

A SCOPING REVIEW OF REFUGEE ADVOCACY MODELS: MAPPING APPROACHES, STRATEGIES, AND IMPLICATIONS

^{1,2}Cifebrima Suyastri

¹Doctoral School of Sociology, International Studies Programme, Faculty of Social Sciences, Eötvös Loránd University, Pázmány Péter Sétány 1/A, 1117, Budapest, Hungary, ²Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, 28284, Indonesia

^{1,2}cifebrimasuyastri@soc.uuir.ac.id

Abstract

Advocacy models enhance refugee protection through frameworks, strategies, and initiatives. This scoping review addresses refugee advocacy models, research gaps, and effective techniques. “Refugee” and “advocacy model” were used to examine Scopus and Web of Science articles from 2013 to 2023. Journal articles, conference proceedings, case studies, regulations, policies, and English news were included. Books, review articles, non-open access articles, non-English articles, commentaries, handbooks, guidelines, and study protocols were excluded. The Nguvu intervention, among other techniques, improved refugee women’s well-being. Trump administration refugee policies and Utica, New York resettlement issues were studied. Multi-stakeholder relationships assisted northern Ethiopian refugee camps. The Nguvu intervention highlights advocacy against damaging policies. The study stresses partnerships and management techniques for transformational goals. Future research should assess the Nguvu intervention’s long-term efficacy, scalability, and new multi-stakeholder refugee advocacy model to serve varied refugee populations’ specific requirements.

Keywords: Refugee, Advocacy, Model, Methods, Policy

1. Introduction

Refugee protection remains one of the most pressing humanitarian and governance challenges in contemporary international politics. According to the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the number of forcibly displaced people has continued to increase due to armed conflicts, political instability, persecution, environmental degradation, and other complex emergencies. While international legal instruments such as the 1951 Refugee Convention and its 1967 Protocol establish normative standards for refugee protection, the implementation of these commitments varies considerably across countries. In many contexts, refugees continue to experience limited access to legal protection, healthcare, education, employment, and other essential services, particularly in countries with limited institutional capacity or those that are not parties to the Refugee Convention.

In response to these challenges, refugee advocacy has become increasingly important in strengthening refugee protection and promoting durable solutions. Governments, international organizations, non-governmental organizations, civil society organizations, and refugee-led initiatives have developed various advocacy strategies to influence policy, improve service delivery, strengthen community participation, and advance refugee rights. These advocacy efforts have expanded

beyond humanitarian assistance to include legal reform, public awareness campaigns, psychosocial support, and multi-stakeholder collaboration. Consequently, refugee advocacy has emerged as an essential component of contemporary refugee governance.

Despite the growing attention devoted to refugee advocacy, the existing literature remains fragmented. Previous studies have primarily examined individual advocacy interventions, specific policy contexts, or particular geographic settings, resulting in limited understanding of the diversity of refugee advocacy models that have been developed worldwide. Moreover, there has been relatively little effort to synthesize the approaches, implementation strategies, and implications of these models across different institutional and socio-political contexts. This fragmentation limits the development of an integrated evidence base that can guide researchers, practitioners, and policymakers in designing more effective refugee advocacy initiatives.

A comprehensive synthesis of existing evidence is therefore necessary to identify patterns, common approaches, research gaps, and future directions within the field of refugee advocacy. A scoping review is particularly appropriate because it enables the systematic mapping of available evidence across diverse study designs, intervention types, and geographical contexts while identifying areas requiring further investigation.

Accordingly, this study conducts a scoping review to map refugee advocacy models reported in the literature between 2013 and 2023. Specifically, it examines the approaches, strategies, and implications of refugee advocacy models and identifies gaps in the existing literature to inform future research, policy development, and evidence-based advocacy practices.

2. Literature Review

The literature on refugee protection has long highlighted the tension between universal human rights principles and state sovereignty. Although states formally endorse international legal frameworks for refugee protection, their implementation is often constrained by national security priorities and border control policies. This tension reflects the securitization of migration, whereby refugees are increasingly perceived through the lens of security rather than humanitarian protection (Haddad 2008; Shore 1993). Consequently, refugee rights are frequently subordinated to state interests, creating significant protection gaps and limiting access to durable solutions.

