

# **How can we reduce loneliness among migrant and ethnic minority people?**

## **Systematic, participatory review of programme theories, system processes and outcomes**

### **Authors**

Professor Sarah Salway\* Professor of Public Health, Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Elmfield, Northumberland Road, Sheffield, S102TU, UK

Dr Elizabeth Such, Research Fellow, School of Health & Related Research, University of Sheffield, Regent Court, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield S1 4DA, UK

Dr Louise Preston, Senior Research Fellow, School of Health & Related Research, University of Sheffield, Regent Court, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield S1 4DA, UK

Dr Andrew Booth, Reader in Evidence Based Information Practice and Director of Information, School of Health & Related Research, University of Sheffield, Regent Court, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield S1 4DA, UK

Dr Maria Zubair, Research Associate, Faculty of Health, Psychology and Social Care, Brooks Building, Manchester Metropolitan University, 53 Bonsall St, Hulme, Manchester M15 6GX, UK

Professor Christina Victor, Professor of Gerontology and Public Health, College of Health and Life Sciences Brunel University, Mary Seacole Building, Kingston Lane, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK

Professor Raghu Raghavan, Professor of Mental Health, School of Nursing and Midwifery, De Montfort University, The Gateway, Leicester, LE1 9BH, UK

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

\* Corresponding author - Department of Sociological Studies, University of Sheffield, Elmfield, Northumberland Road, Sheffield, S102TU, UK. [s.salway@sheffield.ac.uk](mailto:s.salway@sheffield.ac.uk); 0114 222 6438

*Competing interests: None declared*

*Key words (MeSH terms)*

Loneliness; Social Support; Transients and Migrants; Systems Theory;

Ethnic Groups; Racism

### ***Important***

*A 'first look' scientific summary is created from the original author-supplied summary once the normal NIHR Journals Library peer and editorial review processes are complete. The summary has undergone full peer and editorial review as documented at NIHR Journals Library website and may undergo rewrite during the publication process. The order of authors was correct at editorial sign-off stage.*

*A final version (which has undergone a rigorous copy-edit and proofreading) will publish as part of a fuller account of the research in a forthcoming issue of the Public Health Research journal.*

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

*Any queries about this 'first look' version of the scientific summary should be addressed to the NIHR Journals Library Editorial Office – [journals.library@nihr.ac.uk](mailto:journals.library@nihr.ac.uk)*

*The research reported in this 'first look' scientific summary was funded by the PHR programme as project number 16/08/44. For more information visit <https://www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/phr/160844/#/>*

*The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The PHR editors have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' work and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments however; they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this scientific summary.*

*This 'first look' scientific summary presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the PHR Programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the PHR Programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.*

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

## Scientific summary

### Background and rationale

Social isolation and loneliness are widely recognised as major public health problems.

Migrants and ethnic minority people may face particular risks.

### Aim and review questions

The overall aim was to synthesise the available evidence and produce new insights relating to the range of interventions addressing loneliness among people identifying as migrant and/or ethnic minority, plus their logic, functioning and effects. Review questions:

1. What types of interventional approaches to addressing social isolation and/or loneliness among migrant and/or ethnic minority people have been developed and evaluated?
2. How effective are such interventions in reducing social isolation and/or loneliness when compared to usual or no intervention?
3. What health outcomes have been examined?
4. What negative effects have resulted from such interventions?
5. Do effects vary for different people (e.g. by gender, age, income)?
6. What 'programme theory' and assumed underlying mechanisms inform interventions?
7. What system factors increase or decrease social isolation and loneliness among migrant and/or ethnic minority people?
8. What happens when similar interventions are introduced into different contexts?
9. What system conditions support or hamper successful and sustained implementation?

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

10. To what extent do current interventional approaches address the known determinants? Where are the gaps?
11. What are the costs associated with such interventions?
12. What implications are there for roll out at scale in the UK?

## Methods

As well as examining initiatives, we also aimed to uncover broader features of socio-ecological systems that interplay with deliberate intervention and impact upon outcomes. We therefore combined an effectiveness review with a 'systems theory-informed' evidence synthesis.

### Searching

We employed general and targeted electronic database searches (no date restrictions were applied), forward and backward citation searching, review of prior reviews and expert recommendations to locate potentially relevant literature. Search processes conformed to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. Grey literature searches identified additional UK initiatives.

