



"Migration and Social Integration: A Comparative Analysis of Migrants in Europe and the USA"

¹-Dr. Shaikha Nasir Al-Karbi*, ²- Dr. Hachemi Brikel

¹Assistant Professor Of Applied Sociology

Section In College Of Social And Human Science At Mohamed Bin Zayed University For Humanities U.A.E

SHAIKHA.ALKARBI@MBZUH.AC.AE

Scopus ID: 59682066400

²Professor of Sociology Université Ibn Khaldoun Tiaret, Algeria

Hachemi.brikel@univ-tiaret.dz

ABSTRACT : This study addresses the topic of migration and social integration by analyzing the factors influencing migrants' ability to integrate into host societies. It highlights the importance of education, language proficiency, and social interaction as key elements facilitating integration. The study also examines barriers such as cultural and racial discrimination. A sample of migrants from France, the United States, and Belgium was selected. The descriptive-analytical method was used to explore the dimensions of the phenomenon. The study aims to offer practical recommendations to improve integration policies. It raises questions about the relationship between education, language, and social interaction in migrants' integration.

Keywords: Migration, Social integration, Education, Social adaptation, Cultural diversity.

Received : 12/08/2025

Accepted : 25/09/2025

Published : 12/10/2025

Research Problem

Migration is considered one of the oldest social phenomena experienced by human societies. It is closely linked to a set of economic, political, and social factors that push individuals to leave their countries of origin in search of better opportunities. However, the real challenge does not lie in the act of migration itself, but rather in the extent to which migrants are able to integrate into host societies. (Brikel, (2017))

Social integration goes beyond access to job opportunities or social services; it encompasses cultural interaction, social communication, and the development of positive relationships with local populations. It is viewed as a complex process that requires time and effort from both parties—the migrants and the host society alike.

Migrants often face multiple challenges in this regard, most notably cultural differences, language barriers, and the perception of them by the host community—especially when attitudes of discrimination or marginalization prevail. Such difficulties may lead to social isolation, a weakened sense of belonging, or even the emergence of ethnic and religious tensions. ({Brikel, {2024},)

Despite these challenges, social interaction remains a fundamental component in facilitating integration. When a migrant is able to build relationships with local people—whether in schools, workplaces, or residential neighborhoods—this significantly contributes to their acceptance and integration.

Conversely, the host society plays a pivotal role in this process by adopting policies and measures that promote cultural pluralism, dialogue, and openness, thereby ensuring an inclusive environment that fosters a sense of citizenship and belonging. (Djamel & Brikel, 2024,)

In this context, there emerges a need for a comprehensive approach to analyze the phenomenon of migration and integration—an approach that considers the social, cultural, and psychological dimensions, and contributes to the formulation of practical and sustainable solutions.

This raises the core research question:

What are the most significant factors influencing the social integration of migrants, and how can integration be enhanced in multicultural host societies?

Research Questions

To what extent does the educational level of migrants affect their chances of integrating into the host society?

What role does language play in facilitating or hindering the integration process?

How does social interaction between migrants and local populations contribute to either accelerating or delaying the process of social integration?

Research Objectives

To examine the concept of social integration and analyze its various dimensions (economic, cultural, and social).

To propose practical mechanisms to promote positive interaction between migrants and local communities.

To understand how migrants maintain their cultural identity while achieving social adaptation.

Significance of Study

It contributes to reducing the gap between migrants and local populations.

It highlights the importance of cultural dialogue and diversity in building modern societies.

It promotes a culture of coexistence, tolerance, and mutual acceptance in multicultural environments.

Motivation Behind the Study

A personal visit to the United States in the summer of 2023 and interaction with a group of migrants who greatly influenced the choice of this topic, particularly the notable integration observed between migrants and locals in Ohio.

The complexity of social integration as a phenomenon and the lack of a unified vision on how to achieve it. The researcher's desire to contribute academically to a vital topic that directly impacts the stability of modern societies.

Research Hypotheses

The higher the educational level of a migrant, the greater the likelihood of successful integration into the host society.

Language plays a pivotal role in either facilitating or hindering the migrant's integration into the new community.

Social interaction between migrants and locals significantly contributes to accelerating the integration process.

The Concepts

Migration:

According to **Edward Said**, migration is part of the broader process of "Orientalism," through which stereotypes of the East and migrants are constructed in the West. He defines migration as the movement of individuals from one place to another due to political or economic forces. (Said, 1978).

Pierre Bourdieu views migration as a complex social process shaped by class structures and cultural factors. He emphasizes the importance of cultural integration in achieving a balance between the migrant's original identity and the new one.

Michel Foucault links migration to governance technologies and border control mechanisms, perceiving it as a tool for shaping the political identity of individuals within society.

Integration:

According to **Al-Malki** (2013), integration is the process by which individuals assimilate into their societies, horizontally by internalizing values, customs, and lifestyles, and vertically by acquiring a political identity that strengthens their affiliation to state institutions and consolidates their loyalty. (Maliki, 2013, p. 116)

Heckmann (2006) defines integration as a continuous process involving the inclusion and acceptance of migrants within the core institutions, relationships, and structures of the host society. (Heckmann, 2006., p. 211)

Stages of Integration

The process of integration does not follow a fixed or linear trajectory. Migrants go through various stages that can differ in order and intensity depending on numerous factors such as age upon arrival, educational background, media exposure, and the nature of social networks accessed in the host country.

