OXFORD

Journal of Refugee Studies, 2025, 1–16
https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feaf055
Original Article

Integration through insurgency: opposing approaches to refugee resettlement in major resettlement sites

Alexandra Judelsohn[1,*] and Dilli Gautam[2]

[1]Department of Urban and Regional Planning, University at Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14214, United States
[2]Bhutanese Community of Michigan, Grand Rapids, MI 49512, United States

*Corresponding author. Department of Urban and Regional Planning, 232 Hayes Hall, State University at New York (SUNY) Buffalo, Buffalo, NY 14214, United States. E-mail: ajudelso@buffalo.edu

Abstract

Supporting refugee resettlement in the USA requires a network of actors, including, but not limited to, local resettlement agencies, local and county governments (LCGs), and ethnic community-based organizations (ECBOs). Through a qualitative study, we explore how LCGs manage diverse communities by examining how they plan for immigrants and refugees through immigrant welcoming work. We also consider ECBO's response to and role in this work. Findings show that leaders from ECBOs utilize tenets of insurgent planning in their work, while governments take more top-down approaches. We call for the engagement and representation of ECBOs, which can help to improve the civic dimensions of resettlement in the USA.

1. Introduction

Until the recent Trump administration, the United States (US) refugee resettlement program was the largest in the world (UNHCR n.d.). Scholars describe resettlement in the US as "a broken promise, not an impossible one" (Tang 2015: 19). Limited resettlement services and an "urban reality characterized by racialized geographic enclosure, displacement from formal labor markets, unrelenting poverty, and the criminalization of daily life" all contribute to compounding challenges that confront refugees (Tang 2015: 5).

The US refugee resettlement program often focuses on employment outcomes as a measure of success (Fix et al. 2017). In response to this limited view, in their seminal article, Ager and Strang offer a conceptual framework of integration,[1] which provides a more holistic

[1] While integration is a contested and often misunderstood term, it has become a key policy objective in refugee resettlement.

Received: 20 December 2024. **Editorial decision:** 13 August 2025. **Accepted:** 18 August 2025.

understanding of success in resettlement (Ager and Strang 2008). The authors argue that the state must address barriers to integration through policy,[2] and it has become an important policy guide for refugee resettlement in other countries (Cheung and Phillimore 2013; Mulvey 2015; Strang and Quinn 2021). According to Ager and Strang, successful integration involves four thematic areas, characterizing refugee outcomes: "achievement and access across the sectors of employment, housing, education and health; assumptions and practice regarding citizenship and rights; processes of social connection within and between groups within the community; and structural barriers to such connection related to language, culture and the local environment" (Ager and Strang 2008: 166). Overall, this framework focuses on refugees' needs rather than their agency, arguing that policy should work to address these needs.

Yet little is known about how effectively the state—specifically local and county governments (LCGs)—serve refugees. Allen and Slotterback (2021) examine how community engagement processes routinely used by urban planners fell short when planners worked directly with Somali residents with refugee backgrounds. When planners engaged Somali-led organizations to lead these processes, community engagement was successful (Allen and Slotterback 2021). Scholars also explore the crucial role that ethnic community-based organizations (ECBOs) play in serving their communities (Gonzalez Benson et al. 2019; Gonzalez Benson 2020), yet research has not examined what planners might learn from ECBOs.

This study examines how LCGs in two communities enact welcoming work with immigrants and refugees and how ECBOs manage the needs of their communities through tenets of insurgent planning (IP) practices. We first review the literature on LCGs' and ECBOs' role in refugee resettlement and the literature on IP. We highlight gaps in the literature about refugees' experiences with LCGs' welcoming work. We then present the methodology and data we used to understand how the welcoming work of LCGs is perceived and experienced by refugees, and how this work compares to the support offered by ECBOs. Our qualitative findings show that ECBOs utilize the tenets of IP outlined by Miraftab (2009). We conclude by suggesting that integration as a model of resettlement falls short if it does not consider the insurgent approach that ECBOs take.

2. Background: how LCGs and ECBOs support refugees

In 2023, 31.6 million people had refugee status under the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees mandate, and 158,700 of them were resettled in a final country (UNHCR 2024: 3). The main goal of international protections is to return people to their home countries, yet this is often not possible. Resettlement in a third country is an alternative solution (Bose 2020: 29).

Historically, the US has been a leader in resettlement, and the resettlement program has evolved greatly since its beginning in 1948. The current iteration of the resettlement program began in 1980, when Congress passed the Refugee Resettlement Act, establishing the US Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP). USRAP operates as a public–private partnership between the federal government and nonprofit resettlement agencies (Bose 2020: 30). The process of coming to the US is arduous, with tests, interviews, and screenings throughout (Bose 2020: 29). Even prior to the Trump presidencies (which introduced additional obstacles to resettlement), resettlement to the US took, from application to acceptance, 1000 days (Bose 2020: 38). At the time of this writing, the US resettlement program has been halted, staff from the US the Bureau of Population, Refugees and Migration (PRM) have been laid off, and Trump's One Big Beautiful Bill has decimated benefits for refugees already in the US (Barkoff et al. 2025; Church World Service 2025).

When refugees are slated to come to the US, PRM in the Department of State works with the Office of Refugee Resettlement in selecting the city where refugees will be sent[3] (Bose 2020). In deciding, federal entities work with state-level officials (e.g., in New York and Michigan these are

[2] Policy often fails refugees in the USA. President Trump's One Big Beautiful Bill includes a number of provisions that will negatively impact refugees, including, but not limited to, cutting them off from Medicaid, Medicare, and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (Church World Service 2025).

[3] Unlike other immigrants that arrive in the USA, people that arrive as refugees receive services which are location dependent.

State Refugee Coordinators), but at the local level, there is no official representative they work with. Unlike immigrants who arrive in the US with other visa statuses, refugees receive support from the US Reception & Placement program and through other programmatic efforts that they can generally access during their first 5 years in the US (most services end after the first 90 days). The nine Voluntary Agencies (VOLAGS) work with local resettlement agencies (LRAs) who offer direct services to refugees, such as setting up an apartment, providing language classes, and securing employment (Bose 2020). While LRAs are often discussed as the main supporter in resettlement in mainstream media, here, we focus on two less discussed entities: LCGs and ECBOs. Next, we outline the role they play in supporting refugees in their new homes.