### Study selection

Searches were downloaded into Endnote version 9 [Clarivate Analytics (formerly Thomson Reuters), Philadelphia, PA, USA] and then exported to EPPI-Reviewer version 4 (Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre, University of London, London, UK) for screening and extraction. Initial screening for relevance on title and abstract was undertaken by one reviewer, with any uncertain items referred to a second reviewer. A second round of full-text screening applied a piloted, refined and finalised checklist. Uncertainties were resolved by discussion.

### Data extraction

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

An extraction template was developed, piloted and finalised within EPPI-Reviewer (Evidence for Policy and Practice Information and Co-ordinating Centre, University of London, London, UK). Quantitative effectiveness information was double extracted, compared and agreed, calling on a third reviewer for consensus. Extractions for the theory-driven review were undertaken by one reviewer and validated via a process of iterative team discussions and revisiting of papers. Templates included structured items, interpretive coding and visual representations.

## **Appraisal**

For the theory informed review, paper contributions were moderated based on relevance, rigour and richness. For the effectiveness review, we applied the Cochrane Risk of Bias assessment tool to all RCTs, and otherwise simply noted study design.

## **Consultation panel and stakeholder workshops**

We convened three Consultation Panels (CPs) involving 34 participants; two in Sheffield and one in Leicester. All participants self-identified as a migrant and/or having an ethnic minority identity. A mix of other social characteristics was represented.

We held an initial 'meet-and-greet' session and two half-day workshops with each CP. Sessions were highly interactive, employing structured exercises, visual diagrams and open discussion. CPs provided commentary and critique on the emergent review material.

A practitioner workshop involving around 50 people shared emergent findings and sought input to the review products.

## **Synthesis and integration**

Theory development – relating to interventional logic and system processes - was iterative and drew on complementary sources of insight: grand and mid-range theories identified in

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

the published literature; insights from CP workshops; and empirical papers describing interventions. Structured templates in MS Word (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA) characterised the inputs, functions, strategies and causal chains between intervention elements, proximate determinants and relevant outcomes. Iterative team analysis sessions refined theory.

Intervention/initiative papers suitable for quantitative data extraction employed diverse outcome measures and often had methodological limitations. Therefore, a narrative synthesis guided by a set of derived hypotheses was undertaken.

Drawing on CP contributions, relevant data from UK intervention papers, and a sub-set of rich UK non-intervention papers, a narrative synthesis of systems factors that impact upon both risk of loneliness and the operation of interventions was developed.

Textual and diagrammatic synthesis products were produced.

## **Ethics**

Ethics approval for the CPs was granted by the University of Sheffield's SchARR Research Ethics Committee reference number 016132.

## **Results**

### **Developing the theoretical scope**

Initial theory building confirmed the inadequacy of existing formulations of 'loneliness'. In particular, rather than pathologising people's negative appraisal of existing social relations, we acknowledge exposure to social ties and interactions that undermine rather than affirm, and that constrain rather than facilitate companionship. For migrant and ethnic minority people these interactions are commonplace, and threats to self-worth are routinely

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

experienced. Furthermore, for many migrants a loss, or weakening, of significant social exchanges is a common experience.

Important conceptual overlap between related, but distinct, bodies of literature indicated the need to include several related outcomes: emotional loneliness, lack of intimacy; social loneliness, (lack of) sense of belonging; feeling isolated; and feeling unsupported. The resultant model of loneliness included four proximate determinants: [1] positive social ties and interactions; [2] negative social ties and interactions; [3] self-worth; and [4] appraisal of existing ties. This model suggested a wider range of potential solutions than commonly considered.

***What types of interventional approaches to addressing social isolation and/or loneliness among migrant and/or ethnic minority people have been developed and evaluated?***

We ‘typed’ initiatives by identifying their intended *functions* (a set of closely related enabling conditions and opportunities for change). We identified eight types, each identified by a distinctive function, and labelled them as follows: befriending, shared-identity social support groups, intercultural encounters, psychotherapy, training or equipping focused, meaningful activity focused, volunteering and light-touch psychological inputs. Two ‘other’ categories accommodated multifaceted initiatives offering a menu of options or providing diverse inputs at a structural level.

***What ‘programme theory’ and assumed underlying mechanisms inform interventions?***

We went on to develop detailed logic models for the three most common interventional types. These ‘ideal type’ depictions aimed to capture the main elements of the intervention including three functions in each case, and their inter-relationships.

