on the positive and negative intergroup contact on intergroup attitudes and behaviour. We then apply this framework to intentions to return home (Syria) or to migrate another country.

Integration in a host society is a multidimensional process that involves both the refugees and individual members and institutions of the receiving country. As in any other intergroup context, it is rife with mutual perceptions of prejudice, threats, attitudes, and action tendencies on the basis of norms and values of both the refugees’ own and the host societies (Esses & Hamilton, 2017; Hahn et al., 2019). Research evinces that intergroup contact theory is well positioned to address and account for these social psychological processes that underline the refuge integration and how they might influence refugees’ decision making on returning their home or move on to other countries.

Intergroup contact can reduce prejudice only under optimal conditions, such as equal status, cooperation, common goals and institutional support. Today, hundreds of studies, have attested the positive effects of these processes on intergroup relations (Allport, 1954; Hewstone & Swart, 2011; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011; Pettigrew et al., 2011; Vezzali & Stathi, 2017). For instance, a meta-analysis including 515 studies (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) showed that the optimal conditions proposed by Allport are not essential but can lead to even greater prejudice reduction when they are present and contact can reduce prejudice towards different outgroups (i.e. racial and ethnic groups, and disabled people) and both advantaged and disadvantaged group members benefit from intergroup contact (Powers & Ellison, 1995; Tropp, 2007). The present research investigates whether contact motivate or hinder intentions to return home or to move to another country from Syrian refugees’ perspective, a disadvantaged group in Turkey.

To date, most research on contact examined the role of positive contact predominantly, and paid less attention to negative contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). However, negativity is also a part of intergroup contact experiences. Negative contact however could be more strongly associated with outgroup prejudice and discrimination compared to positive contact (Barlow et al., 2012; Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009) but positive contact is more frequent than negative contact (Graf et al., 2014). Thus, recent research on intergroup contact focuses on both positive and negative contact (Árnadóttir et al., 2018; Meleady et al., 2019; Reimer et al., 2018). The present research also takes into account the valence, positive and negative, of contact in motivating refugees’ return or leave intentions. We expect positive contact to be associated with reduced intentions to leave while negative contact would be associated with increased intentions to leave.

Positive contact can motivate refuges to stay where they migrated, and demotivate them from returning to their home country or move to another country. Positive contact is associated with several positive outcomes such as improved outgroup attitudes (e.g. Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011), reduced perceived discrimination (e.g. Dixon et al., 2010), reduced intergroup anxiety (Stephan, 2014). Taken together refugees who experience positive contact might feel more welcomed and motivated to stay.

Migrating to a new country does not necessarily mean that the host society would be very welcoming. On the contrary, if migrants experience lots of negative contact with the dominant group members, this might influence their intentions to return to their home country. Indeed, research conducted among European immigrants in Britain showed that negative contact was related to both increased prejudice and future contact avoidance (Meleady & Forder, 2019). Other studies also reported that negative contact is associated with outgroup avoidance (e.g. Barlow et al., 2012). Daily hostile contact experiences with the people who have conflicting world views can be so high that people might decide or forced to confine their movement to their own communal areas as Dixon et al., (2020) showed in their study among Protestants and Catholics in Belfast. In more extreme cases, individuals might decide to migrate altogether (Echterhoff et al., 2019). Previous research on immigrants for example showed that Turks who had more negative experiences with Germans reported more willingness to return (e.g. Tezcan, 2019). We assume that this might also be the case for the Syrian refugees in Turkey. If the negative contact with the majority group members are frequent and it is safe to return, then refugees can consider returning to their home country or might migrate to another country.

## Mediators Between Intergroup Contact and Migration Intentions Associations

People are not willing to stay where they regularly have negative contact with others. However, in contrast, those who experience positive contact are more likely to stay (Di Saint Pierre et al., 2015). But how can contact influence people’s migrations decisions? We hypothesize that three processes (i.e. pperceived discrimination, identification with the host society and life satisfaction) could explain the associations between intergroup contact and refugees’ intentions to return and migrate to other countries.