2.1 LCGs and welcoming work

LCGs play a crucial role in refugees' experience in their new homes by shaping physical environments and providing essential services. While LCGs are bound by federal and state immigration policies, they can exhibit receptivity or hostility to refugee populations, and scholars have found that the receptivity of a city (as manifested, e.g., in the promotion of refugee-owned businesses) is particularly important, as it is the first step in the integration process (Furuseth et al. 2015; Lester and Nguyen 2016). Despite immigrants moving to the US for centuries, only in recent years have LCGs begun to engage in "welcoming work" (McDaniel et al. 2017). Welcoming work can take a variety of forms, including through the creation and implementation of plans and policies. The national organization Welcoming America is a "nonprofit leading a movement of inclusive communities becoming more prosperous by ensuring everyone belongs, including immigrants" (Welcoming America n.d.). They host "The Welcoming Network," "a network and a movement, driven by the conviction that communities make better decisions when residents of all backgrounds, identities, and perspectives are meaningfully engaged" (Welcoming America n.d.).[4] Tools, resources, and technical assistance are provided to nonprofits and LCGs across the country, they support LCGs with research reports on their immigrant and refugee populations, and provide funding and technical assistance for the creation of welcome plans.

2.2 The role of ECBOs in supporting refugee communities

ECBOs typically serve clients from their own communities, but vary greatly in size, scope, governance, and funding sources. ECBOs themselves are quite distinct in the US—some are similar in form and structure to LRAs themselves and often draw funding from ORR and other federal sources, while others are more akin to the grassroots organizations, and closer to the communities they are situated within. ECBOs supplement the breadth of support services that LRAs provide with culturally relevant care, delivering services more effectively (Gonzalez Benson 2021). For example, ECBOs typically offer services in a neighborhood where their populations live, use a familiar language, follow cultural expectations (e.g., serving elderly populations outside of normal drop-in hours because of the community's respect for elders in their community), and advocate for community needs (Gonzalez Benson 2021).

While conventional theories describe ECBOs as playing a social and cultural role in their community members' lives through mutual aid and community-building work, they do much more. ECBOs engage in a range of welfare-support activities (Gonzalez Benson 2020), help people navigate healthcare systems (Gonzalez Benson et al. 2019), provide culturally preferred emergency response services (Pimental Walker et al. 2022), and create a place to connect with others from the same geographic or religious background (Allen 2010). Although ECBOs play an integral role in serving resettled refugee populations, they are often undercounted in research because of their informal and grassroots nature (Gleeson and Bloemraad 2011) and they may struggle to secure funding for their work and recognition from the state (Gonzalez Benson 2022). Moreover, while there are many public-private partnerships between government agencies and nonprofits (Trudeau 2008), many ECBOs do not have nonprofit status.

[4] While Welcoming America targets the broader immigrant population, this organization is included here because refugee populations are within the scope of populations they serve.

2.3 Insurgent planning

LCGs and city planners control the production and use of space. In doing so, they have taken different approaches in working across diverse populations and "managing difference" (Sandercock 1998). For cities with diverse populations, planning can be increasingly difficult:

> As new and more complex kinds of ethnic diversity come to dominate cities, the very notion of a 'shared interest' becomes increasingly exhausted. These struggles over belonging take the form of struggles over citizenship, in its broadest sense, of rights to and in the polis. (Sandercock 1998: 15)

These sites of struggle can be "spaces of insurgent citizenship," a term coined by James Holston (1995). Spaces of insurgent citizenship form when new residents claim space, which may result in disruptions and disagreements. Sites "are found at the intersection of these processes of expansion and erosion" (Holston 1995: 44). Building on the idea of insurgent citizenship, Holston (1995) defined IP as resisting the modernist liberal planning paradigm.[5] Over the past 30 years, scholars have redefined what IP means. Huq (2020) reviewed scholarship on IP and radical planning, defining IP practices as ones that recognize city planning's dirty history with a "shared commitment to spatial justice" (373). IP occurs through "people and organizations and agencies who are practicing a radical, democratic, and multicultural planning in the interstices of power, sometimes in the face of power, and sometimes (although less often) from positions of state power" (Sandercock 1998: 129 in Huq 2020).

IP encourages a rethinking of what community engagement and participation look like in an era of austerity urbanism (Miraftab 2009). Drawing on the IP literature, Huq identified three features of IP. First, IP is grounded in civil society, not the state (Friedmann 2003 in Huq 2020). Not all scholars agree. Miraftab claims that IP can occur in both invited and invented spaces: invited spaces are formal channels created by governments and nonprofit organizations (they are legitimized by donors and government), while invented spaces are "those collective actions by the poor that directly confront the authorities and challenge the status quo" (Miraftab 2009: 39–41). Second, IP relies on the knowledge of historically marginalized social groups. This knowledge leads to practices that "enact equality and disrupt the dominant production of space, creating possibilities to generate new urban meanings and relations" (García-Lamarca 2017). Lastly, practice is the unit of analysis in IP (Huq 2020). Multiple scholars explain that IP is about *practices*, not actors: the same actors can be engaged in both IP and non-IP practices as their contexts and environments change (Miraftab 2017). Additionally, Miraftab characterizes the guiding practices of IP as counter-hegemonic, transgressive, and imaginative (Miraftab 2009). IP practices "are counter-hegemonic in that they destabilize the normalized order of things" (Miraftab 2009: 33). Those who follow this approach insist on citizens' rights to rebel against the status quo (which often does not serve them) and determine their own terms of engagement and participation. Miraftab explains that IP is transgressive when planners span both "formal and informal arenas of politics and invited/invented spaces of citizenship practice" and consider residents' histories in their practice (Miraftab 2009: 46). Lastly, engaging in IP practices signals a vision for a different future.

2.4 Gaps in the literature and research questions

As previously stated, Ager and Strang's conceptual framework seeks to remove barriers to integration via policy. The goal of IP practices are to challenge and change existing planning paradigms, and thus, policy. But how effective is policy when enacted through top-down planning processes? Existing studies show that planners and other government officials have various degrees of success when engaging with refugee populations, but when refugee community leaders are involved in planning processes, community engagement processes may be more successful (Allen and Slotterback 2021). This study addresses the following research questions:

[5] There is disagreement in the field as to what constitutes IP. For example, "evil insurgents" might be White supremacists or right-wing parties (Davy 2019).

