

Refugee Inclusion and the Fragmentation of Social Belonging in Developed Host Nations

Al-Araf Assadallah Marzuki, Rommy Hardyansah, Didit Darmawan

Badan Riset Inovasi Nasional, Indonesia.
Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 15 August 2023

Revised 30 August 2023

Accepted 14 September 2023

Key words:

refugee inclusion,
symbolic boundaries,
social trust,
integration policy,
cultural adaptation,
democratic citizenship,
host society perception.

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the persistent disconnection between refugee social integration objectives and the actual lived experiences of inclusion in developed host societies. Drawing upon interdisciplinary literature and empirical studies, the analysis reveals that while policies often address structural dimensions such as legal status, employment, and language training, they neglect relational and symbolic aspects that define authentic social integration. Factors such as cultural misalignment, symbolic boundaries, political rhetoric, institutional fragmentation, and media framing significantly influence the extent to which refugees experience genuine belonging. The study highlights the need to shift integration paradigms beyond administrative targets toward more nuanced approaches that emphasize interpersonal trust, cultural recognition, and community engagement. Legal frameworks alone are insufficient without social environments that support reciprocity and mutual understanding. The findings encourage a redefinition of inclusion as a dynamic social process that demands not only policy refinement but also ethical commitment and institutional sensitivity. By illuminating the limitations in current integration frameworks, this paper contributes to ongoing discussions on equity, identity, and democratic inclusion within multicultural societies.

INTRODUCTION

Across many developed countries, the arrival of refugees has reshaped national conversations around inclusion, civic responsibility, and human rights. Governments and international agencies have invested heavily in programs aimed at resettlement, offering housing, education, language training, and employment support. However, the structural and cultural fabric of host societies presents barriers that often obstruct newcomers from building meaningful connections with their new environments (Mozetič, 2022). Public discourse continues to oscillate between humanitarian imperatives and social cohesion, placing refugee integration programs under constant evaluation. The reception given to refugees may be generous on the surface, but deeper processes of adaptation and mutual recognition remain uncertain and fragmented (Vergou et al., 2021).

Urban centers such as Berlin, Stockholm, and Toronto, refugee initiatives have multiplied in recent years. These programs intend to create

pathways for individuals who have fled conflict zones to reconstruct their lives. Despite generous social welfare provisions, many resettled individuals experience alienation, marginalization, or symbolic exclusion. Access to economic opportunities does not necessarily translate into participation in communal life. Language acquisition, cultural adaptation, and community acceptance remain complex tasks that do not unfold uniformly across refugee groups. Policymakers emphasize inclusion, the lived realities of refugees often reflect fractured social encounters (Shaw & Wachter, 2022).

Academic literature has attempted to conceptualize the multifaceted nature of integration by examining dimensions such as legal status, education, employment, health access, and civic engagement. Social integration remains one of the most difficult dimensions to capture, as it involves intangible elements of belonging, shared norms, and reciprocal recognition. Unlike structural indicators, social integration depends on everyday interactions and symbolic negotiations.

* Corresponding author, email address: alaraf00@gmail.com

The discrepancy between policy frameworks and actual social experience raises questions about the efficacy of current models of inclusion and their impact on long-term cohesion (Nuissl et al., 2019).

This issue becomes particularly salient in times of sociopolitical tension, where refugee communities are often perceived as threats to national identity or public order. The rise of xenophobic rhetoric and populist movements has further complicated efforts to foster solidarity and intercultural dialogue. Under such conditions, refugee integration becomes a contested terrain, shaped by both state interventions and community reactions. These dynamics call for a deeper examination of how social integration unfolds, who defines its success, and what structural conditions support or hinder it in practice (Strang & Quinn, 2021).

While states have enacted integration measures through legal, educational, and employment policies, the social dimension of refugee inclusion continues to face severe conceptual and practical gaps. Ager and Strang (2008), despite the presence of formal integration mechanisms, refugees often find themselves excluded from informal networks that are crucial for social belonging. These include community groups, neighborhood associations, and interpersonal relationships that foster trust and familiarity. The absence of access to such relational spaces leads to feelings of invisibility and dislocation among refugees (Strang & Quinn, 2021).

Scholars have emphasized that integration frameworks are frequently driven by administrative and demographic priorities rather than social outcomes. Castles et al. (2002) argue that while governments may track indicators such as employment or language proficiency, these metrics do not necessarily reflect the subjective experiences of belonging. Integration programs are often implemented without sufficient sensitivity to the cultural capital and social identities of refugees, resulting in misalignments between institutional expectations (Campion, 2018).