To our knowledge, research on perceived discrimination and intentions to migrate to another country among refugees is scarce. One study by Di Saint Pierre and colleagues (2015) found that economic migrants’ contact with Dutch was related to wishes to return via perceived discrimination. However, their study did not differentiate positive and negative contact. Thus, we wanted to examine the mediating role of perceived discrimination for both positive and negative contact. We know from previous literature that positive contact can reduce perceived discrimination (Dixon et al., 2010; Saguy et al., 2009; Wright & Lubensky, 2009). Also, a longitudinal study show that cross-ethnic friendships are associated with reduced perceived discrimination over time (Tropp et al., 2012). Nevertheless, there might be other consequences of the contact and perceived discrimination association. In the context of the present research, one option for refugees is to return home or migrate to another country. More specifically, positive contact could make refugees feel less discriminated against which in turn could reduce their intentions to migrate. In contrast, negative contact could increase refugees’ perceptions of being discriminated and this in turn could increase their intentions to migrate.

We also argue that identification with the host society can play central role on explaining the association between intergroup contact and intentions to migrate. The acculturalization framework suggests thatwhen different groups come into contact, they revaluate their identities (Berry, 1997; Zimmermann et al., 2007). Berry (1997) argued that there are four acculturation strategies according to immigrant’s cultural maintenance and contact dimensions. Some immigrants hold on to their original identity (separation), while others embrace both identities (integration) or embrace only the host identity (assimilation), and some show little interest both identities (marginalization). Our expectation is that embracing the identity of the host society more will be associated with reduced intentions to migrate among refugees.

Indeed, contact could help people to build a connectedness with a larger group. This connectedness known as solidarity is a central component of identification that is a sense of psychological bond and belonging (Leach et al., 2008). Researchers predominantly considered this type of solidarity related bond as a proxy of identification with the ingroup (Cameron, 2004; Ellemers et al., 1999; Leach et al., 2008) which essentially relies on social categorization. Originated from Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979), social categorization has fundamental connections with cognitive, emotional and behavioural reactions towards others (Turner et al., 1987). For example, people are more likely to help ingroup members compared to outgroup members (Dovidio et al., 1997). Furthermore, previous studies repeatedly showed that social identification is related to increased well-being, life satisfaction and reduced depression (e.g. Eller et al., 2016; Cruwys et al., 2014; Haslam et al., 2009; Helliwell & Barrington-Leigh, 2011). However, people can feel solidarity with outgroup members as well. Putnam (2000) suggested that contact can work as a bridge to sustain social capital which has several benefits in the societal level, such as generation of broader identities and improving the living conditions of the whole community. Di Saint Pierre and colleagues (2015) found that contact with Dutch natives was associated with more return wishes via increased host country identification among migrants. If people experience stronger solidarity-based identification with the host community, they will benefit from this positive feeling and would be less inclined to migrate elsewhere. In line with previous work, we expected identification with the host society to mediate the association between contact and intentions to return.

Apart from perceived discrimination and identification with the host society, life satisfaction too can explain the association between intergroup contact and migration intentions. Life satisfaction is a core part of psychological well-being (Diener et al., 1985) and evidence shows that people’s psychological well-being is closely related to their contact experiences with others (Bagci et al., 2014; Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008). For example, disabled people’s friendships with non-disabled people are linked to greater psychological well-being (Bagci et al., 2018a). Similarly, Bosnian adults’ post-war contact was positively associated with several positive outcomes like lowered post-traumatic stress disorders, morbidity and increased outgroup trust and intergroup forgiveness (Voci et al., 2017). Tip et al. (2019) longitudinally replicated these positive effects of contact on mental health and well-being among refugees in Britain. Refugees who have positive contact with British people reported increased well-being. Consequently, we think that positive contact could increase refugees’ life satisfaction in Turkey which in return can reduce their intentions to return to their home country and migration to the Western countries while negative contact could do the opposite.