1) How is the welcoming work that LCGs engage in perceived and experienced by refugees?
2) Do ECBOs use tenets of IP to meet the needs of their communities, and if so, how?

3. Methods

To answer these research questions, the lead author conducted a qualitative study focusing on two counties: Erie County, New York and Kent County, Michigan. The main city in Erie County is Buffalo, a rust belt city with a history of immigration and population decline. In Kent County, the two main cities are Grand Rapids and Kentwood, which border one another. Buffalo and the Grand Rapids/Kentwood area are both the second-largest cities in the state.

To select these two counties, the lead author narrowed down the list of cities in the US where over 3,000 refugees resettled between fiscal years 2012 and 2016 (Refugee Processing Center n. d.).[6] The sites were selected based on variables that impact refugees' resettlement experiences, as described in Ager and Strang's Conceptual Framework of Integration (see Table 1, and outlined above).[7] While transportation is not included in Ager and Strang's framework, transportation variables were included given the transportation-related challenges refugees face (Bose 2014; Szajna and Ward 2015; Okour 2019; Smith et al. 2022). In addition to using Refugee Processing Center and ACS data, the lead author conducted a search of local and state policies that explicitly pertain to immigrant and refugee populations. Examples include a welcome plan specifically for immigrant populations, an Office of New Americans (ONA),[8] or an immigrant advisory board that provides feedback to a government.

Erie County and Kent County provide various similarities and contrasts (see Table 1), and selecting these two counties allows for a comparison of state-, county-, and municipal-level policies. Both counties have generally been welcoming of refugee populations and have seen increases in foreign-born populations in recent years. Many in leadership positions, for instance, have spoken in favor of welcoming refugees. In Erie County, former Mayor Byron Brown verbally supported refugees, claiming a Mayor's National Day of Immigration (City of Buffalo 2017). Both previous mayors of Grand Rapids (George Heartwell, a Republican, in this position from 2004 to 2015 and the mayor at the time of this research and Rosalynn Bliss, a Democrat, in this position from 2016 to 2024) spoke publicly about their support for refugee populations. Heartwell and Bliss stated that it is important, and part of American values, to welcome those fleeing violence and persecution (Stateside Staff 2015; Muyskens 2017). Both the City of Buffalo and Kent County are part of a global network of local governments, hosted by Welcoming America.

Data included twenty-seven semi-structured interviews, a focus group, and document review. Semi-structured interviews explore the "perceptions, experiences and attitudes" of participants that are often not captured in plans or other written documents (Harvey-Jordan and Long 2001). Twenty-seven interviews, averaging 47 minutes, were conducted between April 2021 and December 2022[9] with stakeholders involved both directly and indirectly with refugee populations. Interviews were conducted over Zoom, phone, and in person, and the focus group occurred in person. Stakeholders represented LRAs, municipal, county, and state governments, ECBOs, and other nonprofits that serve refugee communities (see Table 2 for breakdown by site). Subjects were recruited through stratified purposeful and snowball sampling to identify actors

[6] These data were what were available at the time. While cases are at the county level, data on how many refugees resettle in localities are only available at the city level.

[7] The lead author looked at the following employment and economic variables (part of what Ager and Strang call "markers and means"): the percent employed civilian population 16 years and over in manufacturing (to understand low-income employment), unemployment rate for civilian population in labor force 16 years and over (to understand general unemployment), and income below poverty level (to see the city-level poverty rates). Additionally, Ager and Strang include housing under "markers and means," so gross rent as percent of household income in the past 12 months was included to understand how affordable housing is.

[8] The term New American includes all immigrants, including refugees. It may be used instead of refugee or immigrant for two reasons. First, there are municipal and county offices that aim to serve all immigrant populations, including refugees, often with the term in the title. Second, some people with refugee backgrounds have expressed a want to not use the term refugee, as it brings back a stressful period in their lives and have expressed a preference for the term New American instead.

[9] The COVID-19 pandemic caused delays in data collection.

Table 1. City-level data[a] derived from Ager and Strang's conceptual framework of integration.

	Employment			**Housing**	**Transportation**		**Foreign-born population**	**Local/state integration policy**		
	% Employed civilian population 16 years and over in manufacturing	Unemployment rate for civilian population in labor force 16 years and over	Income below poverty level	Gross rent as 10%–29% of household income in the past 12 months ($)	Population density (per sq. mile)	% uses public transit for work	Foreign-born population	Office of New Americans or New Americans Policy	Sanctuary City/County/ State Policy	Plans or studies for new Americans
Buffalo, NY	8.80%	9.90%	25.90%	36.70%	6,413	11.90%	8.94%	Yes, local + state	None	City New Americans Study
Grand Rapids, MI	16.10%	8.50%	17.70%	38.90%	4,367	4.10%	9.98%	Yes, state	Kent County (2019)	Kent County Welcome Plan

[a] The analysis was conducted at the county level to capture work at the city and county levels.

Table 2. Sector and location of interviewees.

Sectors	Location		
	Erie County, NY	Kent County, MI	Total
ECBO	3	4	7
State	4	7	11
LRA	2	4	6
NGO	3	0	3
Total	12	15	27

across organizations and institutions who were knowledgeable about refugee populations. Community partners from refugee populations in each county helped to connect to potential interviewees as well. At the end of each interview, the lead researcher asked whether there was anyone else they recommend she speak to. Interview questions generally asked about the respondent's organization and scope of work, how aspects of the city impact people's experiences and success of integration, and the role of LCGs in refugee resettlement.

Interviews and the focus group were transcribed and coded utilizing strategies from thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is a way of seeing, allowing the researcher to move through information in such a way as to share insights with others and make sense out of materials (Boyatzis 1998: 1–5). Starting with a deductive approach, the lead author used an initial codebook based on Ager and Strang's conceptual framework of integration, adding codes inductively as themes emerged from the interviews (Bernard and Ryan 1998: 498). Interview transcripts were coded and reread until themes emerged. Dedoose software was utilized for coding. As the primary researcher was an outsider to the refugee community, findings were fact-checked by refugee community leaders in each locality to ensure that the findings were valid (Ziersch et al. 2019).