As the migrant comes into contact with the new culture—gradually engaging with its language, values, beliefs, and behaviors—one of two outcomes usually unfolds: either assimilation or isolation. Full assimilation, according to scholars, tends to occur over extended periods and often among second-generation migrants, especially if their cultural background closely resembles that of the host society. ({Khelifa & Brikel, {2025},})

However, in cases of significant cultural disparity, migrants may initially prefer separation and isolation. Over time, depending on their environment, they may begin adopting new cultural habits or seeking new social relationships—leading to a phase of cultural maintenance. This then evolves into interaction and participation, which encourage the migrant to engage in adaptation by balancing stereotypical knowledge of the host culture with prior experiences, ultimately leading to acculturation—a blending of old and new cultural knowledge.

At this stage, the migrant develops social capital, considered the key to adaptation and a direct result of lived social relationships. Ultimately, this culminates in social integration, wherein the migrant becomes actively involved in various social domains and is accepted within the institutions, networks, and settings of the host society. (Shahtah, 2017, p. 252).

Theories of Migration and Integration

1. Theory of Social Action (Max Weber):

Max Weber's theory of social action is considered one of the most prominent frameworks for understanding social behavior, including the process of social integration. Weber posits that social action is shaped by cultural and social norms and values, with individuals making decisions based on their interaction with these norms. According to Weber, social action is not a mere mechanical response to stimuli but is driven by goals and meanings that individuals assign through their interaction with the social environment. (Hachemi, 2010)

In the context of migrant integration, Weber suggests that the integration process requires individuals to interact with the dominant cultural framework of the host society and conform to its local norms and values. From this perspective, social integration necessitates migrants' efforts to adapt to the culture of the new society without abandoning their original identity. Rather, it assumes a nuanced interaction between their identity and those of others within the host community. (Huntington, 1993, p. 156)

2. Symbolic Interactionism (Herbert Blumer):

Building on the work of George Herbert Mead, Herbert Blumer expanded the theory of symbolic interactionism to include the process of social integration. This theory interprets social actions as being based on symbolic meanings acquired by individuals through their interactions with others. Blumer emphasizes that meanings are not fixed but are shaped and redefined through continuous social interaction. (Brikel H., 2015, p. 1007)

With respect to integration, symbolic interactionism focuses on how migrants construct meanings around their new social identity through interaction with the host society. Migrants engage with individuals in the new community and participate in cultural and social dialogues, which help them shape their perception of integration and how society accepts them. This shared understanding among individuals from different cultural backgrounds serves as the foundation for reducing isolation and promoting effective integration. (Foucault, 1975, p. 113)

3. Theory of Social Capital and Distinction (Pierre Bourdieu):

Pierre Bourdieu's theory provides a profound understanding of how social and economic resources influence individuals' positions within society. Bourdieu argues that people carry their own forms of cultural and social capital into social interactions. Cultural capital includes knowledge, skills, and experiences, while social capital encompasses networks and social relationships. (Hachemi, 2017)

In the case of migrant integration, Bourdieu suggests that migrants possessing cultural and social capital aligned with the host society are more likely to integrate successfully. Conversely, those lacking such capital face greater challenges, leading to marginalization. Therefore, enhancing migrants' cultural and social capital through education and social engagement can significantly facilitate their integration process. (Bourdieu, 1990, p. 92)

4. Theory of Social Integration (Émile Durkheim):

Émile Durkheim is one of the foremost scholars concerned with studying social integration through the concept of "social cohesion." He believed that societies maintain social balance through the normalization of shared values and social bonds. Durkheim was particularly interested in what happens when individuals fail to integrate into these social networks, which could lead to social disintegration and deviance.

In the context of migrant integration, Durkheim highlights the risk of alienation when migrants are unable to find their place within the host society's social system. Thus, integration is seen as a process of incorporating migrants into the social and cultural networks of the host community. The failure to build appropriate connections may result in social isolation, making it essential to implement policies that actively support migrants' inclusion. (Runis Pennix, 2016, p. 316)

Field Procedures

Study Locations:

This study was conducted in three countries considered among the most prominent global destinations for migration, namely:

France: Due to its long history with immigration—particularly from the Maghreb countries—and the ongoing challenges related to the integration of second and third-generation migrants.

The United States of America: As a multicultural society, it offers a unique setting for studying various models of integration and cultural diversity, especially with the annual opportunity for migrants to participate in the Green Card Lottery.

Belgium: Because of the diversity in its regional integration policies (notably between Flanders and Wallonia) and the presence of large immigrant communities, particularly of Arab and African origin.

Scope of the Study:

This research falls within the domain of Sociology, specifically in the area of comparative social studies. It seeks to analyze social relationships, cultural dynamics, and policies that influence the integration of migrants into host societies. The study aims to explore the variations in integration experiences across different national and regional contexts, with a focus on how social, legal, and cultural factors intersect to shape the integration process. (Hachemi, 2018)

Temporal Scope:

Date	Activity	Location
July 20, 2023 – August 30, 2023	Field Observation	Migrants in Ohio
November 2023 – March 2024	Exploratory Study	Returnee migrants in Algeria
February 2024 – October 2024	Collection of Scientific Materials (books & journals)	Arab Republic of Egypt, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, and United Arab Emirates

October 2024 – December 2024	Distribution of Pilot Questionnaires	Egypt and the United Arab Emirates
January – February 2025	Manual and Online Distribution of Questionnaires	//
March 2025	Retrieval of Questionnaires	//
April 2025	Data Analysis using SPSS	//
May 2025	Final Report Writing	//

Table 1: Timeline of the Study's Development

Human Scope

The study relied on a group of migrants to Europe and the United States originating from various Algerian cities, including M'sila, Tiaret, and Biskra. The total number of participants was 64 migrants, selected as a simple sample due to the ease of communication and accessibility.