**The Present Research**

This research aimed to investigate whether and how the contact valence, positive versus negative, is associated with intentions to return and migrate to the West among Syrian refugees in Turkey. Among all of the refugee groups, Syrians are currently the largest refugee group including 6.6 million people in the world and Turkey hosts the largest, 3.6 million, number of Syrian refugees globally (UNHCR, 2019). As discussed above, positive contact could reduce refugees’ intentions to return and migrate to the West. Conversely, negative contact could enhance these intentions. In line with previous research, we also examined underlying mechanisms for these associations. We hypothesized that these associations can be mediated by perceived discrimination (Dixon et al., 2010; Tropp et al., 2012), identification with the host society (Leach et al., 2008), and life satisfaction (Bagci et al., 2014; Mendoza-Denton & Page-Gould, 2008). Specifically, we proposed that more positive contact with the Turkish host society would be associated with higher life satisfaction and identification with the host society, and lower perceived discrimination. Consequently, lower perceived discrimination, stronger identification with the host society, and greater life satisfaction would in turn be associated with less willingness to return and migrate to the West among Syrian refugees in Turkey. Contrariwise, more negative contact with the host society would be associated with lower life satisfaction and identification with the host society, and with higher perceived discrimination, which in turn would enhance Syrian refugees’ intentions to return home and migrate to the West.

## Method

**Participants and Process**

A sample size calculation considering the population size of Syrian refugees in Turkey (approximately 3.6 million) showed that minimum 271 participants are recommended for 5% margin of error and 90% confidence level. In total, 285 Syrian adults completed the surveys (141 women, 143 men, 1 other, age *Mage*= 35.12, *SD* = 11.33). Majority of the participants were living in the cities closer to Syria (%87 inMardin, Diyarbakir, Sanliurfa; %9.5 in Istanbul and Ankara).

The data was collected via an online questionnaire (*N* = 185) and a paper-pen survey (*N* = 100)[[1]](#footnote-2). The online questionnaire was distributed via social media whereas paper-pen surveys were collected by a trained women pollster who was migrated from Syria and became a Turkish citizen. The participants were informed about the study aims and procedures. No reward was given.

***Measures***

All the measures were translated from Turkish to Arabic by a bilingual scholar. The Arabic version of the survey was evaluated by ten bilingual native speakers on a scale from 1 (*not at all* ) to 7 (*totally agree*) whether the translations were appropriate to the Arabic that Syrians speak (*M*= 6.50, *Sd* = .70), comprehension was good (*M*= 5.90, *Sd* = 1.10), and any Syrian would understand the sentences (*M*= 5.80, *Sd* = 1.81).

 All of the constructs in this study were measured with 7-point Likert type scales. Intergroup contact measure was adopted from Dhont and Van Hiel (2009). Positive contact was measured with three items asking the frequency of positive contact with Turks (1, *not so often*; 7, *very often*;). An example item for positive contact was “How often do you have pleasant contact with Turks?” (α = .82). Negative contact was measured with two items and an example item was “How often do you have unpleasant contact with Turks?” (α = .78, *r* =.64, *p* < .001).

We adapted two items from Bagci et al. (2018b) to measure *perceived discrimination*: “How often did you personally experience discrimination because you are Syrian?” and “How often do you think the society discriminates against Syrians?” (1, *not at all*; 7, *all the time*, *α* = .72, *r* =.57, *p* < .001). Life satisfaction was measured using three items adopted from Diener et al., (1985): “In most ways my life in Turkey is close to my ideal”, “The conditions of my life in Turkey are excellent” and “I am satisfied with my life in Turkey” (1, *not at all*; 7, *all the time*, *α* = .84). Identification with the host society was measured with three items adopted from Leach et al., (2008)’s solidarity items: “I feel a bond with Turks”, “I feel solidarity with Turks” and “I feel committed to Turks” (1, *not at all*; 7, *all the time*, *α* = .92).