Planning documents drafted explicitly for refugee and immigrant populations were also reviewed. In Kent County, this was the Kent County Welcome Plan (KCWP), and in Buffalo, this was the New Americans Study. In reviewing the plans, the lead author gauged the extent to which city governments engage and serve refugee communities and the priorities they laid out. While this does not provide a thorough understanding of how municipalities take part in supporting refugees, official plans and policy documents indicate how immigrants are being included in local decision-making or considered in resource allocation. They also suggest municipalities'—and in theory, communities'—long-term vision for the inclusion of refugees and immigrants.

4. Findings/Discussion

4.1 LCGs: failed attempts at meeting the needs of refugee residents

LCGs in Kent and Erie Counties engaged in welcoming work through different avenues. Kent County published the KCWP explicitly for immigrant and refugee populations. In preparing the plan, the welcome plan coordinator hosted focus groups to discern refugees' priorities and what was holding them back from achieving their priorities (Caudill et al. 2020: 32). Participants included a range of people across country of origin (33 countries were represented), age, professional occupation, immigration status, and English proficiency (Caudill et al. 2020: 32). A county employee reflects on the robust data collection:

> There were 800 surveys, 25 focus groups … the folks at Welcoming America, the team that we received the grant from, they are like … your guys' data is insane. We just got a lot of feedback and a lot of information from our New American community here to focus on what was an actual priority. (Interviewee 16)

The plan states that "results were then articulated into a welcome plan" (Caudill et al. 2020: 9). Despite robust data collection, there was disagreement about what ended up in the plan. A LCG representative reflects on this:

> As far as the Mexican community, [they were] very clear on [proposing] driver's license for all and others were similar. … Then [we had to think about] really being a voice, because things get whitewashed. Driver's license for all didn't make it in one of the recommendations. I was really furious about that, but then I just got outvoted. "Okay, well this is stuff we can do locally. We don't want it to get too political." I'm like, "We don't want to have courage." I just didn't agree with it. I was like, "This is what they said, what we ought to do." They did put it in the appendix, buried in the back, this was the thing, but we want to focus on what we could do locally. (Interviewee 23)

Instead of advocating for community member concerns, authors of the report handpicked priorities. A note at the end of the plan states, "Latinx focus group participants particularly expressed their fear and lack of faith in the law enforcement system and officials. They stressed safety, specifically for Latinx community members, and access to driver's licenses for all as priorities" (Caudill et al. 2020: 33).[10]

Still, the plan included various priorities identified by the community. Immigrants and refugees expressed distrust and fear of police, which was addressed by the following priority: "Ensure All Kent County Residents Are and Feel Safe" with the goal of "enhanc[ing] relationships and communication between New Americans and law enforcement to better serve and protect the community and keep officers safe" (Caudill et al. 2020: 28). Tragically, in 2022, Patrick Lyoya, a refugee from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, was killed by an on-duty police officer which further highlighted the fear and distrust of police. County staff involved in creating and implementing the plan reported that the COVID-19 pandemic sidetracked implementation of welcome plan recommendations, which is why this had not been addressed. Furthermore, refugee community members did not see the plan as something for them. One refugee community leader said: "So when something is coming from the government, families are suspicious. When you say welcome plan and [it] is not stamped by a community leader or by their religious leader or anything, they just go through the motions" (Interviewee 21). Unfortunately, despite the substantial time, resources, and community engagement invested in the creation of the plan, our interviews revealed skepticism and frustration from the refugee community.

In Erie County, welcoming work has occurred mainly at the city level through the New Americans Study and the subsequent creation of the ONA. The purpose of the New Americans Study was to "attract and retain the wealth of talent that is arriving from other countries, facilitate the creation and expansion of economic opportunities, and ensure that the city continues to support its newest residents" (City of Buffalo 2016: 1). Preparation of the study involved collecting data on refugee and immigrant populations, conducting focus groups, and conducting over sixty interviews that "focused on assessing needs, barriers, strengths, and opportunities" (City of Buffalo 2016: 4). To understand best practices across the country, the researchers conducted a literature review based on twenty-five indicators brought up in focus groups and interviews (City of Buffalo 2016: 5). Twenty-seven strategies were identified and organized into the categories of "welcoming, settling in, strengthening, and moving forward" (City of Buffalo 2016: 5).

The ONA was created to implement many strategies outlined in the New American Study. The study describes the ONA as "prepared to engage with Ethnic Community-Based Organizations, nonprofit agencies, educational institutions, foundations, faith and community groups, local businesses, and other stakeholders to implement these strategies" (City of Buffalo 2016: 7). Examples of strategies include increasing language access, establishing a community space, expanding employment programs, and facilitating professional careers (City of Buffalo

[10] We recognize that at the time of the writing of the Kent County New Americans Study, many Latinx residents likely did not arrive with refugee status. Yet, these examples are included as they are instances of different priorities in the plan versus immigrant community needs.

2016: 8–16). City documents indicate that the ONA will "regularly meet with refugee and immigrant community members to assess and better understand the goals and needs of the population, and how we can best serve them" (City of Buffalo n.d.). The previous director of the ONA, who was in her position for about 6 years, did indeed start the Office's work by actively making connections with the community:

> [W]hen I started, the key was the connection … so my first and best contact was a community police officer in the Buffalo Police Department who really had a good relationship, had gone to the annual event of World Refugee Day, had been invited regularly to immigrant community events, who had a good relationship with immigrant community organizations at Buffalo State College. So, he was my first kind of, "Let me introduce you to who we know so far." And then from there, it just became a steady stream. The organizations would tell other organizations like, "Hey, there's a contact." And so, the first year was really developing relationships. It was like a meet and greet all the time … And so, I would go and introduce myself and say, "The city wants to be available to you. We want you to take advantage of the resources that everybody can." (Interviewee 9)

Despite the many connections the ONA director was able to make across the refugee community in Buffalo, she realized quickly that the power and mandate of the ONA did not allow them to address the many needs the refugee groups presented:

> The problem for me personally was the issues that they had were not services that the City did … I would say to people I met, 'Bring me the problem and I will work on it.' That's kind of what I did at the office. I was given a lot of freedom to work on things, I think because it wasn't a specific department … So it's good and bad, right? … But because I'm not a specific department, I don't have a budget, I don't have staff. (Interviewee 9)

Despite having flexibility to work with refugees on topics important to them, the ONA does not have adequate resources because the ONA is not in the city charter. The City of Buffalo has "departments that are mandated, and organized, and structured via the City of Buffalo Charter" (Interviewee 9), which was formed in the 1800s. It is a unique set of laws that mandate departments, dictating what the city provides and has control over. Without an amendment to the charter to include the ONA as an office, resources are limited. When the new director of the ONA was asked if it would make more sense for the ONA to be at the county level, he replied, "Yes, it would" (Interviewee 9). Without a mandate and recognition in the city charter, politics came before actual, tangible assistance for refugee communities, and at the time of this writing, the ONA has no staff.