Questionnaire

The data collection instrument was a structured questionnaire composed of 19 questions, distributed according to the hypotheses of the study.

Pilot questionnaires were distributed in October to a group of students and migrants in the Arab Republic of Egypt and the United Arab Emirates.

The final version of the questionnaire, revised and validated by academic reviewers, was later distributed. A total of 64 questionnaires were handed out, of which 52 were returned. However, only 44 questionnaires met the scientific and methodological standards required for analysis.

Peer Review Committee for the Questionnaire

Name of Reviewing Professor	Academic Rank	Area of Specialization	Affiliated University
Nadjeh Makhlouf	Professor (Ph.D.)	Sociology	Univ of msila
Kaid Adel	Professor (Ph.D.)	Sociology	Univ of tiaret
Rachid Djaloud	Professor (Ph.D.)	Sociology	Univ of djelfa

Table 2: Peer Review Panel of Professors

Data Analysis in Light of the Hypotheses

Gender and Marital Status

Gender	Marital Status	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Male	Married	4	9.1	5	11.3	4	9.1	13	29.5
	Widowed	2	4.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.5
	Divorced	1	2.25	1	2.25	0	0.0	2	4.5
	Single	5	11.3	3	6.8	2	4.5	10	22.7
	Subtotal	12	27.7	9	20.5	6	13.6	27	61.3
Female	Married	4	9.1	4	9.1	2	4.5	10	22.7
	Widowed	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	Divorced	3	6.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.8
	Single	2	4.5	2	4.5	0	0.0	4	9.1
	Subtotal	9	20.5	6	13.6	2	4.5	17	38.6
Other	—	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	—	21	47.7	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table(3): Gender and Marital Status Distribution by Country

Based on Quantitative Evidence, We Observe That:

Gender Distribution:

Males constitute 61.3% of the sample, while females represent 38.6%.

Marital Status of Males:

Highest percentage of married males:

In France and the United States, married men form the majority, accounting for 9.1% in France and 11.3% in the U.S.

Single males also represent a significant proportion:

In both France and the U.S., there is a notable percentage of single males (11.3% in France and 6.8% in the U.S.).

In Belgium, the percentage of single males is lower, at 4.5%.

Divorced and widowed males:

These categories show lower proportions. For instance, in France, divorced males represent 2.25%, and in the U.S., the percentage remains the same (2.25%).

Widowers in France do not exceed 4.5%.

Marital Status of Females:

Married females represent a noticeable proportion, at 9.1% in both France and the U.S., while in Belgium the percentage is lower.

Single females in France and the U.S. represent moderate percentages (4.5% in each).

Divorced females:

There is a higher rate of divorce among females compared to males. In France, the percentage reaches 6.8%, while no cases of divorce were recorded among women in the U.S. and Belgium.

Analysis:

There is a clear variation in the distribution of marital status between males and females. Women show more diversity in marital status—particularly in terms of divorce—while males tend to show greater stability in terms of either being married or single.

The gender-based social distribution reflects disparities in participation within the study. Males show a stronger inclination toward marriage compared to females; however, cases of divorce and singleness, especially in France and the United States, are also present. (Hachemi, 2014)

From the data table, we observe differences in marital status across countries. France and the United States show higher percentages of divorced and single individuals compared to Belgium, where no divorced females were recorded in the sample.

Years of Residence by Country

Years of Residence	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Less than 1 year	1	2.27	0	0.00	1	2.27	2	4.55
1–3 years	4	9.09	3	6.82	1	2.27	8	18.18
3–5 years	7	15.91	5	11.36	2	4.55	14	31.82
More than 5 years	9	20.45	7	15.91	4	9.09	20	45.45
Total	21	47.72	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.99

Table 4: Distribution by Years of Residence

More than 5 years:

45.45% of the participants in the sample have resided for more than 5 years in France, the United States, and Belgium, which may indicate a level of stability in these countries.

Between 3 and 5 years:

31.82% of the participants have lived in these countries between 3 and 5 years. This percentage is more prominent in France and the U.S., with 15.91% and 11.36%, respectively.

From 1 to 3 years:

Approximately 18.18% of the participants have resided in these countries for a period between 1 and 3 years, with France recording the highest percentage in this category (9.09%).

Less than 1 year:

Only 4.55% of the participants have lived in the respective countries for less than one year.

Country-Specific Insights

France:

France recorded the highest percentage of participants who have lived there for more than 5 years, at 20.45%.

The percentage of those who have resided for 1 to 3 years is also notable, at 9.09%.

United States:

The U.S. shows a more balanced distribution, with 15.91% of participants having lived there for more than 5 years, and 6.82% residing between 1 and 3 years.

Belgium:

Only 9.09% of the participants have resided in Belgium for more than 5 years, suggesting that most respondents in Belgium have not been settled for long durations.

Interpretation

A majority of participants in the sample have resided in the target countries for extended periods (over 5 years).

France hosts the largest proportion of long-term residents, reflecting a relatively higher level of migrant stability.

In contrast, Belgium tends to attract migrants who stay for shorter periods, with a significant proportion in the category of less than 3 years.

Migrant stability appears most prominent in France, which shows a considerable share of residents with over 5 years of residence.

France and the United States can be considered as destinations capable of attracting long-term migrants. Belgium tends to serve as a more short-term destination, with only 9.09% of the sample residing there for more than 5 years.