Another fundamental issue is the asymmetry between host populations and refugee groups in terms of power and influence. According to Kymlicka (1995), multicultural policies often presume a level playing field, ignoring the historical and political inequalities that structure intergroup relations. Refugee integration becomes a one-sided process where newcomers are expected to adapt without reciprocal efforts from the host society. This expectation reinforces exclusionary dynamics and diminishes the potential for genuine intercultural exchange (Strang & Quinn, 2021).

Research in this area demands close attention because it touches the moral foundations of democratic societies. The integration of refugees is not merely a bureaucratic task; it reflects the ethical stance of a nation toward those who have experienced forced displacement. When social integration fails, it signals deeper fractures in the social fabric that cannot be repaired through policy measures alone (Martin et al., 2022). Addressing these issues requires sustained critical inquiry into the lived realities of both refugees and host communities, ensuring that inclusion is more than a procedural claim (Haley et al., 2021).

This research aims to analyze the disparity between the intended objectives of refugee social integration programs and the lived experiences of inclusion within developed countries. By synthesizing empirical studies and theoretical discourses, the study seeks to uncover the mechanisms that perpetuate symbolic exclusion and limited social participation. The analysis will also contribute to academic discourse by clarifying conceptual limitations in current frameworks and highlighting the socio-cultural variables that shape integration processes.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study applies a literature-based research method to examine the discrepancy between refugee social integration objectives and lived experiences in developed countries. The approach employed is qualitative and exploratory in nature, aiming to identify recurring theoretical themes and empirical insights found in academic sources. The design follows the principles of a narrative literature review, which enables the researcher to synthesize a wide range of academic materials across disciplines including sociology, political science, and migration studies. As noted by Jesson et al. (2001), narrative reviews are particularly useful for evaluating diverse perspectives, mapping theoretical landscapes, and formulating new interpretations based on existing research. This method is especially relevant given the abstract and value-laden nature of social inclusion, which cannot be reduced to a fixed set of variables or statistical outputs.

The data collection process involved systematic identification of peer-reviewed journal articles, academic reports, and books from scholarly databases such as JSTOR, ScienceDirect, and Taylor & Francis Online. Search terms included "refugee social integration," "inclusion outcomes," "symbolic exclusion," and "policy-practice gaps." The inclusion criteria were based on theoretical richness, relevance

to developed country contexts, and methodological credibility. The analytical process used thematic coding and critical synthesis, drawing insights from both conceptual frameworks and empirical findings. The interpretive model was informed by the approach described by Booth et al. (2003), which advocates for iterative engagement with texts, allowing patterns, contradictions, and theoretical gaps to emerge naturally through close reading. This method ensured the construction of a coherent, grounded narrative capable of elucidating complex integration dynamics.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Social inclusion remains a complex and contested ambition within contemporary migration governance. As states strive to design frameworks for welcoming refugees, the question of what constitutes meaningful participation in society remains largely unsettled. While policies may articulate goals around access and support, these intentions often operate within narrowly defined bureaucratic parameters. Behind official declarations lies a far more intricate landscape shaped by perception, interaction and emotional connection (Cobigo et al., 2016).

Efforts to promote refugee integration frequently gravitate toward easily monitored achievements, such as labor market entry or institutional enrollment. Although these markers provide useful data points, they rarely capture the nuanced human experience that accompanies displacement and resettlement. Personal histories, community dynamics, and unspoken codes of acceptance exert influence that is difficult to quantify yet critical to understand. Without acknowledging these layers, integration remains incomplete, regardless of institutional reach (Catarci, 2014).

Many host nations embed integration strategies within frameworks rooted in procedural justice rather than experiential well-being. Legal protections, educational access, and vocational pathways are undeniably important, but they do not guarantee social cohesion. The subtleties of recognition, inclusion, and trust unfold outside formal settings in conversations, gestures, and daily encounters. This invisible realm is where acceptance is either cultivated or denied, often beyond the scope of policy design (Choy et al., 2018).

The academic discourse has increasingly drawn attention to the disjunction between what states intend and what refugees perceive. Researchers point to a pattern of neglecting the interpersonal and symbolic aspects of integration, which are central to

any authentic sense of belonging. These omissions are not mere oversights; they represent a fundamental misunderstanding of what it means to be part of a society. Belonging is reduced to statistics, the emotional and relational dimensions of settlement remain unresolved (Endale, 2016).

Thus, a meaningful exploration of refugee integration requires looking beyond metrics and into the fabric of everyday life. It involves interrogating the social norms, political choices, and institutional behaviors that shape whether a newcomer feels acknowledged or alienated. Without such inquiry, integration programs risk reinforcing separation under the guise of inclusion—leaving behind those they were meant to welcome (Scardigno, 2019).