Few interviewees in Erie County commented on the New American Study, which may suggest its limited impact in the community. One leader in resettlement in Buffalo critiqued the plan as follows:

> It isn't really a plan. It doesn't really look at the city's role, which is what it should have done. It is kind of a dumb thing … the best of it is that it's an external signal that the mayor cares about refugees, that he created this [ONA] office, that he stands at the podium and raises the flag from Burma on the appropriate day and goes to the events and things like that … . The worst of it … is that it doesn't really have a focus. And it hasn't, anyway, worked with the [resettlement] agencies at all. (Interviewee 12)

Interviews with ECBOs suggest that there has been little if any implementation and no accountability. Unsurprisingly, ECBO leaders in Buffalo also did not bring up the New Americans Study or the actions it proposes, likely because it was published over 5 years before research interviews took place, and because the ONA—which was mandated to carry out the plan's strategies—had been vacant for over a year. Furthermore, none of the ECBO leaders interviewed discussed being involved in the data collection that shaped the New Americans Study, despite being prominent refugee community leaders.

Ultimately, as these interviews and plan reviews suggest, the KCWP and the City of Buffalo New Americans Study are welcoming efforts with substantive staff time behind them, but refugee communities express frustration from the misalignment between what the plans paid out as priorities and where authority lay in acting on these priorities. In the next section, we analyze how ECBOs more effectively reach refugee populations following the tenets of IP.

4.2 Grassroots ECBOs: using IP practices effectively to reach refugee populations

IP practices often involve non-state actors to address issues of power and justice. In this section, we explore how ECBOs engage in multicultural IP to deliver services, filling gaps left by LCGs and addressing issues of justice. We outline how ECBOs practice Miraftab's three guiding principles of IP: they are counter-hegemonic, transgressive, and imaginative (Miraftab 2009).

4.2.1 ECBOs as counter-hegemonic

IP practices "are counter-hegemonic in that they destabilize the normalized order of things" (Miraftab 2009: 33). Those who work in a counter-hegemonic way insist on citizens' rights to rebel from the status quo (which often does not serve them) and to determine their own terms of engagement and participation. ECBO leaders meet their constituents in the ways in which community members want to engage—whether it be by contacting them in appropriate ways, such as through WhatsApp, or creating representation within existing government structures, like the refugee advisory board of the Office of Global Michigan. An ECBO in Erie County (led by an ethnic group whose members arrived as refugees) hosts weekly walk-in hours for refugee residents to ask questions, have mail translated, and seek assistance for a variety of issues. One ECBO leader reflects on how he chose to engage with their community in a way that was effective for the people his organization served:

> And we did food distribution, culturally appropriate. A lot of people in our community are vegetarian. So, a lot of food that was served in food banks was meat. The thing that we don't eat. So, we bought food from local stores and distributed that, and that was on Facebook. (Interviewee 14)

This ECBO leader saw that one social service that serves the broader community was insufficient for his community, and worked to fill this gap. This interviewee goes on to share how the ECBO bridged relationships with LCGs as well:

> So [we at] the [ECBO organization], we brought the Sheriff's office in our community, the City of Kentwood Police Department in our community, and also we went there … in their agency and talked about our community too. So we, like the smaller organizations like ours, have done that [reached out to other institutions to form connections]. And a lot of organizations who are in positions of power and have the capacity haven't seen that as a need [to broker relationships with ECBOs]. But we saw that as a need. So we did [it on] our own. And I wish that could be done with other refugee and immigrant communities. (Interviewee 14)

While the services mentioned here may be offered through other state agencies or LRAs, refugee clients are more receptive to services at an ECBO due to the ECBO's familiarity with language and culture. For example, ECBOs may uphold cultural expectations that younger people will help older people and be at a location close to where people from their community live. By listening deeply in an empathetic way, while reflecting on their own positions of privilege, ECBO leaders engaged with community members on their own terms.

4.2.2 ECBO work as transgressive

When planners foster the transgressive principle of IP, they span both "invited and invented spaces" (Miraftab 2009). Invited spaces are those that involve citizen participation but have been authorized and encouraged by political authorities, while invented spaces are "those collective

actions by the poor that directly confront the authorities and challenge the status quo" (Miraftab 2009: 35–9). In this section, we share examples of both.

Throughout interviews, many examples of invited spaces were included and interviewees conveyed the transgressive nature of ECBOs' work with the broader refugee community. Community leaders bring language knowledge and cultural familiarity, and refugee families place trust in them due to their familiar background and experiences. In Kent County, two nonprofits recognized the important role of refugee community leaders, and hired them to serve as a liaison between schools and families. A representative from the org said:

> Schools will call and say there was a behavioral issue today for a student we serve, because we are the emergency contact. We clear any student linked to us with the school district, with permission of parents. They reach out and ask if we will help connect directly with parents, rather than the traditional way where they would contract with an interpreter and do it themselves. So, we are the middleman that helps to make that connection. (Interviewee 20)

This respondent went on to say that families often reach out to their contact to ask questions and seek assistance with issues unrelated to school, such as housing, purchasing a car, or navigating emergency food services. A relationship is already established as the refugee community leader knows the family, and can deliver culturally appropriate and effective services.