Current Legal Status

Legal Status	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Refugee	4	9.09	0	0	2	2.55	6	13.64
Legal Immigrant	9	20.45	14	31.82	4	9.09	27	61.36
Student	3	6.82	1	2.27	1	2.27	5	11.36
Undocumented	5	11.36	0	0	1	2.27	6	13.64
Total	21	47.7	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table 5: Legal Status Distribution

Legal Migrants:

Legal migrants constitute the largest group of participants in the sample, accounting for 61.36% across all countries.

The United States shows the highest percentage of legal migrants, with 31.82%, followed by France at 20.45%, and Belgium at 9.09%.

Refugees:

13.64% of the participants in the sample were refugees.

France records 9.09% of refugees, while Belgium records 2.55%.

Students:

11.36% of the participants were students.

France recorded the highest percentage of students at 6.82%, followed by the United States and Belgium with 2.27% each.

Undocumented Migrants:

13.64% of the participants in the sample were undocumented migrants.

The largest share of these was in France at 11.36%, followed by Belgium at 2.27%, while there were no undocumented migrants in the United States.

France:

France is the second-largest destination for legal migrants, with 20.45%, in addition to having a high percentage of undocumented migrants at 11.36%.

United States:

The United States records the highest percentage of legal migrants, at 31.82%, and does not register any undocumented migrants, which may indicate that most migrants there have legal status.

Belgium:

The percentage of legal migrants in Belgium is significantly lower than in the United States and France, at only 9.09%. It also recorded a lower percentage of refugees.

Legal Migrants form the largest group in both the United States and France, reflecting that most migrants in these countries have a well-defined legal status.

Refugees represent a higher percentage in France compared to the other countries.

Students are most represented in France among migrants with a legal status.

Undocumented Migrants show a noticeable percentage in France, but they rarely appear in the United States and Belgium.

The United States appears as the primary destination for legal migrants.

France serves as a destination for those possibly with mixed legal statuses, including refugees and undocumented migrants.

Belgium attracts fewer legal migrants compared to France and the United States, with a stronger focus on other migrant categories.

Educational Level

Educational Level	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Can Read	2	4.55	0	0	1	2.27	3	6.82
Primary School	3	6.82	0	0	0	0	3	6.82
Secondary School	5	11.36	2	4.55	3	6.82	10	22.73
University	7	15.91	9	20.45	2	4.55	18	40.91
Postgraduate	4	9.09	4	9.09	2	4.55	10	22.73
Total	21	47.7	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table 6: Educational Level Distribution

Literacy: Only 6.82% of participants in the sample are literate. This category is represented by France with 4.55%, while the United States recorded 0%, and Belgium recorded 2.27%.

Primary Education: 6.82% of participants in the sample have a primary education level. France had the highest representation in this category at 6.82%, while there was no representation in the United States or Belgium.

Secondary Education: 22.73% of participants hold a secondary school certificate. France had the highest representation in this category at 11.36%, followed by the United States at 4.55%, and Belgium at 6.82%.

University Education: 40.91% of participants in the sample hold a university level of education. The United States had the highest representation in this category at 20.45%, followed by France at 15.91%, while Belgium recorded 4.55%.

Postgraduate Studies: This category represents 22.73% of participants. France had the highest representation in this category at 9.09%, followed by the United States at 9.09%, and Belgium at 4.55%.

France: France shows a diverse educational level, with strong representation in the primary, secondary, and postgraduate categories. However, the highest percentage is found at the university level, at 15.91%.

United States: The United States holds the largest percentage of individuals with university education, at 20.45%, in addition to a good representation in the postgraduate category at 9.09%.

Belgium: Belgium remains less represented in different educational levels, with lower percentages across most categories compared to France and the United States.

The university education category is most represented in the United States at 20.45%, while in France it is 15.91%.

Secondary education represents 22.73% of the total sample, with France and the United States excelling in this category.

Postgraduate studies are well represented in both France and the United States, though Belgium shows the lowest representation.

Primary education and literacy constitute the lowest percentages, with higher representation in France.

Higher Educational Level and Its Role in Integration:

University and Postgraduate Education: Individuals with a university or postgraduate education level are generally more capable of integrating into host societies. They have better opportunities in the labor market and greater chances for social interaction through advanced academic or professional jobs.

In the United States, where this category represents 40.91%, individuals with these educational levels are likely to face better opportunities for adaptation and engagement in community activities, especially in academic or professional fields.

France also has good representation in these categories (university level at 15.91% and postgraduate at 9.09%), indicating that individuals with higher education levels in France are more likely to integrate, particularly in academic and research sectors.

Secondary Education: Those holding a secondary school certificate (22.73%) may face greater challenges in integration compared to those with higher degrees, as secondary education may limit their access to advanced job opportunities or deeper interaction with local communities.

France and the United States have the highest representation in this category (11.36% and 6.82%, respectively), meaning these individuals may encounter difficulties finding advanced job opportunities or may face barriers in engaging more deeply with local communities.

Primary Education and Literacy: Those with only a primary education or who can read and write represent 6.82% of the sample. This group may face difficulties integrating, as they might lack the necessary skills to fully engage with society.

France appears to have a higher representation of this group compared to other countries, which may indicate that some migrants arriving in France do not possess sufficient education to actively participate in social or economic life.

The Main Reason for Migration

Reason for Migration	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Economic Reasons	4	9.09	2	4.55	2	4.55	8	18.18
Political Reasons	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.27	1	2.27
Security-Related Reasons	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
Educational Purposes	11	25.00	5	11.36	2	4.55	18	40.91
Other / Family Reunification	6	13.64	8	18.18	3	6.82	17	38.64
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (7): Primary Reasons for Migration

Economic Reasons:

9.09% of migrants in France report that the primary reason for their migration is economic factors, while only 4.55% of migrants in the United States cite economic reasons, and Belgium also represents 4.55%. In total, 18.18% of individuals migrated due to economic reasons.