The distinctive function of befriending was identified as *provision of a one-to-one relationship of trust that provides tailored emotional support and companionship*. The distinctive function of shared-identity social support group interventions was identified as

*providing a safe, authentic, reciprocal social space where people who recognise some kind of shared identity engage with meaning and enjoyment.* The logic model for Inter-cultural Encounters was more tentative, with the distinctive function identified as *to bring people who do not normally interact together in meaningful contact across ethnic/cultural/religious difference*. Befriending and shared-identity social support group models shared some common logic with several other intervention types. Most operated via proximate determinants [1], [3] and to a lesser extent [2]. Light touch psychological inputs were unusual in operating via proximate determinant [4].

***How effective are such interventions in reducing social isolation and/or loneliness when compared to usual or no intervention?***

There was consistent evidence from nine qualitative studies that befriending initiatives led to improvements in dimensions of loneliness. Three quantitative studies showed a positive impact on a relevant outcome. In contrast, four reported no such impact, but none of these appeared to achieve the distinctive function. There was consistent qualitative evidence from 10 studies that BF interventions that achieve function 1 - “one-to-one tailored support” - result in a positive social tie for the befriender. There was limited and mixed evidence on whether befriending initiatives result in positive ties *beyond* the befriender-befriender relationship. There was consistent qualitative evidence from 10 studies that BF initiatives result in increased self-worth among befriendeds. There was consistent qualitative evidence from eight studies that befriending interventions result in decreased negative ties and interactions (with family members and/or professionals). None of the befriending studies documented changes in appraisal of existing ties.

Nineteen qualitative, and six quantitative, studies of shared-identity social support groups provided evidence to suggest a positive impact on dimensions of loneliness, whereas three quantitative studies reported no effect. There was consistent qualitative evidence from 29

studies that shared-identity social support group initiatives that achieve function 1 – “safe, reciprocal space” - lead to increased positive ties among group members, and one quantitative study supporting this finding. Consistent qualitative evidence from 16 studies showed such ties and interactions extending beyond group activities. Qualitative evidence from seven studies and quantitative evidence from two studies suggested SSGs lead to reduced negative ties and interactions for participants. Eighteen qualitative studies, and one quantitative study, provided evidence that shared-identity social support groups can increase participant self-worth. Two qualitative studies suggested shared-identity social support groups can produce more positive appraisal of existing ties.

Few intercultural encounter studies provided data on relevant outcomes. There was qualitative evidence from 12 studies of increased positive ‘within group’ ties, and from 15 studies of increased positive ‘out group’ ties. Two quantitative studies also suggested increased ‘out group’ ties. A small number of studies reported no such changes. There was mixed evidence as to whether intercultural encounter initiatives reduce the experience of negative ties and interactions for migrant/minority ethnic people. Several intercultural encounter initiatives aimed to produce broader shifts in attitudes and practices of individuals beyond the immediate initiative but very limited evidence was available to assess effects.

Drawing on the qualitative evidence and theoretical insights, we developed hypotheses regarding likely relationships between interventional characteristics and outcomes that were used to guide exploration of 34 quantitative outcome studies. Notwithstanding the generally low quality study designs, we found fairly consistent support for the following hypotheses: (i) Interventions that target underlying causes of loneliness (via tailoring or multiple inputs) are more effective than those that do not; (ii) Interventions that explicitly aim to boost self-worth are more effective than those that do not; and (iii) Interventions

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This ‘first look’ scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

that explicitly support the building of a shared identity social network for new migrants are more effective than those that do not.

***What negative effects have resulted from such interventions?***

A small number of studies suggest that befriending initiatives may result in some befriendee dependence and feelings of loss at relationship end. Reduced self-worth (self-esteem) was reported in one befriending study (though this initiative did not achieve the distinctive function). In relation to intercultural encounter initiatives, a few studies suggested potential for encounters to exacerbate negative attitudes, inequalities in status and racist behaviour.

***Do effects (positive and negative) of interventions vary for different people (e.g. by gender, age, income)?***

Few published studies considered differential effects of interventions and no consistent patterns were discernible.

***What system factors increase or decrease social isolation and loneliness among migrant and/or ethnic minority people? What system conditions support or hamper successful and sustained implementation of interventions?***

At individual level, a lack of self-confidence and low self-worth undermining people's ability both to form and maintain social connections, and to take up intervention opportunities was a prominent theme. Other factors were: ill health and disability; lack of material resources; and lack of awareness and familiarity with opportunities for social engagement. Evidence suggested both a commonly felt need for opportunities to socialise within ethnically-homogenous groups at times, and a desire to engage across ethnic difference. The potential for people to connect and find commonality around various aspects of identity or experience was also emphasised. New migrants can be disappointed by a lack of hoped-for close relationships with non-migrant established residents.