Another nonprofit hires refugee community leaders to work with community members across a range of issues. A focus group participant shared that her client was dealing with Children's Protective Services (CPS). She served as a cultural broker, not solely as an interpreter:

> [T]hey are trying to keep away the mom and dad, separate and take the kids to CPS. I said no. I stepped in. I said that I work for this woman through [non-profit]. I talked to CPS. … CPS didn't like me at all [laughs]. I said that we grew up in war. Hitting, kicking, biting, domestic violence, it is not accepted in this country. But we are used to seeing it. Sometimes when you are holding something, like when you do not express it, sometimes aggression happens. Sometimes abuse happens …. Then the doctor diagnosed that he [the father] had severe depression, he even tried to kill himself. He has been on medication for six months and now the [CPS] case is closed. (Focus Group Respondent)

While some LCGs have language access programs so that translation is provided, refugee community members can provide cultural context. Without representation from an ECBO leader, this family's story could have been very different. Having a cultural broker to explain cultural norms and expectations ensured that this family could stay together and helped the family understand that violent behavior is punishable by law in the US. Working with a community leader allowed community members to have an advocate, someone who can navigate complex systems and work as a liaison.

State actors can also engage in IP practices through transgressive means, again creating "invited spaces." In Michigan, the state refugee coordinator initiated a state-level refugee advisory board called the Michigan Immigrant and Refugee Council (MIARC). The advisory board sits within the Office of Global Michigan, a state agency housed within the State Refugee Coordinator's office. The commission aims to improve accessibility and inclusivity within Michigan's programs by engaging with communities and legislative bodies to address key priorities. Their work centers on community involvement, supporting immigrants and refugees and empowering them to thrive in their new communities. Through collaboration, the MIARC advocates for fair policies, provides essential services, and promotes cultural understanding, recognizing the positive impacts immigrant and refugee populations have on the State of Michigan.

ECBOs also work to invent spaces of citizenship, although only one invented spaces came up in this study. In Kent County, the Bhutanese Community of Michigan (BCM) took proactive steps to support vulnerable populations during the early days of the COVID-19 pandemic. In mid-April 2020, BCM became the first organization in the area to deliver essential supplies, such as face masks and hand sanitizer, directly to households with senior citizens, prioritizing their safety

and well-being. Recognizing the unique needs of its community, BCM partnered with local grocery stores to provide culturally familiar foods to residents, ensuring that community members could maintain their dietary customs despite the challenges of the pandemic. In collaboration with the Kent County Health Department, BCM helped streamline the vaccination process, focusing on those facing transportation difficulties or language barriers, to ensure equitable access to vaccinations.

4.2.3 ECBO work as imaginative

The final principle of IP is that it is imaginative. Those engaged in IP can dream of a different future, hold on to hope, and persevere in their work toward that future. After being forced to flee their homes and coming to the US, where the resettlement system that is intended to support them is inadequate, refugees may experience despair. Yet ECBO leaders maintain hope for their communities. One community leader reflects on how she continues to push for what she believes in, despite an inadequate resettlement system:

> I'm always pushing for the ideal change. I'm not going to be grateful for being allowed to breathe when we don't have housing, when we don't have all these other things …. Many [resettlement agency] spaces I've been a part of do not have a lot of former refugees—which is [where] a lot of the executive-level decision making [takes place]. (Interviewee 17)

Other refugee community leaders report that this outlook is not common among the broader refugee community. Many want to get by, live their lives, and support their children. Some do not see the point of civic engagement, voting, or concern themselves with larger societal issues (Interviewee 21). But community leaders imagine a different future and work toward achieving it. The activities they engage in show this: they make their voices heard through state-level advisory councils, work within and push against systems that prioritize the dominant community, and serve as representatives of their communities.

4.2.4 Limitations and challenges of ECBOs and ECBO leaders

Of course, ECBO leaders have limitations. Leaders may have more educational experience, may be from a higher caste, may have had more financial resources and higher standards of living in their previous life, may be from the city (unlike those who live in rural places and refugee camps), or may belong to different religious groups. One ECBO leader reflects on the discovery that none of the children in the program he runs have fathers, as their mothers were victims of rape:

> Every Saturday we have meetings here. There was a particular group, about 15 students here, and I said, "Okay, I want you to take this form home, ask your parents to sign these forms. I need to have them back because they have to sign these forms for you to be in the program. And somebody said, 'Why don't you tell us, 'Ask your moms to sign these forms?' I said, 'What does that mean? Parents, dad or mom could sign it.' He said, 'No. None of us has a dad.'" I knew a lot of them didn't have any dad, but not one out of 15 kids, how is that possible?

While this ECBO leader is from the same country of origin as the participants in the program he runs, he has a very different background. He and his family members came to the US as immigrants, not refugees, have high levels of educational attainment and are religious leaders. Despite heterogeneity, unfortunately, those from outside the refugee community sometimes view refugees as a homogenous group.[11] Various lived experiences and backgrounds demonstrate that ECBO leaders cannot always speak on behalf of all the diverse members of their communities—but they often do, for a variety of reasons.

Additionally, being an ECBO leader can be emotionally taxing. They may work with community members who have experienced trauma, are in difficult situations, have mental and

[11] For example, in Buffalo, Karen people are often considered Burmese, even though they are distinct ethnic groups.

physical challenges, live in a system that does not support them, and receive calls from community members at all hours. One community leader reflects on how this work impacts her:

> You can be strong in front of them, but yourself, you are weak. So, I need to take time, take space, and sometimes I just go to the river and scream so loud and cry. I need to check and see if there is anyone in this park [laughing]? Any kids will be around me seeing me before I scream? I just park in my car and check if there is anyone around me. We are not allowed to cry so loud in our cultures or in our families. (Focus Group Respondent)

She further noted that a system that does not sufficiently support her community members and does not take time to understand cultural differences can magnify her challenges and sense of frustration.

Lastly, on top of navigating challenging life situations, ECBO leaders may be new to the US system themselves and need to learn how to navigate bureaucratic systems to get things done. One ECBO leader reflects:

> Those who are working in the system already are much more ahead of us … . We know what the issues are in the community, but we don't know how to identify which part of the system is failing and who is in charge of that, being able to problem map and figure out what's the strategy. Who is the person? Where should we be focusing? Which system is leading into the problem that we're seeing on the ground? It's all intertwined. (Interviewee 17)

ECBO leaders ensure that their community members have their basic needs met and their rights respected, but must they do this within a system that they themselves are simultaneously learning about. Without connections in places of power, ECBO leaders may be limited in the leverages they have to make more structural changes and to assist their community members.