Within this context, refugee advocacy has emerged as an important mechanism for promoting and protecting refugee rights. Advocacy refers to activities undertaken to influence decision-makers, public opinion, and institutional practices in support of particular individuals, groups, or public interests, and is widely recognized as a core function of civil society organizations (Mosley 2011). In the refugee context, advocacy extends beyond humanitarian assistance by addressing structural barriers that hinder refugees' access to legal protection, social services, and fundamental rights.

Refugee advocacy models encompass the frameworks, strategies, and institutional arrangements developed to advance refugee rights, well-being, and protection (Fehsenfeld and Levinsen 2019; Stephens 2018). These models involve a diverse range of actors, including governments, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), civil society organizations, international agencies, and refugee-led

organizations. Their primary objective is to respond to the multidimensional challenges experienced by refugees, including forced displacement, discrimination, restricted access to public services, and violations of fundamental human rights (Stephens 2018).

Existing literature demonstrates that refugee advocacy is implemented through multiple approaches. One prominent approach focuses on policy advocacy, aiming to influence legislative reforms, administrative practices, and international policy frameworks that support refugee protection. Such initiatives promote refugee-friendly legislation, encourage compliance with international human rights standards, and advocate for durable solutions, including resettlement, local integration, and voluntary repatriation (Pupavac 2008). Another approach emphasizes service-oriented advocacy through the provision of legal assistance, healthcare, education, psychosocial support, and livelihood programs tailored to refugee populations (Amon and Friedman 2020). In addition, advocacy frequently includes public awareness campaigns intended to reduce discrimination, challenge negative stereotypes, foster solidarity, and strengthen social acceptance of refugees within host communities (Fehsenfeld and Levinsen 2019; Pupavac 2008; Stephens 2018).

The literature further emphasizes that effective refugee advocacy depends on collaboration among multiple stakeholders. Partnerships involving governments, NGOs, community-based organizations, international organizations, and refugee-led initiatives enable the pooling of expertise, resources, and institutional capacities necessary to address increasingly complex refugee issues (Fehsenfeld and Levinsen 2019). Through coordinated action, these collaborative arrangements enhance advocacy effectiveness, improve service delivery, and strengthen policy influence (Pupavac 2008; Stephens 2018).

Previous studies also identify several implications of refugee advocacy models. Successful advocacy contributes to stronger refugee protection systems, greater access to essential services, improved community integration, and policy reforms that prioritize refugee rights and human dignity (Scribner 2017). Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these models is often constrained by limited financial resources, political resistance, changing policy environments, and broader socio-political dynamics. These challenges require advocacy strategies to remain adaptive through continuous monitoring, evaluation, and institutional learning (Hathaway 1991; Ife and Fiske 2006).

Overall, the literature demonstrates that refugee advocacy models constitute an essential mechanism for addressing structural barriers to refugee protection. By integrating policy advocacy, service provision, public engagement, and multi-stakeholder collaboration, these models contribute to creating more inclusive and rights-based responses for displaced populations (Fehsenfeld and Levinsen 2019; Stephens 2018). However, existing scholarship remains fragmented across different intervention types, geographical settings, and institutional contexts. While previous studies have examined specific advocacy initiatives or policy responses, relatively few have systematically synthesized the diverse approaches, strategies, and implications of refugee advocacy models. This gap provides the rationale for conducting the present scoping review, which aims to comprehensively map existing refugee advocacy models and identify directions for future research.

3. Research Methods

3.1. Study Design

A comprehensive search strategy was conducted to identify relevant studies on refugee advocacy models, published between January 1, 2013 and February 1, 2023. Electronic databases, including Scopus and Web of Science, were searched. The search terms were carefully selected and combined using Boolean operators (e.g., AND, OR) to ensure the identification of relevant articles. This systematic review was reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines (Page et al. 2021). The PICOS items, namely population, intervention, comparator, outcomes, and study design, followed a previous systematic review (Kusuma, Pratiwi, and Pitaloka 2022). All curated studies were imported into Zotero software to identify and remove duplicate records.

3.2. Search Strategy

The systematic literature search was performed using two electronic databases (Web of Science and Scopus). The literature search used primary terms to broaden the search. Key terms used for the search are presented in Table 1.