Educational Reasons:

Educational reasons are the primary motivation for migration to France, accounting for approximately 25%, indicating that many migrants have chosen France for educational opportunities. In the United States, this percentage is estimated at 11.36%, while in Belgium, it stands at 4.55%.

Educational factors are particularly prominent as a reason for migration, especially to France, which serves as a destination for international students seeking higher education.

Analysis of the Above Table:

From the above data, we can conclude that:

Educational reasons are among the main drivers of migration, especially to France.

Family reunification is a significant reason for migration, with this group being most represented in the United States.

Economic reasons do not play a major role in migration to these countries.

Political and security reasons do not appear to be primary factors in migration to France, the United States, or Belgium.

Analysis of the Impact of Reasons on the Integration Process:

Educational Reasons:

Migrants who migrate for educational reasons, such as students, tend to integrate more quickly into the host communities because they are typically in academic environments where they meet people from diverse cultural backgrounds. They also often learn the local language faster due to continuous exposure in education. This integration is broader as it involves interaction with classmates and participation in university activities.

However, while these individuals may integrate socially with relative ease, they might face challenges in retaining aspects of their original cultural identity due to their focus on education and financial limitations.

Family Reunification:

When individuals migrate for family reunification, they often have a strong support network in the host community through family members who may have migrated before them. This support can help facilitate the integration process through guidance and assistance in adapting to the new life. Despite the familial support, there might be difficulty in opening up to the host community if the family initially tries to hold on to their original cultural traditions. This can lead to a form of social isolation where individuals may prefer to interact with family members or others from their home country.

Economic Reasons:

Migrants who move for economic opportunities may face greater challenges in integration because they need to find work and achieve financial stability quickly. These individuals may have to accept jobs that do not match their academic or professional skills, which could limit their interactions with the host society. Due to the pressures of work life, these migrants may lack the time and energy to participate in social or cultural activities, reducing their opportunities for integration. Additionally, they may struggle to learn the local language or adapt to new social customs, hindering the integration process.

Political Reasons:

Migrants who flee political instability often have a strong desire to integrate due to the need for stability after experiencing conflict or upheaval. They may have a strong drive to build a new life and become integrated into the host society.

However, these individuals might face psychological or emotional challenges due to their past experiences in their home country, such as trauma or ongoing anxiety. These psychological hurdles may affect their ability to integrate socially.

Security Reasons:

Migrants fleeing security threats in their home countries may initially feel unsafe or anxious in the host country. This can hinder their ability to integrate into the new society, as they may still fear returning to their homeland or feel rejected by the host community.

This group of migrants may be more reserved in their interactions with the local society due to previous experiences of oppression or violence. Additionally, psychological conditions may impact their willingness to engage with others.

Mastery of the Host Country's Language

Language Proficiency	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Good	13	29.55	9	20.45	5	11.36	27	61.36
Intermediate	5	11.36	5	11.36	2	4.55	12	27.27
Poor	2	4.55	1	2.27	1	2.27	4	9.09
Do Not Speak the Language	1	2.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.27
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (8): Language Proficiency in the Host Country

The level of language proficiency is one of the key factors that significantly affects migrants' ability to integrate into the host society. Speaking the local language facilitates communication with others, helps to build stronger social and professional connections, and enhances migrants' opportunities to engage in social and economic activities.

The data indicates that the majority of migrants in the sample (61.36%) have a good level of language proficiency in the different host countries (France, the United States, Belgium). This suggests that these

individuals are generally able to interact effectively with the host society. In France, for example, 29.55% of migrants have good language skills, which contributes to their smoother social interactions, participation in community activities, and faster cultural and social integration. These individuals have a higher chance of employment and engagement in social and political activities, which enhances their ability to build a stable life.

However, despite their good language proficiency, these migrants may face challenges in retaining aspects of their cultural identity, especially if they feel pressured to fully assimilate into the local culture.

Around 27.27% of migrants have an intermediate level of language proficiency. These individuals may encounter some difficulties in daily communication, which could limit their opportunities for work and social interaction. Nevertheless, they are still able to interact to a limited extent with the host society. Such individuals often require additional time and training to improve their language skills, which can hinder their full participation in social or cultural activities.

9.09% of the migrants in the sample report poor language proficiency, meaning they face significant challenges in interacting with the local community. This could limit their opportunities to find jobs, participate in daily life, and interact with neighbors or coworkers. These migrants may experience social isolation and difficulty adjusting to local laws or accessing social and health services.

Only 2.27% of migrants in the sample do not speak the language of the host country, placing them in a particularly challenging position regarding integration and interaction with the local community. They may experience complete isolation, which can significantly affect both their personal and professional lives.

Language Assistance in Integration

Extent of Language Assistance in Integration	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Helpful	13	29.55	9	20.45	5	11.36	27	61.36
Moderately Helpful	5	11.36	5	11.36	2	4.55	12	27.27
Slightly Helpful	2	4.55	1	2.27	1	2.27	4	9.09
Did Not Help	1	2.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.27
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (9): The Role of Language in Facilitating Integration

Mastery of the local language is not only a crucial factor for daily interactions, but it is also an essential element in facilitating social integration and active participation in the host society. This impact is reflected in the responses to the question regarding the extent to which language has assisted in the integration process.