Return intentions were measured using two items: “If Syria becomes a safe place in the coming years, I would lean toward the idea of a permanent return”, “If Syria becomes a safe place in the coming years, I would intend to return permanently” (1, *totally disagree*; 7, *totally agree*, *α* = .93, *r* =.87, *p* < .001). Migration to the West intentions were also measured with two items “I lean toward to the idea of going to developed Western countries in the future” and “I intend to go to developed Western countries in the future” (1, *totally disagree*; 7, *totally agree*, *α* = .94).

## Results

We present the descriptive statistics in Table 1. We used Mplus software (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017) to test our theoretical model in structural equation modelling (SEM) with robust maximum likelihood estimation to deal with any potential non-normality in the data.

We evaluated the fitness of our model with the chi-square test, the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), standardized root mean square residual (SRMR), and the comparative fit index (CFI). A good fit is achieved by *χ*2/df < 3, a CFI value >.95, an RMSEA of <.06, and an SRMR of <.08 (Hu & Bentler, 1999). We employed our observed variables (question items) to form latent variables. A confirmatory factor analysis showed that all of our observed variables loaded significantly onto their respective latent factors and our measurement model fit the data well (*χ*2(97) = 121.50, *χ*2/*df* = 1.25, CFI = .99, RMSEA = .03 [.01, .04], SRMR = .03). Additional tests showed that t multicollinearity was not a concern (for all predictors and mediators the Tolerance values > .30 and VIF values < 3.00)[[2]](#footnote-3). We then tested our proposed model (Figure 1) in which we entered positive and negative contact as independent variables, discrimination, identification with the host society and life satisfaction as mediating variables, and intentions to return and migration intention to the West as dependent variables.

In order to control for any bias resulting from small sample size, we report all effect sizes with confidence intervals obtained via bootstrapping with 5000 resamples (Preacher & Hayes, 2008; Zhang et al., 2010). Bootstrapping creates standardized point estimates (PE) with bias-corrected confidence intervals (CIs) to control for bias resulting from small sample sizes or non-normal distributions. PEs with CIs without zero between two values indicates significant path co-efficient. As expected, positive contact was indirectly and negatively associated with return intentions via perceived discrimination (β = -.06, [-.12, -.01]), and identification with the host society (β = -.15, [-.27, -.04]). In similar vein, positive contact was also indirectly associated with intentions to migrate West via life satisfaction (β = -.13, [-.22, -.05]). Contrary to our expectations, negative contact was indirectly and positively associated with return intentions only via perceived discrimination (β = -.06, [-.12, -.01]). Our proposed model explained 17% and 13% of variance in our criterion variables, return intentions and migration to the west, respectively, and 34%, 39%, 50% of variance in our mediating variables, life satisfaction, perceived discrimination, and identification with the host society, respectively.

Our data is cross-sectional and it is difficult to rule out alternative or reverse causal explanations. For instance, perceived discrimination, life satisfaction and outgroup identification might be associated with return intentions and migration intentions to West via positive and negative contact (Alternative Model 1). Individuals could also be harbouring intentions to return to their home country or migrate to West. These intentions might be associated with positive and negative contact via perceived discrimination, life satisfaction and outgroup identification (Alternative Model 2). First alternative model had an acceptable good fit, *χ2* (103) 151.48, *p* < .05, *χ2*/*df* = 1.47, CFI = 98, RMSEA = .04 [.03, .05], SRMR = .04 but had a significantly worse fit ∆*χ2*(6) = 33.75, *p* < 0.001 compared to our proposed model. Second alternative model too showed an acceptable fit, *χ2* (102) 149.52, *p* < .05, *χ2*/*df* = 1.46, CFI = 98, RMSEA = .04 [.02, .05], SRMR = .07, but again our proposed model had a significantly better fit compared to our proposed model ∆*χ2*(5) = 31.50, *p* < .001. We rejected both alternative models.

Discussion

We examined the impact of positive and negative contact on refugees’ intensions to remigrate (when it is safe to return) and migrate to the West and tested potential mediators for these associations. We found that positive contact was associated with reduced intentions to return via reduced perceived discrimination and increased identification with the host society; and with intentions to migrate to West via increased life satisfaction. Negative contact on the other hand was only associated with return intentions via increased perceived discrimination.