Understanding the disconnection between refugee social integration objectives and the actual lived experiences of inclusion within developed host societies requires a multidimensional exploration of sociocultural, political, and institutional dynamics. A recurring theme in the literature is the overemphasis on structural integration at the expense of relational and affective inclusion. According to Phillimore (2012), integration programs often prioritize quantifiable outcomes such as employment or language acquisition, neglecting the less measurable but essential dimensions of interpersonal trust and belonging.

Cultural misalignment is another central factor influencing the divide between policy intentions and lived experiences. Berry (2001) notes that acculturation strategies frequently assume assimilation as the default path, placing the burden of adjustment entirely on refugees. This expectation disregards the bidirectional nature of integration, in which host societies are equally responsible for adaptation and openness. When refugees sense that their cultural backgrounds are undervalued or pathologized, it creates an emotional distance that cannot be bridged through administrative solutions.

Symbolic boundaries further complicate the process of social inclusion. Lamont and Molnár (2002) describe how symbolic boundaries—informal lines demarcating in-groups from out-groups—are maintained through discourses of national identity, civic virtue, and perceived social norms. Refugees are often positioned as outsiders, not through formal exclusion but through subtle cues of distrust, pity, or avoidance. These boundaries reinforce societal stratification, undermining the integrative functions of inclusive policy.

Public narratives and media representations also play a pivotal role in shaping social perceptions. Esse et al. (2013) argue that refugees

are frequently portrayed as burdens or threats, which fuels public anxiety and fosters hostile environments. State policies promote inclusion, media portrayals can cultivate suspicion among host populations. This disconnects between message and medium disrupts the psychological preconditions necessary for social solidarity.

Another important element is the absence of social trust. Putnam (2007) finds that in ethnically diverse societies, increasing heterogeneity may initially reduce levels of generalized trust. Refugees, being newcomers with limited access to local networks, are particularly affected by this erosion of trust. Their isolation is compounded by the lack of reciprocal engagement from host communities, leading to parallel existences rather than shared social spaces.

Institutional fragmentation contributes to the inconsistency between policy design and everyday experience. Responsibilities for refugee integration are often spread across disconnected bureaucracies with limited coordination. Spencer (2006) observed that such fragmentation results in contradictory messages and service gaps, burdening refugees with navigating systems that were never designed with coherence in mind. This institutional disarray contributes to the confusion and frustration experienced by both refugees and service providers.

Language remains a powerful mediator of inclusion or exclusion. Although language classes are commonly offered, their pedagogical content often fails to incorporate cultural and pragmatic competence. Norton & Toohey (2001) highlight that language acquisition is not simply a technical process but a social one, involving identity negotiation and power relations. When refugees are taught language in isolation from social context, they struggle to access authentic communicative participation.

The psychological labeling of refugees contributes to long-term stigmatization. Zetter (2007) explained that the category "refugee" can become an institutional label that reduces individuals to passive recipients of aid, denying their agency and personal history. This dehumanization limits refugees' ability to assert their identities and fosters dependency rather than mutual recognition.

Residential concentration in socioeconomically deprived neighborhoods creates another layer of exclusion. Musterd and Andersson (2005) argue that spatial segregation restricts exposure to diverse social networks, reinforces existing stereotypes, and limits access to employment and education. As a result, refugees are contained geographically and socially, with few avenues to bridge those divides.

Educational institutions, while designed to be inclusive, often replicate mainstream cultural narratives. Banks (2004) asserts that curriculum content rarely reflects the epistemologies and historical narratives of marginalized groups. This lack of representation alienates refugee students and reinforces the perception that their identities are peripheral to the national story.

Political discourse further distorts integration practices. Freeman (2004) contends that immigration policy in liberal democracies often serves symbolic purposes, more concerned with signaling control than promoting genuine inclusion. When politicians instrumentalize refugee narratives for electoral purposes, public attitudes harden, and inclusive intentions are reduced to rhetorical gestures.

Legal protections, while foundational, are insufficient to guarantee social equity. Bauböck (2001) explains that legal status may ensure rights on paper but cannot engineer mutual recognition or emotional security. Without mechanisms that promote cross-cultural engagement, anti-discrimination laws operate in isolation, unable to dismantle underlying social hierarchies.

Civil society organizations occupy a complex position in the integration ecosystem. While NGOs and volunteer networks often bridge institutional gaps, their capacity is contingent on political will (Appel & Schnable, 2019). When adequately supported, they foster inclusive environments. When constrained, they reinforce fragmented service delivery and uneven support landscapes.