A significant 61.36% of migrants in the sample reported that language helped them significantly in integrating into the host society. This suggests that most migrants with good or intermediate language skills feel they are able to communicate effectively, gain better opportunities in education and employment, and establish social and cultural connections with the host society. This, in turn, enhances their stability and well-being, increasing their social interaction and participation in social, economic, and cultural activities. However, these individuals may still face challenges in maintaining their original cultural identity due to the pressure to fully assimilate into the local language and culture.

A further 27.27% of migrants felt that language helped them to a moderate degree. This indicates that these individuals face some challenges despite having a reasonable command of the language. They may struggle with understanding certain local terms or expressions, which can restrict their ability to participate fully in social and cultural activities. Consequently, their integration may be limited, and their interactions might be confined to environments where people share similar cultural backgrounds. Therefore, these individuals require additional support to improve their language skills in order to engage more effectively in the community.

9.09% of migrants indicated that language did not help them significantly in their integration. These individuals likely face greater communication difficulties, limiting their ability to fully engage with the local society. As a result, they experience social or cultural isolation, which hinders their participation in social activities and obstructs their progress in society. This makes the integration process more challenging for

them, highlighting the need for extended language support programs to improve their language skills and increase their opportunities for social and economic integration.

Only 2.27% of migrants stated that language did not assist them in their integration. This low percentage suggests that the majority of migrants recognize the importance of language in facilitating integration, even if their language skills are intermediate or weak.

Contribution of Employment to Integration

Contribution of Work to Integration	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Very Significant	7	15.91	11	25.00	5	11.36	23	52.27
Moderate	9	20.45	3	6.82	2	4.55	14	31.82
Minimal	4	9.09	1	2.27	0	0.00	5	11.36
No Contribution	1	2.27	0	0.00	1	2.27	2	4.55
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (10): The Contribution of Employment to Social Integration

France: Only 15.91% of individuals believe that work contributes significantly to integration, while 20.45% view it as having a moderate contribution. This reflects a moderate impact of employment on integration in French society. This may be related to the social reality in France, where the society is grappling with issues related to cultural and ethnic identities, making integration more complex.

United States: The highest percentage of individuals in the United States (25%) consider work to have a significant contribution to integration. This result may reflect the United States' large capacity to absorb migrants into the labor market, which is considered a key factor in integration. The United States has a long history of absorbing migrants, and the diverse work environment contributes to fostering social integration.

Belgium: Belgium shows the lowest percentage of individuals who see work contributing significantly to integration (11.36%), indicating greater challenges in terms of integration there compared to the other countries. Despite being one of the more advanced European countries, Belgium faces difficulties in the social integration of migrants, especially due to immigration policies that may not always be aimed at fostering smooth cultural and social integration.

On the other hand, the percentages of those who consider work as a moderate or weak contributor to integration vary across countries. In France and the United States, there are relatively higher percentages of individuals who believe work contributes moderately (France: 20.45%, United States: 6.82%). In Belgium, this percentage is lower (4.55%), suggesting that Belgians do not view work as significantly contributing to integration. These differences could reflect variations in educational systems, social policies, or legal frameworks that define labor opportunities and social integration.

Economic Integration: Economic integration emerges as a central factor in the process of social adaptation. Individuals who contribute to the workforce have a greater chance of building social networks and enhancing financial stability, which helps reinforce their sense of belonging and integration into society.

Migrant Labor: In countries like the United States, work can be a powerful driver of social integration for migrants. Economic policies in these countries are often more flexible in integrating migrants into the labor market. However, in Belgium, migrants may face greater challenges in accessing suitable job opportunities due to social or economic laws that limit their chances for integration.

France: French society is sometimes sensitive to cultural diversity, and integration remains a contentious issue. Work patterns may either reinforce or challenge an individual's cultural identity within society.

United States: Given its long history of migrant absorption, work is considered a strong means of integration, as the cultural diversity in the United States enhances opportunities for communication and collaboration across different cultural identities.

Belgium: The Belgian culture may be less accepting of diversity compared to other countries, making the integration process more challenging for individuals from different cultural backgrounds.

Work is considered an important element of social integration in these countries, but its impact varies depending on social, economic, and cultural policies. In the United States, work demonstrates a strong

contribution to social integration, while in France and Belgium, this contribution is less pronounced. Therefore, Belgium and France may need to develop more effective strategies to enhance social integration through work, focusing on improving labor policies and economic equality.

Exposure to Racial Discrimination

Type of Discrimination Experienced		France		United States		Belgium		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	Based on Ethnicity	1	2.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.27
	Based on Religion	4	9.09	0	0.00	2	4.55	6	13.64
	Based on Language	3	6.82	0	0.00	1	2.27	4	9.09
	Based on Culture	1	2.27	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	2.27
No		12	27.27	14	31.82	5	11.36	31	70.45
Total		21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (11): Experiences of Racial Discrimination

The overall findings show that 13.64% of individuals have experienced racial discrimination based on religion, and 9.09% based on language, highlighting the influence of these factors in different societies.

Interestingly, 70.45% of participants reported not experiencing racial discrimination, indicating that a large proportion of individuals feel they have not encountered discrimination. This suggests that various societies may have taken positive steps to combat racial discrimination, or that these issues may not be as pronounced as expected.

Cultural and religious diversity serves as a primary source of tensions in society, especially in countries like France and Belgium, where differences in language and religion can lead to racial discrimination.

The United States remains a relatively positive model in this context, but further analysis is needed to understand the nature of unspoken racial discrimination within the social environment.