These findings extend previous work on intergroup contact theory by showing that contact do not only improve outgroup attitudes (Hodson & Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, 2011), but that it could also influence refugees’ decision making related to staying in the host country, returning home, or migrating to another country. Our findings are consistent with previous work on the associations between increased socio-cultural integration and reduced return intentions among migrants (Anniste & Tammaru, 2014; de Haas & Fokkema, 2011; Di Saint Pierre et al., 2015). We contributed to this line of research from intergroup contact perspective in several ways.

First and foremost, previous studies focus mainly on the effect of positive contact on attitudes toward refugees among the members of the host society and studies conducted among refugees took into account only positive contact experiences (e.g. Di Saint Pierre et al., 2015). In the present research, we examined both positive and negative contact (Pettigrew & Hewstone, 2017) among refugees. Surprisingly, the effects of positive contact on return intentions and intentions to migrate to West were more pronounced. These results corroborate previous research (e.g., Barlow et al., 2012; Graf et al., 2014) but contradict findings from Pettigrew and Tropp (2011) study. Taken together, these results suggest that researchers need to take into account of both types of intergroup contact. Research looking at alternative outcomes (e.g. civic participation of refugees in the society, entrepreneurial activities, or political behaviour) other than classical intergroup processes (e.g. prejudice reduction) would be particularly welcome. In similar vein, research should also focus on giving more voice to the refugees and increasing their visibility in the mainstream psychological research. Refugees are the primary stakeholders and the end-users of the research on refugee studies. Research focusing on refugee experiences would contribute to their welfare more than research focusing on attitudes and behaviour towards the refugees.

Second, previous researchers predominantly focused on perceived discrimination as a motivator for fighting against injustice (Klandermans et al., 2008; Wright & Tropp, 2002; van Zomeren, et al., 2008). We argue that fighting with discrimination via social movement may not be the optimal solution especially when one’s group is in precarious conditions. For the very same reasons, people may also decide to choose not to challenge the *status quo*. Consistent with previous work (Di Saint Pierre et al., 2015), we found that reduced perceived discrimination against refugees is associated with increased return intentions. However, previous work by Di Saint Pierre and her colleagues (2015) was about economic migrants’ wishes but not refugees’ intentions to return. Moreover, they focused on perceived discrimination and identification with the host society only. We believe that we extend this line work at two fronts. We considered the role of life satisfaction as a mediating process and investigate whether the effects of contact via our mediating processes (perceived discrimination, identification with the host society, and life satisfaction) extend to intentions to migrate to another country or region. These results introduce a new avenue for research on how dimensions of contact with the host society could influence decisions to leave among refugees. Results show that positive contact does indeed reduce both intentions to return home or to migrate to another country. In addition, our results also speak to the more traditional research on contact and prejudice reduction and its applications to refugee-host society relations, we found that contact is related to reduced perceived discrimination (Dixon et al., 2010; Tropp, 2007; Wright & Lubensky, 2009) and demonstrate that perceived discrimination can explain the associations between contact and return intentions. These results are understandable in the sense that individuals do not want to stay in a place where they are highly discriminated against, and so would rather return to their home country to avoid further inequity when it is safe to return.

It is important to note that perceived discrimination was more closely related to return intentions while its correlation was weaker for migration intentions from Turkey to the Western countries. This might be due to the perception that they might still experience discrimination (maybe even more) in the Western countries (see André & Dronkers, 2016). At least in Turkey, refugees share the same religion with the host society, and Syrian culture is more similar to Turkish compared to Western European culture. However, if refugees are not happy with their life in Turkey, it is understandable for them to consider moving Western European countries. Non-discriminated and financially satisfied refugee images from Europe might motivate refugees in Turkey to move Europe. Future research could investigate whether perceptions of similarities between the host culture and refugee’s culture or even perceptions of identifying with a common superordinate group, a common Muslim ingroup, play any role in these processes.