Table. 1 Keywords used in each database

No.	Database	Keywords
1	Scopus	(TITLE-ABS-KEY("refugee") OR KEY("refugee")) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY("advocacy model") OR KEY("advocacy model"))
2	Web of Science	(TS=("refugee" OR "refugees") AND TS=("advocacy model" OR "advocacy models"))

Source: Author’s elaboration, 2024

3.3. Eligibility Criteria

This review applied inclusion and exclusion criteria to identify relevant journals for analysis. The scoping review included journal articles, conference proceedings, case studies, regulations, policies, and news articles published in English, while excluding books, review articles, non-open access articles, non-English articles, commentary articles, handbooks, guidelines, and study protocols.

3.4. Study Selection and Data Extraction

A standardized data extraction form was developed to collect relevant information from the included studies and was piloted in relation to the refugee advocacy model focus of this review. The title and abstract of each article were screened by CS and MM, and the full text of eligible articles was then assessed for quality by CS. Data screening was conducted using the Rayyan Intelligent Systematic Review software (<https://www.rayyan.ai/>) (Ouzzani et al. 2016). Duplicate papers were excluded from the study. Abstracts were read, and relevant full articles were reviewed for data extraction. Any uncertainty or conflict was discussed at regular check-ins until consensus was reached between CS and MM. The interpretation of the screening criteria was continually reviewed; when

questions arose, the team backtracked to ensure that the criteria had been applied correctly and consistently, independent of who had screened the records. Rayyan's AI screening and highlighting function was used, but each record was still screened manually, and the team erred on the side of inclusion. Full-text articles were screened independently by at least two researchers, and conflicts or uncertainties were resolved through discussion until consensus was reached. Following the original framework, a formal quality appraisal of the included studies was not conducted (Ouzzani et al. 2016).

Data extraction templates were developed to map data to each research question. The following data were extracted: (1) general information, including the author(s), publication year, country/region, research design, population, strategies and approaches employed, and outcomes and implications reported; and (2) types of intervention, including the Nguvu intervention, interviews, administration, shifts in federal policies, and the creation and development of multi-stakeholder partnerships.

3.5. Collating, Summarizing, and Reporting the Results

The analysis used data related to the research questions to summarize implementation motives and elements of the implementation process. Articles were read and re-read, with initial ideas sorted into domains of explanation for refugee advocacy models. Initial codes were then identified within each article. These codes were compared based on similarities and differences and organized into potential themes, which were subsequently compared to generate the interventions used, resulting in clear definitions and names for each intervention within each domain of the refugee advocacy model. Data analysis was conducted in pairs, and any uncertainties or differences were discussed among all authors until consensus was reached.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1. Study Selection

This systematic review assessed studies on the refugee advocacy model published between January 1, 2013 and February 1, 2023. The flow diagram of the literature search and screening process, following the inclusion and exclusion criteria using the PRISMA approach (Page et al. 2021), is presented in Figure 1. The initial search yielded a total of 761 records, obtained from two databases: Web of Science (n = 28) and Scopus (n = 733). After removing 8 duplicates using the Rayyan AI® software (Ouzzani et al. 2016), 753 records were screened for eligibility based on their titles and abstracts. Of these, 744 records were excluded for various reasons, including wrong population (n = 12), wrong study design (n = 210), wrong publication type (n = 47), and unrelated studies (n = 475). Nine reports were assessed for eligibility through full-text screening based on their relevance to the research question and inclusion criteria. Four reports were excluded because they were not written in English (n = 3) or were not open access (n = 1). Finally, five studies were included in the scoping review.

Figure. 1 PRISMA Flow Diagram of Study Identification, Screening, and Inclusion

Identification	Records identified from Databases (n = 2): Web of Science (n = 28), Scopus (n = 733); Total registers (n = 761) Records removed before screening: Duplicate records removed (n = 8); Records marked ineligible by automation tools (n = 0); Records removed for other reasons (n = 0)
Screening	Records screened (n = 753) → Records excluded (n = 744): Wrong population (n = 12); Wrong study design (n = 210); Wrong publication type (n = 47); Not related study (n = 475) Reports sought for retrieval (n = 9) → Reports not retrieved (n = 0) Reports assessed for eligibility (n = 9) → Reports excluded: Not open access (n = 1); Not English article (n = 3)
Included	Studies included in review (n = 5)

Source: Adapted from Page et al. (2021), PRISMA 2020

4.2. Study Characteristics

The five included studies explored different aspects of refugee advocacy models. Two were conducted in the United States (Beers 2020; Richard and Callahan 2020), while the others originated from Tanzania (Greene et al. 2019), Canada (Kaur et al. 2022), and Spain (Moreno-Serna et al. 2021). The geographic distribution of the studies reflects a diverse range of contexts and settings, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of refugee advocacy models across different regions (see Table 2).