Historical memory and national identity narratives deeply influence refugee reception. Gilroy (2004) emphasizes that the politics of belonging are historically constructed, shaped by colonial legacies, racial hierarchies, and national myths. Refugees enter these memory fields as perceived intrusions, encountering social scripts that predefine their place before interaction even begins.

Individual resilience is often celebrated but can mask systemic neglect. Luthar & Cicchetti (2000) warn against the uncritical valorization of resilience, which may deflect attention from structural injustice. While personal strength helps refugees navigate adversity, it should not be an excuse for weak policy design or lack of institutional empathy.

Framing the refugee experience through the lens of personal perseverance can unintentionally obscure deeper flaws in systemic arrangements. Narratives that emphasize adaptability and inner strength often overshadow the responsibility of public institutions to create environments where dignity is not contingent on struggle. When resilience is romanticized, the burden of adjustment subtly shifts to those who have already endured significant upheaval.

In this climate, valor becomes a requirement rather than an inspiration. Refugees are frequently praised for their courage, yet this praise comes at the cost of overlooking the structures that continually demand such bravery. The absence of responsive governance and culturally attuned service delivery is recast as a test of individual character, rather than a policy failure requiring correction.

Empathy within institutions cannot be replaced by admiration from afar. Policies must be designed not around the expectation that individuals will persist despite obstacles, but around the conviction that obstacles should not exist in the first place. Equity demands deliberate effort to reduce systemic barriers, not to applaud those who survive them (Shogren, 2022). True progress is measured not by exceptional resilience, but by the extent to which systems enable dignity, access, and opportunity for all – without requiring extraordinary struggle.

Moreover, the narrative of resilience, while emotionally appealing, can entrench social complacency. It provides a moral shield behind which ineffective frameworks hide, allowing those in power to evade accountability. Compassion must be expressed not through applause for endurance, but through the reform of conditions that necessitate it (Granzka et al., 2019).

Ultimately, genuine inclusion means shifting focus from survival to flourishing. Societies must be measured not by how well the vulnerable adapt, but by how intentionally they remove the need for such adaptation. Refugee integration should be a reflection of collective conscience, not a stage for individual endurance.

CONCLUSION

This study underscores the necessity for scholars, practitioners, and policymakers to re-examine the conceptual foundations and operational logic of refugee integration programs. The findings indicate that effective integration cannot be measured solely through economic or legal indicators but must account for emotional security, cultural validation, and participatory inclusion. A failure to address these dimensions risks perpetuating social stratification and eroding the democratic fabric of host societies. Integration should be understood as a continuous social process requiring mutual effort, structural coherence, and ethical responsiveness.

Future integration policies must be designed with a stronger orientation toward relational inclusion and supported by comprehensive institutional collaboration. Emphasis should be placed on

culturally responsive education, community-based interaction, and the dismantling of symbolic boundaries. Stakeholders must prioritize trust-building initiatives and counter-narratives to mitigate the social stigmatization of refugees. Most importantly, refugees must be engaged as co-creators of inclusion rather than passive recipients of state interventions.

REFERENCES

- Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21(2), 166–191.
- Appel, S., & Schnable, A. (2019). Don't Reinvent the Wheel: Possibilities for and Limits to Building Capacity of Grassroots International NGOs. In *Citizen Aid and Everyday Humanitarianism*, 12(3) 64-81.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). *Handbook of Research on Multicultural Education* (Vol. 2). C. A. M. Banks (Ed.). CA: Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Banks, J. A. (2004). Multicultural Education: Historical Development, Dimensions, and Practice. *Review of Research in Education*, 19(1), 3–49.
- Bauböck, R. (2001). Multinational Citizenship: A New Form of Democratic Inclusion?. *International Journal of Multicultural Societies*, 3(1), 1–20.
- Berry, J. W. (2001). A Psychology of Immigration. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3), 615–631.
- Booth, A., Papaioannou, D., & Sutton, A. (2003). *Systematic Approaches to a Successful Literature Review*. SAGE Publications, London.
- Campion, E. D. (2018). The Career Adaptive Refugee: Exploring the Structural and Personal Barriers to Refugee Resettlement. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 105, 6–16.
- Castles, S., Korac, M., Vasta, E., & Vertovec, S. (2002). *Integration: Mapping the Field*. Home Office, London.
- Catarci, M. (2014). Critical Consideration on the Concept of Integration of the Migrants and Refugees. *Revista Interdisciplinar da Mobilidade Humana*, 22(43):71-84
- Choy, S., Wärvik, G. B., & Lindberg, V. (2018). Considerations for the Integration of Students' Experiences. *Integration of Vocational Education and Training Experiences: Purposes, Practices and Principles*, 29 (2), 345-365.
- Cobigo, V., Brown, R. I., Lachapelle, Y., Lysaght, R., Martin, L., Ouellette-Kuntz, H., Stuart, H., & Fulford, C. (2016). Social Inclusion: A Proposed Framework to Inform Policy and Service Outcomes Evaluation. *Inclusion*, 4(4), 226-238.