The loss of family ties and support associated with migration was a prominent theme. In addition, however, families as a source of stress, and 'negative social support' was also an

important issue. Competing demands and responsibilities were felt to increase risk of social isolation and to negatively impact upon people's ability to access and sustain engagement in interventions. Stigma of isolation and loneliness, and of accepting support, was also highlighted. Working with, rather than against, family ties is important.

Feeling unwelcome and experiences of inter-personal racial harassment at community level were found to limit social interactions and contribute to feelings of isolation and lack of belonging among both migrants and ethnic minority people. On the other hand, 'neighbourliness'; that is, the positive, relatively fleeting, encounters between people in public spaces were identified as contributing to a feeling of being 'at home'. Local geographies - the presence, or absence, of spaces and places for positive social encounters and connections - were highlighted as important. Unreliable and unwelcoming public transport was a further factor restricting social engagement.

Official systems and processes frequently act to 'other' and thereby undermine a sense of belonging among migrants and ethnic minority people. The experience of micro-aggressions from people in authority was reported as commonplace, contributing to a feeling of not being valued and of not belonging.

The wider hostile policy and media environment towards migrants (and by extension ethnic minority people) undermines people's sense of belonging, and negatively impacts take up and success of initiatives.

***To what extent do current interventional approaches address the known determinants of social isolation and/or loneliness among migrant and/or ethnic minority people? Where are the gaps? What implications are there for roll out at scale in the UK? What are the costs associated with such interventions?***

A preliminary assessment of UK activity suggested that shared-identity social support group and befriending interventions are common, but that some promising approaches are currently relatively rare including: training (and access to) digital technologies; direct transfer of resources to support social participation; provision of safe spaces to discuss and develop coping strategies for racism; provision of information, skills and navigational support for new contexts; equipping people with social and communication skills.

Our review revealed no evidence of strategies that are effective in tackling overt racism, or increasing organisational cultural competence, with knock-on positive implications for our proximate determinants or outcomes. And, while we identified a large and varied set of 'inter-cultural encounter' initiatives in the UK, none provided strong evidence of impact.

Consultation panel discussions and the practitioner workshop highlighted the disjuncture between the published literature, which tended to focus narrowly on individual initiatives, and the reality of a complex system within which individuals may encounter diverse deliberate provision, as well as other resources and processes, that support or hamper their social connectedness. We developed a visual representation of a potential systems approach to 'loneliness proofing'. Broad considerations included: targeting and tailoring interventions to individual needs; provision of varied formal and informal opportunities for social connection both within and across ethnic groups; effective sign-posting and referral between agencies; engagement of the general public to increase neighbourliness; and concerted efforts to tackle racism and improve cultural competence within organisations.

There was very little information on costs of UK interventions and no assessments of cost effectiveness. Widespread use of volunteers may represent good value for money.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Finally, an important tension was highlighted between the demonstrated need for opportunities to build and celebrate intra-ethnic, 'bonding' ties, and policy orientations that present such ties as threatening, and favour supporting bridging ties across difference.

## Conclusions

Common conceptualisations of 'loneliness' can be usefully extended to recognise four proximate determinants when focusing on migrant and ethnic minority populations: [1] positive social ties and interactions; [2] negative social ties and interactions; [3] self-worth; and [4] appraisal of existing ties.

Diverse interventions have been introduced with the potential to impact upon loneliness among these groups. Befriending, shared-identity social support groups and intercultural encounters interventions were most common. Credible programme theory was developed for the first two of these types. Evidence of positive impact on loneliness was strongest for shared-identity social support groups. Quantitative evidence was inadequate and there were no data relating to long term impacts.

The UK evidence base was extremely limited. Grey literature, however, suggested significant relevant activity around the country. Priorities are to co-produce interventional approaches with migrant and ethnic minority people that address the underlying nature and causes of loneliness among these populations, and to evaluate existing interventions that are being delivered – particularly shared-identity social support groups, intercultural encounters and multicomponent programmes.

An inter-locking set of factors operating at individual, family, community, organisational and wider societal levels produce risk of loneliness, and undermine access to, and impact of, interventions. Inter-personal, structural and cultural racism operate throughout the system

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

to produce risk of loneliness. Current UK interventional approaches fail to address many of these system factors.

**Study registration:** The review protocol is registered on PROSPERO (International prospective register of systematic reviews) (CRD42017077378)

**Funding:** The National Institute for Health Research Public Health Research programme. Grant number PHR 16/08/44.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Salway *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This 'first look' scientific summary may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.