5. Discussion and conclusion

Ager and Strang (2008) share a conceptual framework of integration that, while comprehensive, relies on policy to address the needs of refugees, but IP can be a way to address challenges refugees face. One might question whether those working in LCGs can engage in IP practices. According to Huq (2020), "the evolving literature on IP has shifted away from an analysis of insurgent *actors* to a contextualized exploration of insurgent *practices*" (386). While the literature on IP has yet to document a LCG staff who has engaged in IP practices, it is not out of the question. We explore how LCGs manage diverse communities by examining the welcoming work they engage in to support refugee populations. While data collection was extensive through the KCWP and ONA, unfortunately, refugees and immigrants do not see these types of efforts as useful to their communities. In contrast, ECBOs, which are naturally closer to immigrant and refugee communities, effectively meet the needs of their communities through practices of IP. While some collaborate with LCGs and nonprofits, they also work in their own invented spaces to meet the needs of the populations they serve.

LCGs should recognize the critical importance of representation and engagement with community leaders, especially within refugee communities, as they may be skeptical of governments due to past experiences. Those engaged in welcoming work need to develop deeper listening skills and incorporate inclusive perspectives into planning processes, rather than merely ticking boxes on paper. Refugee resettlement work is often politicized, and policymakers hesitate to prioritize or commit resources to these efforts. The resulting policies look supportive in theory but fall short in practice. This gap frequently stems from a lack of trust and cultural understanding between policymakers and ECBOs, as well as limited relationships with ECBO leaders.

While it is not traditionally within the routine practices of LCG professionals to engage in in-depth intercultural partnership methods, they can rely on the ECBOs in their local areas to effectively reach and support refugee communities, fostering more meaningful and impactful community planning. Now, more than ever, it is crucial that entities outside of LRAs support

refugees. With Trump's order to close resettlement to the US, LRAs will not have sufficient funding to exist, as they did during the last Trump administration (Mathema and Carratala 2020). ECBOs continue doing this work throughout federal changes to resettlement.

Conflict of interest. None declared.

Funding

Rackham Candidate Research Grant, Rackham Graduate School, University of Michigan.
Kaufman Scholarship, Food Systems Planning and Healthy Communities Lab, University at Buffalo.

References

Ager, A., and Strang, A. (2008) 'Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21: 166–91. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen016

Allen, R. (2010) 'The Bonding and Bridging Roles of Religious Institutions for Refugees in a Non-Gateway Context', *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 33: 1049–68. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870903118130

Allen, R., and Slotterback, C. S. (2021) 'Building Immigrant Engagement Practice in Urban Planning: The Case of Somali Refugees in the Twin Cities', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 43: 740–55. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/07352166.2017.1360745

Barkoff, S. et al. (2025) 'State Department Enacts Widespread Layoffs, Cutting 1,353 Staff as Part of Reorganization', *CBS News*, <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/state-department-trump-administration-start-layoffs-in-coming-days/>, accessed 15 July 2025.

Bernard, H. R., and Ryan, G. W. (1998) 'Text Analysis: Qualitative and Quantitative Methods', in H. Russell Bernard (ed.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Cultural Anthropology Qualitative Research*, pp. 595–646. Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press.

Bose, P. S. (2014) 'Refugees in Vermont: Mobility and Acculturation in a New Immigrant Destination', *Journal of Transport Geography*, 36: 151–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2014.03.016

Bose, P. S. (2020) *Refugees in New Destinations and Small Cities: Resettlement in Vermont*. Singapore: Palgrave Macmillan.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998) *Transforming Qualitative Information: Thematic Analysis and Code Development*. SAGE.

Caudill, P. et al. (2020) *Kent County Welcome Plan*. <https://www.grandrapidsmi.gov/files/assets/public/departments/diversity-andinclusion/ files/new-folder-2/gateways-for-growth-welcome-plan-kent-county-book- _final_web.pdf>, accessed 9 October 2024.

Church World Service. (2025) *Impact of the 'One Big Beautiful Bill' (OBBB) on Refugees and ORR-eligible Humanitarian Entrants*. <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1V2Iy-8F3Y63zQ2qOUHmDEWPH0rDiBnpAPSZpXDq-2Ak/edit? tab=t.0>, accessed 9 July 2025.

City of Buffalo. (2016) *City of Buffalo New Americans Study*. <https://www.buffalony.gov/DocumentCenter/View/2135/City-of-Buffalo-New-Americans-2016-Study-PDF? bidId=>, accessed 9 October 2024.

City of Buffalo. (2017) 'Mayor Brown Proclaims Today U.S. Conference Of Mayor's National Day of Immigration Action in Buffalo'. Buffalo, NY. https://www.buffalony.gov/CivicAlerts.aspx? AID=96, accessed 16 July 2025.

City of Buffalo. (n.d.). '*Office of New Americans*'. *City of Buffalo*. <https://www.buffalony.gov/422/Office-of-New-Americans>, accessed 20 August 2024.

Davy, B. (2019) 'Evil Insurgency. A Comment on the Interface "Strengthening Planning's EffectivEeness in A Hyper-Polarized World"', *Planning Theory & Practice*, 20: 290–7. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2019.1600290

Fix, M, Hooper, K., and Zong, J. (2017) *How Are Refugees Faring? Integration at U.S. and State Levels*. Washington, D.C.: Migration Policy Institute. <https://www.migrationpolicy.org/sites/default/files/publications/TCM-Asylum-USRefugeeIntegration-FINAL.pdf>, accessed 9 October 2024.

Furuseth, O, Smith, H., and Mcdaniel, P. (2015) 'Belonging in Charlotte: Multiscalar Differences in Local Immigration Politics and Policies', *Geographical Review*, 105: 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1931-0846.2014.12048.x

García-Lamarca, M. (2017) 'From Occupying Plazas to Recuperating Housing: Insurgent Practices in Spain', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 41: 37–53. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12386

Gleeson, S., and Bloemraad, I. (2011) 'Where Are All the Immigrant Organizations? Reassessing the Scope of Civil Society for Immigrant Communities'. Berkeley, USA: Institute for Research on Labor and Employment.