Belgium may need to strengthen its efforts to improve cultural pluralism and ensure a reduction of racial discrimination across all domains.

Sense of Belonging to the Host Society

Level of Belonging		France		United States		Belgium		Total	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
YES	Strong Sense of Belonging	5	11.36	11	25.00	4	9.09	20	45.45
	Moderate Sense of Belonging	9	20.45	3	6.82	3	6.82	15	34.09
	Weak Sense of Belonging	6	13.64	1	2.27	0	0.00	7	15.91
NO		1	2.27	0	0.00	1	2.27	2	4.55
Total		21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (12): Sense of Belonging to the Host Society

From the following statistics, we can observe the following:

Sense of Belonging in France:

Only 11.36% of participants in France report feeling a strong sense of belonging, reflecting some of the challenges migrants face in fully integrating into French society. This could be linked to various factors, such as cultural and political tensions, with the French national identity being a central element, which may cause some individuals to feel isolated or alienated.

However, 20.45% feel a moderate sense of belonging, indicating that there are opportunities to improve integration within French society.

Only 2.27% report not feeling a sense of belonging, suggesting that France may have some policies and practices that promote feelings of inclusion, even among the less integrated individuals.

Sense of Belonging in the United States:

25% of participants in the United States report feeling a strong sense of belonging, the highest percentage among the three countries, indicating that, despite social and political challenges, the U.S. may create a better environment for migrants to feel included. This reflects the U.S.'s ability to integrate individuals into society more effectively, particularly in multicultural settings.

The fact that no one reported not feeling a sense of belonging (0% of participants) suggests that American culture may be more inclusive in terms of accepting diversity.

Only 6.82% feel a moderate sense of belonging, indicating some variation among participants, with some feeling more strongly connected to American society.

Sense of Belonging in Belgium:

Only 9.09% of participants in Belgium report a strong sense of belonging, a very low percentage compared to the other countries. This may reflect some of the challenges migrants face in integrating into Belgian society, including cultural and linguistic tensions.

Belgians may face difficulty in developing a collective identity due to the linguistic and cultural diversity across regions (such as between Flemish and Walloon communities).

6.82% feel a moderate sense of belonging, indicating room for improvement in fostering a greater sense of belonging within Belgian society.

Local Acceptance of Migrants

Level of Acceptance	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
High	5	11.36	12	27.27	5	11.36	22	50.00
Moderate	9	20.45	3	6.82	2	4.55	14	31.82
Low	6	13.64	0	0.00	0	0.00	6	13.64
None	1	2.27	0	0.00	1	2.27	2	4.55
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (13): Perceived Level of Acceptance by the Local Population

Acceptance of Locals in France:

Only 11.36% feel they are highly accepted by the local population in France, reflecting some challenges in the full integration of migrants into French society. This may be related to challenges in cultural and religious identity, which could limit the level of acceptance.

20.45% feel a moderate level of acceptance, indicating a mixed reality where there is some degree of acceptance but not at a high level.

2.27% of participants in France feel that there is no local acceptance, which suggests that challenges in accepting migrants may reach concerning levels for some individuals.

Acceptance of Locals in the United States:

27.27% of participants feel highly accepted, the highest percentage among the three countries, reflecting the multicultural nature of the United States. U.S. policies promote equality and inclusion, which may contribute to improving acceptance of migrants.

Only 6.82% feel a moderate level of acceptance, suggesting that the vast majority in the U.S. believe there is sufficient acceptance of migrants.

Interestingly, 0% of participants in the U.S. reported feeling weak or no acceptance, reflecting a more open attitude toward migrants.

Acceptance of Locals in Belgium:

Only 11.36% feel highly accepted by the local population in Belgium, a relatively low percentage compared to the United States. This may be due to cultural and linguistic challenges within Belgium between different regions (such as the Flemish and Walloon communities), which could affect the level of acceptance of migrants.

Only 4.55% feel a moderate level of acceptance, indicating that migrants in Belgium may face difficulties in gaining widespread acceptance.

2.27% of participants in Belgium feel that there is no local acceptance, indicating a sense of rejection from some individuals.

Preservation of Original Cultural Practices

Frequency of Cultural Practice Retention	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Always	12	27.27	13	29.55	5	11.36	30	68.18
Sometimes	7	15.91	1	2.27	2	4.55	10	22.73

Never	2	4.55	1	2.27	1	2.27	4	9.09
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (14): Retention of Original Cultural Practices

Preservation of Cultural Practices in France:

27.27% of participants in France maintain their original cultural practices permanently. This may indicate that a portion of migrants in France continue to preserve their cultures and traditions.

15.91% of participants preserve their cultural practices occasionally, suggesting that they do not face significant challenges in integrating some of their original cultural practices with life in French society.

Only 4.55% do not preserve their cultural practices at all, indicating that the acceptance of original cultural practices in France still exists to some extent.

Preservation of Cultural Practices in the United States:

29.55% of participants in the United States maintain their original cultural practices permanently, indicating that the cultural diversity in the U.S. encourages people to preserve their own cultures.

Only 2.27% preserve their cultural practices occasionally, suggesting that the majority of participants in the U.S. view their original cultural practices as an important part of their daily lives.

Only 2.27% do not preserve their cultural practices at all, reflecting that migrants in the U.S. tend to hold on to their culture even while integrating into American society.

Preservation of Cultural Practices in Belgium:

11.36% of participants in Belgium maintain their original cultural practices permanently, the lowest percentage among the three countries. This may suggest that Belgium may not provide an environment that encourages migrants to preserve their original cultures as much as other countries.