Refugee advocacy models identified in this scoping review encompassed a range of approaches and strategies aimed at addressing the rights and well-being of refugees. The models highlighted include the Nguvu Intervention, a program integrating brief Cognitive Processing Therapy and Advocacy Counseling, which demonstrated positive outcomes in terms of improved psychological distress and reduced intimate partner violence among Congolese refugee women in Tanzania (Greene et al. 2019). Another model explored the climate change–human migration nexus, with policy experts emphasizing the economic and political factors of migration related to climate change and countering securitization narratives (Kaur et al. 2022). The analysis of the Trump administration’s actions and policies towards refugees and the U.S. refugee resettlement system served as a critical example of a broader administrative deconstruction agenda (Beers 2020). Additionally, advocacy efforts for refugee resettlement in Utica, New York, led to positive benefits for the community and the preservation of its ability to participate in the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (Richard and Callahan 2020). Finally, the creation and development of multi-stakeholder partnerships for humanitarian action demonstrated the potential for increased transformational impact and the importance of effective management practices (Moreno-Serna et al. 2021).

The approaches and strategies employed within these refugee advocacy models varied depending on the specific context and objectives. They encompassed intervention programs integrating therapy and counseling techniques, exploration of complex issues such as the climate change–human migration nexus through expert perspectives, analysis of policies and actions affecting refugee resettlement systems, advocacy efforts to preserve resettlement programs despite policy changes, and the establishment and management of

multi-stakeholder partnerships for refugee response. These diverse strategies reflect efforts to address the unique needs and challenges faced by refugees and to promote their rights and well-being.

Table. 2 Refugee Advocacy Models Identified in the Scoping Review

Authors	Year	Country/Region	Research Design	Population	Strategies and Approaches	Outcomes and Implications
Greene et al. (2019)	2019	Tanzania	Pilot study	Congolese refugee women in Tanzania	Nguvu intervention: an 8-session program integrating brief Cognitive Processing Therapy and Advocacy Counseling, delivered by trained lay facilitators	Improved psychological distress and reduced intimate partner violence; acceptable relevance, feasibility, and acceptability; identified implementation challenges and areas for modification ahead of a feasibility RCT
Kaur et al. (2022)	2022	Canada	Qualitative research	Policy experts selected via a structured nomination process	Interviews; policy documentation analyzed using a coding frame	Policy experts emphasized the economic and political drivers of climate-related migration and acted as a countervailing power against securitization framing; the study revealed differing professional perspectives between researchers and government
Beers (2020)	2020	USA	Case study	U.S. refugee resettlement system and policies	Analysis of the Trump administration’s actions and policies towards refugees and the U.S. refugee resettlement system	Documented the harm done to refugees and obstruction of resettlement institutions; situated within the broader “administrative deconstruction” agenda
Richard and Callahan (2020)	2020	USA	Case study	Refugees in Utica, New York	Shifts in federal refugee policy and their effects on resettlement in Utica, New York	Positive benefits accrued to the community despite policy changes; advocacy efforts secured new income from New York State, preserving participation in the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program

Implications

Moreno-Serna et al. (2021)	2021	Spain	Case study	Multi-stakeholder partnerships for humanitarian action	Creation and development of multi-stakeholder partnerships to provide energy to refugee camps and host communities in northern Ethiopia	Active participation of aid agencies increased the transformational potential of refugee response; feedback loops and internal learning are essential for managing complex partnerships; facilitators and sustainability-oriented university centers play a critical, underexplored role
----------------------------	------	-------	------------	--	---	--

Source: Author's elaboration based on included studies, 2024

The identified implications and outcomes of these refugee advocacy models highlighted both positive impacts and areas for improvement. Positive outcomes included improved psychological well-being and reduced violence among refugee women, countering securitization narratives related to climate-induced migration, and the preservation of community participation in resettlement programs. However, challenges and areas for improvement were also identified, such as implementation challenges, modification needs, and the critical role of facilitators in collaborative arrangements. These findings underscore the importance of continued research and evaluation to refine and enhance the effectiveness of refugee advocacy models in addressing the complex needs of displaced populations and advocating for their rights.