Gonzalez Benson, O. (2020) 'Welfare Support Activities of Grassroots Refugee-Run Community Organizations: A Reframing', *Journal of Community Practice*, 28: 1–17. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705422.2020.1716427

Gonzalez Benson, O. (2021) 'Refugee-Run Grassroots Organizations: Responsive Assistance beyond the Constraints of US Resettlement Policy', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34: 2124–41. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feaa010

Gonzalez Benson, O. (2022) 'Shadows of the Shadow State: Grassroots, Refugee-Led Organizations within a Multi-Scalar and Contested Resettlement Institutional Domain', *Environment and Planning C: Politics and Space*, 40: 1745–62. https://doi.org/10.1177/23996544221106303

Gonzalez Benson, O. et al. (2019) 'A Framework for Ancillary Health Services Provided by Refugee- and Immigrant-Run CBOs: Language Assistance, Systems Navigation, and Hands-on Support', *Journal of Community Medicine & Health Education*, 9: 1–5.

Harvey-Jordan, S., and Long, S. (2001) 'The Process and the Pitfalls of Semi-Structured Interviews', *Community Practitioner: The Journal of the Community Practitioners' & Health Visitors' Association*, 74: 219–21. Maidstone: Media Shed.

Holston, J. (1995) 'Spaces of Insurgent Citizenship', *Planning Theory*, 13: 35–51.

Huq, E. (2020) 'Seeing the Insurgent in Transformative Planning Practices', *Planning Theory*, 19: 371–91. SAGE Publications. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095219901290

Lester, T. W., and Nguyen, M. T. (2016) 'The Economic Integration of Immigrants and Regional Resilience', *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 38: 42–60. https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12205

Mathema, S., and Carratala, S. (2020) *Rebuilding the U.S. Refugee Program for the 21st Century*. Center for American Progress. <https://www.americanprogress.org/article/rebuilding-u-s-refugee-program-21st-century/>, accessed 15 July 2024.

McDaniel, P, Xiomara Rodriguez, D., and Kim, A. J. (2017) 'Receptivity and the Welcoming Cities Movement: Advancing a Regional Immigrant Integration Policy Framework in Metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia', *Papers in Applied Geography*, 3: 355–79. https://www.tandfonline.com/action/showCitFormats? doi=10.1080/23754931.2017.1367957

Miraftab, F. (2009) 'Insurgent Planning: Situating Radical Planning in the Global South', *Journal of Planning Theory*, 8: 32–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/1473095208099297

Miraftab, F. (2017) 'Insurgent Practices and Decolonization of Future(s)', in M. Gunder, A. Madanipour, and V. Watson (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Planning Theory*, pp. 276–88. New York: Routledge.

Mulvey, G. (2015) 'Refugee Integration Policy: The Effects of UK Policy-Making on Refugees in Scotland', *Journal of Social Policy*, 44: 357–75. https://doi.org/10.1017/S004727941500001X

Muyskens, C. (2017) *Mayor Bliss and Governor Snyder Respond to Refugee Ban*. Calvin University Chimes. https://calvinchimes.org/2017/02/03/bliss-and-snyder-respond/

Okour, Y. (2019) *Understanding the Transportation Experiences of Refugees: A Case Study of Iraqi and Syrian Refugees in Erie County, NY*. https://ubir.buffalo.edu/xmlui/handle/10477/79318?show=full

Walker, A. P. P. et al. (2022) 'Participatory Action Research in Times of Coronavirus Disease 2019: Adapting Approaches with Refugee-Led Community-Based Organizations', *Progress in Community Health Partnerships: Research, Education, and Action*, 16: 69–76. Johns Hopkins University Press.

Refugee Processing Center. (n.d.). 'Refugee Processing Center'.

Sandercock, L. (1998) *Towards Cosmopolis*. West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons.

Smith, C. et al. (2022) 'Making of Home: Transportation Mobility and Well-Being among Tucson Refugees', *Journal of Transport Geography*, 103: 103409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2022.103409

Stateside Staff (Director). (2015) *Fear or Freedom: Grand Rapids Mayor Makes Case for Welcoming Syrian Refugees*. In Interlochen Public Radio. <https://www.interlochenpublicradio.org/around-michigan-state-government/2015-11-19/fear-or-freedom-grand-rapids-mayor-makes-case-for-welcoming-syrian-refugees>, accessed 6 June 2023.

Strang, A. B., and Quinn, N. (2021) 'Integration or Isolation? Refugees' Social Connections and Wellbeing', *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 34: 328–53. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fez040

Szajna, A., and Ward, J. (2015) 'Access to Health Care by Refugees: A Dimensional Analysis', *Nursing Forum*, 50: 83–9. https://doi.org/10.1111/nuf.12051

Tang, E. (2015) *Unsettled: Cambodian Refugees in the New York City Hyperghetto*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Trudeau, D. (2008) 'Towards a Relational View of the Shadow State', *Political Geography*, 27: 669–90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2008.07.002

UNHCR. (2024) 'Global Trends Report 2023'. UNHCR. <https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends-report-2023>, accessed 2 June 2025.

UNHCR. (n.d.). 'Resettlement in the United States'. *UNHCR US*. <https://www.unhcr.org/us/what-we-do/resettlement-united-states>, accessed 27 September 2024.

Welcoming America. (n.d.). 'Welcoming Network'. <https://welcomingamerica.org/welcoming-network/>, accessed 21 October 2024.

Yi Cheung, S., and Phillimore, J. (2013) *Social Networks, Social Capital and Refugee Integration*. Cardiff University. <https://www.nuffieldfoundation.org/sites/default/files/files/Phillimore%20Refugree%20Integration%20Report.pdf>, accessed 4 April 2024.

Ziersch, A. et al. (2019) 'Conducting Ethical Research with People from Asylum Seeker and Refugee Backgrounds', in P. Liamputtong (ed.) *Handbook of Research Methods in Health Social Sciences*, pp. 1871–89. Springer: Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-5251-4_50.

Journal of Refugee Studies, 2025, 00, 1–16
https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feaf055
Original Article