- Endale, E. G. (2016). Integration and Homeland Engagement: A Case of Ethiopian Refugees Residing in Atlanta. *Journal of Peacebuilding and Development*, 11(3), 114 - 119
- Esse, V. M., Medianu, S., & Lawson, A. S. (2013). Uncertainty, Threat, and the Role of the Media in Promoting the Dehumanization of Immigrants and Refugees. *Journal of Social Issues*, 69(3), 518–536.
- Freeman, G. P. (2004). Immigrant Incorporation in Western Democracies. *International Migration Review*, 38(3), 945–969.
- Gilroy, P. (2004). *Postcolonial Melancholia*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Grzanka, P. R., Gonzalez, K. A., & Spanierman, L. B. (2019). White Supremacy and Counseling Psychology: Critical–Conceptual Framework. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 47(4), 478–529.
- Haley, D., Paucar-Caceres, A., & Schindwein, S. (2021). A Critical Inquiry into the Value of Systems Thinking in the Time of COVID-19 Crisis. *Systems*, 9(1), 1–14.
- Jesson, J., Matheson, L., & Lacey, F. M. (2001). *Doing Your Literature Review: Traditional and Systematic Techniques*. SAGE, London.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural Citizenship: A Liberal Theory of Minority Rights*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Lamont, M., & Molnár, V. (2002). The Study of Boundaries in the Social Sciences. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 28(1), 167–195.
- Luthar, S. S., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). The Construct of Resilience: Implications for Interventions and Social Policies. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12(4), 857–885.
- Martin, S. R., Emich, K. J., McClean, E. J., & Woodruff, C. T. (2022). Keeping Teams Together: How Ethical Leadership Moderates the Effects of Performance on Team Efficacy and Social Integration. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 176(1), 127–139.
- Mozetič, K. (2022). A Help or Hindrance? Highly Educated Refugees' Perceptions of the Role of Civic Integration Programmes in Accessing the Labour Market in Oslo, Malmö and Munich. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 10(8), 1–18.
- Musterd, S., & Andersson, R. (2005). Housing Mix, Social Mix, and Social Opportunities. *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(6), 761–790.
- Norton, B., & Toohy, K. (2001). Changing Perspectives on Good Language Learners. *TESOL Quarterly*, 35(2), 307–322.
- Nuissl, H., Domann, V., & Engel, S. (2019). Integration Als Kommunalpolitische Aufgabe: Die Erschließung Eines Sich Neu Formierenden Lokalen Politikfeldes. *Raumforschung und Raumordnung and Planning*, 77(4), 319–331.
- Phillimore, J. (2012). Implementing Integration in the UK: Lessons for Integration Theory, Policy and Practice. *Policy & Politics*, 40(4), 525–545.
- Putnam, R. D. (2007). E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century. *Scandinavian Political Studies*, 30(2), 137–174.
- Scardigno, F. (2019). The Cultural Integration of Young Refugees: An Experience within the Italian Academic Context. *Italian Journal of Sociology of Education*, 11(3), 283–303.
- Shaw, S. A., Poulin, P., & Crump, K. (2022). Implementing Psychosocial Support Groups in US Refugee Resettlement. *Journal of Social Service Research*, 48(5), 593–605.
- Shogren, K. A. (2022). Presidential Address, 2022—Dismantling Systemic Barriers: Re-Envisioning Equity and Inclusion. *Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities*, 60(6), 520–529.
- Spencer, S. (2006). *The Challenge of Integration in Europe*. Policy Network, London.
- Strang, A. B., & Quinn, N. (2021). Integration or Isolation? Refugees' Social Connections and Wellbeing. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34(1), 328–353.
- Vergou, P., Arvanitidis, P. A., & Manetos, P. (2021). Refugee Mobilities and Institutional Changes: Local Housing Policies and Segregation Processes in Greek Cities. *Urban Planning*, 6(2), 19–31.
- Zetter, R. (2007). More Labels, Fewer Refugees: Remaking the Refugee Label in an Era of Globalization. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 20(2), 172–192.