4.3. Discussions

The scoping review revealed a diverse range of refugee advocacy models, each employing unique approaches and strategies to address the rights and well-being of refugees. One notable model identified in this review is the Nguvu Intervention, which integrates brief Cognitive Processing Therapy and Advocacy Counseling. This intervention demonstrated positive outcomes, including improved psychological distress and reduced intimate partner violence among Congolese refugee women in Tanzania (Greene et al. 2019). The feasibility of delivering the Nguvu intervention through lay refugee workers was evident through training and supervision, with significant implications for its scalability. The apprenticeship model, which allows for local training and supervision of lay facilitators, enhances the potential for the sustainability of Nguvu in humanitarian and low-resource settings (Murray et al. 2011). No adverse events or indications were found that participation in the Nguvu intervention would increase the risk of intimate partner violence (IPV) for women in relationships. It is important to highlight that the safety and confidentiality of treatment cohort participants were closely monitored and protected, and similar precautions should be implemented in future efforts to deliver this intervention to IPV survivors at ongoing risk. These

findings suggest that integrating therapeutic and counseling techniques can effectively address the mental health needs and promote the safety of refugee women in specific contexts (Greene et al. 2019; Murray et al. 2011).

Another important model explored in this review is the examination of the climate change–human migration nexus through the perspectives of policy experts (Kaur et al. 2022). The analysis highlighted the economic and political factors of migration related to climate change and emphasized countering narratives that securitize climate-induced migration. By expanding understanding of the complex drivers of climate-related displacement, this model contributes to more comprehensive approaches in addressing the challenges faced by climate-displaced populations.

The case study on the actions and policies of the Trump administration towards refugees and the U.S. refugee resettlement system has implications for refugee advocacy models (Beers 2020). It provides a real-world example of the challenges faced by advocates working to protect the rights and well-being of refugees, and highlights the need for advocacy efforts to counter harmful policies and obstruction of resettlement programs. The findings emphasize the negative consequences of policy changes on refugees and the obstruction of resettlement efforts, underscoring the importance of advocacy in countering harmful policies and protecting refugees' rights and well-being. The Trump administration's attempts to dismantle the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) align with its broader anti-immigrant agenda (Callen 2017). However, the longevity, bipartisan support, statutory basis, and Congressional oversight of the resettlement program make it less likely to be terminated compared to other programs, and the administration's persistent attacks on refugee resettlement run counter to conventional explanations in the literature on program termination (Berry, Burden, and Howell 2010; Kuipers, Yesilkagit, and Carroll 2018; Lewis 2019). This case study serves as a reminder of the critical role that refugee advocacy models play in responding to policy changes, defending refugees' rights, and promoting durable solutions, and underscores the necessity of robust and effective advocacy strategies within the broader context of refugee advocacy. A related case study from Utica, New York, examined shifts in federal refugee policy and their effects on local resettlement (Richard and Callahan 2020). These efforts showcased the positive benefits that can accrue to communities despite policy changes: through advocacy, the community preserved its participation in the U.S. Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP), ensuring ongoing support for refugee populations. This case underscores the importance of local advocacy in maintaining and enhancing the protection and integration of refugees.

The review also encompassed the creation and development of multi-stakeholder partnerships for humanitarian action (Moreno-Serna et al. 2021). These partnerships involve collaboration with diverse actors, including the private sector, to mobilize knowledge, resources, and public attention in support of the objectives of the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) (Hansen 2018; Thomas 2017; Türk and Garlick 2016). Multi-stakeholder partnerships are considered essential for achieving the transformational goals outlined in the UN 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (Sachs et al. 2019). With the increasing number of displaced populations, the importance of service

delivery and market integration in refugee response is growing, necessitating active involvement from public, private, civil society, and academic actors; detailed studies of ongoing multi-stakeholder partnerships may help researchers and practitioners contribute effectively to new response policies such as the CRRF (Pascucci 2021; Thomas 2017; Tomasini 2018). The study demonstrated the potential for these partnerships to have a transformative impact, highlighting the importance of effective management practices, feedback mechanisms, and internal learning for partnership success (Moreno-Serna et al. 2021). It also emphasized the role of facilitators in fostering collaboration and the need for sustainable university centers to support cross-sector collaboration in refugee response efforts.