Third, we extend the previous research on acculturation and integration by showing that positive but not negative contact contribute to the integration. We showed that identification with the host society mediates the association between contact and return intentions. We conceptualized, identification as a solidarity-based *identification with the host society* (Leach et al., 2008; Tajfel & Turner, 1979). In our findings, identification with the host society appeared, albeit qualitatively, to have a slightly stronger role in explaining the association between positive contact and intentions to return. Increased positive contact was related to stronger identification with the host society which in turn was associated with reduced return intentions. This result is in line with the acculturation framework in terms of the ways people re-evaluate their ethnic identities when they move into a different country and have contact with the host group members (Berry, 1997; De Vroome et al., 2014). Refugees who had more positive contact experiences with locals can feel more integrated to the host country and identify more with the host country, which in turn might reduce their intentions to return.

Last but not least, we also contribute the research on well-being among refugees. Our results demonstrate that negative contact might have detrimental effects on societal well-being by reducing life satisfaction and increasing discord between the refugees and members of the host society. Previous research evinced that life satisfaction is fundamentally related to mental health (Lombardo et al., 2018). Our results showed that negative intergroup contact was associated with life satisfaction which in turn was associated with intentions to migrate to West. These findings are in line with previous work which shows the impact of quality of contact on positive mental health and political behaviour in a similarly disadvantaged group context, indigenous communities in Chile and Mexico (Eller et al., 2016; Eller et al., 2020). Future longitudinal or experimental research looking at how contact relates to integration among refugees and political behaviour among general populations via mental health and life satisfaction would be particularly welcome.

## Limitation and Future Research

We acknowledge that the findings we present might be subject to several limitations Our design is cross-sectional and our findings can only represent snapshot of the psychological process at a single point in time, the data collection period. Thus, it might be problematic to generalize our results to the general population and to other contexts. Therefore, longitudinal studies would be a better positioned to provide more conclusive evidence to confirm or refute our hypotheses as they would be able to trace the causality across several waves in time. Psychological processes related to migration intentions among refugees are dynamic and therefore could be easily influenced the political and social context. For instance, refugees would be more inclined to consider migrating if European countries are to adopt policies more favourable to migration. Experimental studies manipulating contact or mediating processes would also provide more causality. That said, it would not be easy to test these hypotheses in controlled laboratory settings which might also raise additional issues regarding external validity.

 Similarly, asking refugees about their intentions to migrate can provide valuable information about their future behaviour. However, intentions do not necessarily translate into their actual future migration behaviour and it might be problematic to draw conclusions on actual behaviour from research that measures intentions only (see Armitage & Conner, 2001). Future research can examine prior contact experience frequencies among those who returned to their homeland and/or migrated to the West.

Increasing number of refugees is a global reality. It is important to understand and foresee refugees’ moving intentions to inform social, economic, and political decisions. Majority of empirical research has so far focused on migration intentions among migrants and research investigating intentions to return or migrate to another country among refugees is scarce. This is understandable as refugees might be harder to reach and might be in a more vulnerable conditions that could prevent them from participating in research. In Turkey, all refugee related research requires special permissions from government agencies which might be difficult to obtain. Moreover, such scrutiny might introduce a certain amount of bias to the results as refugees might be concerned about the social desirability or might fear that their participation would jeopardize their current situation. Policy makers can benefit from studies like ours to better understand and predict refugees’ future migration behaviour.

In conclusion, the current research provides insights of the roles of positive and negative contact on refugees’ intentions to return homeland and migrate to the West. This study also attempted to explain how intergroup contact is related with these decisions by providing the mediating roles of perceived discrimination and identification with the host society for intentions to return and life satisfaction for intentions to migrate to the West. Cumulatively, we believe that we bring good news with our findings. Policy makers tasked with making decisions related to the welfare of refugees should might benefit from evidence we present here. Refugee-host society relations are a fundamental component of both refugee welfare and integration.

We wish to confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this publication and there has been no significant financial support for this work that could have influenced its outcome. No funding was received for this work.
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