Overall, the diverse range of approaches and strategies employed within refugee advocacy models, together with the positive outcomes identified such as improved psychological well-being, countering securitization narratives, and preserving community participation demonstrate the potential effectiveness of these models. However, challenges and areas for improvement were also identified, including implementation challenges, modification needs, and the critical role of facilitators in collaborative arrangements. These findings provide valuable insights for future research and practice, emphasizing the importance of refining and enhancing the effectiveness of refugee advocacy models in addressing the complex needs of displaced populations and advocating for their rights.

While this scoping review provides valuable insights into refugee advocacy models, several limitations should be considered. The search was conducted using only two databases, potentially missing relevant studies from other sources. The inclusion criteria focused on a specific timeframe, excluding earlier studies, and the small number of included studies and their geographical concentration limit the generalizability of the findings. Reliance on published studies may introduce publication bias, and the review did not assess individual study quality or conduct a formal synthesis of findings. Despite these limitations, this review serves as a foundation for understanding refugee advocacy models and highlights the need for future research to address these limitations and provide a more comprehensive understanding.

5. Conclusions

This review sheds light on the diverse range of refugee advocacy models and their implications for addressing the rights and well-being of refugees. The Nguvu Intervention, which integrates Cognitive Processing Therapy and Advocacy Counseling, demonstrates positive outcomes in improving psychological distress and reducing intimate partner violence among Congolese refugee women in Tanzania. The study highlights the feasibility of delivering the intervention through lay refugee workers, making it scalable in humanitarian and low-resource settings. Additionally, the examination of the climate change–human migration nexus and the case study on the Trump administration’s actions towards refugees provide valuable insights into the challenges faced by advocates and the importance of advocacy efforts in protecting refugee rights and countering harmful policies. The review also emphasizes the significance of multi-stakeholder partnerships, involving collaboration with the private

sector and other actors, in achieving the transformational goals outlined in the UN 2030 Agenda. Effective management practices, facilitation of collaboration, and support from sustainable university centers are crucial for the success of these partnerships. While the review provides important insights, it acknowledges limitations such as database selection and inclusion criteria, and underscores the need for future research to address these limitations and enhance understanding of refugee advocacy models. Future research should assess the long-term efficacy and scalability of interventions such as Nguvu, and explore the development of new multi-stakeholder refugee advocacy models capable of serving the specific requirements of varied refugee populations.

Bibliography

- Amon, J. J., and E. Friedman. 2020. "Human Rights Advocacy in Global Health." In *Foundations of Global Health & Human Rights*, edited by L. O. Gostin and B. M. Meier. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197528297.003.0007>.
- Beers, D. J. 2020. "The End of Resettlement? US Refugee Policy in the Age of Trump." *Social Sciences* 9 (8): 129.
- Berry, C. R., B. C. Burden, and W. G. Howell. 2010. "After Enactment: The Lives and Deaths of Federal Programs." *American Journal of Political Science* 54 (1): 1–17.
- Callen, Z. 2017. "Repurposing the Administrative State." *The Forum* 15 (2): 379–393.
- Fehsenfeld, M., and K. Levinsen. 2019. "Taking Care of the Refugees: Exploring Advocacy and Cross-Sector Collaboration in Service Provision for Refugees." *VOLUNTAS: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations* 30 (2): 422–435.
- Greene, M. C., S. Rees, S. Likindikoki, A. G. Bonz, A. Joscelyne, D. Kaysen, R. D. Nixon, T. Njau, M. T. Tankink, A. Tiwari, and others. 2019. "Developing an Integrated Intervention to Address Intimate Partner Violence and Psychological Distress in Congolese Refugee Women in Tanzania." *Conflict and Health* 13: 1–16.
- Haddad, E. 2008. *The Refugee in International Society: Between Sovereigns*. Vol. 106. Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, R. 2018. "The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework: A Commentary." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 31 (2): 131–151.
- Hathaway, J. C. 1991. "Reconceiving Refugee Law as Human Rights Protection." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 4 (2): 113–131.
- Ife, J., and L. Fiske. 2006. "Human Rights and Community Work: Complementary Theories and Practices." *International Social Work* 49 (3): 297–308.
- Kaur, P., B. Ho, T. Kaukab, M. Rashid, A. Bowry, A. Yousafzai, and R. Minhas. 2022. "For the Parent, by the Parent: Creating a Program to Empower Parents of Refugee Background Using Novel Participatory Approaches." *Paediatrics & Child Health* 27 (Suppl 3): e20.
- Kuipers, S., K. Yesilkagit, and B. Carroll. 2018. "Coming to Terms with Termination of Public Organizations." *Public Organization Review* 18: 263–278.
- Kusuma, I. Y., H. Pratiwi, and D. A. E. Pitaloka. 2022. "Role of Pharmacists in Antimicrobial Stewardship During COVID-19 Outbreak: A Scoping Review." *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*, 2605–2614.
- Lewis, D. E. 2019. "Deconstructing the Administrative State." *The Journal of Politics* 81 (3): 767–789.
- Moreno-Serna, J., T. Sánchez-Chaparro, L. Stott, J. Mazorra, R. Carrasco-Gallego, and C. Mataix. 2021. "Feedback Loops and Facilitation: Catalyzing Transformational Multi-Stakeholder Refugee Response Partnerships." *Sustainability* 13 (21): 11705.
- Mosley, J. E. 2011. "Institutionalization, Privatization, and Political Opportunity: What Tactical Choices Reveal About the Policy Advocacy of Human Service Nonprofits." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 40 (3): 435–457.
- Murray, L. K., S. Dorsey, P. Bolton, M. J. Jordans, A. Rahman, J. Bass, and H. Verdelli. 2011. "Building Capacity in Mental Health Interventions in Low Resource

- Countries: An Apprenticeship Model for Training Local Providers.” *International Journal of Mental Health Systems* 5: 1–12.
- Ouzzani, M., H. Hammady, Z. Fedorowicz, and A. Elmagarmid. 2016. “Rayyan—A Web and Mobile App for Systematic Reviews.” *Systematic Reviews* 5: 210.
- Page, M. J., J. E. McKenzie, P. M. Bossuyt, I. Boutron, T. C. Hoffmann, C. D. Mulrow, L. Shamseer, J. M. Tetzlaff, E. A. Akl, S. E. Brennan, R. Chou, J. Glanville, J. M. Grimshaw, A. Hróbjartsson, M. M. Lalu, T. Li, E. W. Loder, E. Mayo-Wilson, S. McDonald, and D. Moher. 2021. “The PRISMA 2020 Statement: An Updated Guideline for Reporting Systematic Reviews.” *BMJ* 372: n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>.
- Pascucci, E. 2021. “More Logistics, Less Aid: Humanitarian-Business Partnerships and Sustainability in the Refugee Camp.” *World Development* 142: 105424.
- Pupavac, V. 2008. “Refugee Advocacy, Traumatic Representations and Political Disenchantment.” *Government and Opposition* 43 (2): 270–292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1477-7053.2008.00255.x>.
- Richard, A. C., and S. Callahan. 2020. “Making Sense of US Refugee Resettlement: Utica as a Model for the Nation.” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 690 (1): 176–183.
- Sachs, J. D., G. Schmidt-Traub, M. Mazzucato, D. Messner, N. Nakicenovic, and J. Rockström. 2019. “Six Transformations to Achieve the Sustainable Development Goals.” *Nature Sustainability* 2 (9): 805–814.
- Scribner, T. 2017. “You Are Not Welcome Here Anymore: Restoring Support for Refugee Resettlement in the Age of Trump.” *Journal on Migration and Human Security* 5 (2): 263–284.
- Shore, C. 1993. “Inventing the ‘People’s Europe’: Critical Approaches to European Community ‘Cultural Policy.’” *Man*, 779–800.
- Stephens, M. 2018. “Rethinking Frameworks for Refugee Advocacy: An Analysis Grounded in Political and Democratic Institutions.” *Journal of Refugee Studies* 31 (4): 528–543.
- Thomas, M. 2017. “Turning the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework into Reality.” *Forced Migration Review* 56.
- Tomasini, R. M. 2018. “The Evolutions of Humanitarian-Private Partnerships: Collaborative Frameworks Under Review.” In *The Palgrave Handbook of Humanitarian Logistics and Supply Chain Management*, 627–635.
- Türk, V., and M. Garlick. 2016. “From Burdens and Responsibilities to Opportunities: The Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework and a Global Compact on Refugees.” *International Journal of Refugee Law* 28 (4): 656–678.