4.55% of participants preserve their cultural practices occasionally, reflecting some flexibility in integrating their original cultures with life in Belgium.

2.27% of participants in Belgium do not preserve their cultural practices at all, indicating greater engagement with Belgian culture at the expense of their original culture.

Preservation of Original Culture and Its Impact on Integration

The retention of one's original culture hinders integration	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	6	13.64	1	2.27	2	4.55	9	20.45
No	11	25.00	12	27.27	5	11.36	28	63.64
Not Sure	4	9.09	2	4.55	1	2.27	7	15.91
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (15): Does Retaining One's Original Culture Hinder Integration

France:

13.64% of participants believe that preserving original culture hinders integration. This may reflect some cultural tensions between migrants and French society, where openness to the local culture is seen as part of the integration process.

However, 25% of participants believe that preserving original culture does not hinder integration, meaning many migrants in France consider maintaining their cultural identity not to be in conflict with the process of adapting to French society.

9.09% of participants do not have a clear opinion on this matter, indicating that this issue can be a subject of debate and remains unresolved for some individuals.

The United States:

Only 2.27% of participants believe that preserving original culture hinders integration, reflecting the great openness offered by the U.S. toward migrants, where American culture encourages cultural diversity and the preservation of original identities.

27.27% believe that preserving original culture does not hinder integration, reflecting an environment that fosters multiculturalism in American society.

4.55% do not have an opinion, highlighting that the majority hold a positive stance toward cultural diversity.

Belgium:

Only 4.55% of participants in Belgium believe that preserving original culture hinders integration, suggesting that individuals in Belgium may face fewer challenges in maintaining their original cultures without feeling that it hinders their integration.

11.36% believe that preserving original culture does not hinder integration, meaning most participants in Belgium view engaging in Belgian society as not requiring abandonment of their original cultural identity.

2.27% do not have a clear opinion on the potential impact of preserving original culture on integration.

Participation in Social or Cultural Activities

Level of Participation	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Regularly	6	13.64	9	20.45	5	11.36	20	45.45
Occasionally	9	20.45	5	11.36	2	4.55	16	36.36
Never	6	13.64	1	2.27	1	2.27	8	18.18
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table (16): Participation in Social or Cultural Activities**France:**

Only 13.64% of participants regularly engage in social or cultural activities, indicating a gap in consistent social involvement among migrants in France.

20.45% participate occasionally, meaning that some engage sporadically, which may reflect difficulties in full adjustment or the availability of social opportunities.

13.64% do not participate at all, suggesting that a segment of migrants is not involved in social or cultural life, possibly due to cultural or psychological barriers.

The United States:

20.45% of participants regularly engage in social or cultural activities, indicating greater interaction with the local community.

11.36% participate occasionally, showing a balanced level of irregular participation.

Only 2.27% do not participate at all, which may reflect the open social environment in the United States, which encourages diversity and engagement in cultural and social activities.

Belgium:

11.36% of participants in Belgium regularly engage in social or cultural activities, a lower percentage compared to the United States, which may indicate limitations in available opportunities or differences in social cultures.

4.55% participate occasionally, suggesting that some participants prefer social activities intermittently.

Only 2.27% do not participate at all, a relatively low percentage compared to France, indicating better interaction with society than in France.

Participation in Public Life

Level of Participation	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Regularly	9	20.45	8	18.18	5	11.36	22	50.00
Occasionally	8	18.18	5	11.36	2	2.27	15	34.09
Never	4	9.09	2	2.27	1	2.27	7	15.91
Total	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97

Table 17: Participation in Public Life**France:**

20.45% of participants regularly engage in public social activities such as schools, churches, and mosques, which is a reasonable rate, indicating moderate interaction with the local community.

18.18% participate occasionally, meaning some migrants prefer to engage in public life intermittently.

9.09% do not participate at all, which may reflect difficulties in accessing social opportunities or cultural restrictions that may prevent some from participating.

The United States:

18.18% of participants in the United States regularly engage in public activities, which is an average rate reflecting the potential for social integration.

11.36% participate occasionally, indicating that some prefer to participate intermittently depending on the available opportunities.

Only 2.27% do not participate at all, suggesting greater flexibility in accepting migrants into public life in the United States.

Belgium:

11.36% regularly engage in public activities, which is much lower compared to the other countries, possibly indicating limitations in opportunities or social culture.

2.27% participate occasionally, which is a very low level of participation.

2.27% do not participate at all, suggesting that participation in public life in Belgium may be a challenge for some individuals.

Future Aspirations

Future Aspiration	France		United States		Belgium		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Obtaining Citizenship	21	47.73	15	34.09	8	18.18	44	99.97
Improving Professional Status	21	47.73	13	29.55	6	13.64	40	90.91
Returning to the Homeland	1	2.27	2	4.55	1	2.27	4	9.09
Educating Children	17	38.64	15	34.09	8	18.18	40	90.91
..Staying Here as if It Were My Homeland	19	43.18	13	29.55	7	15.91	39	88.64

Table 18: Future Aspirations

Obtaining Citizenship:

In France, obtaining citizenship is one of the main aspirations for migrants, as the significant percentage (47.73%) indicates that migrants aim for long-term settlement and integration into French society.

In the United States, similar aspirations are observed (34.09%), but at a lower rate.

In Belgium, the ambition to obtain citizenship is the lowest (18.18%), which may reflect a sense of not needing to change their legal status, or perhaps the social options in Belgium are less appealing to migrants.

Improving Professional Status:

There are clear aspirations to improve professional status across all countries, with the United States and France showing the highest desire for professional advancement (29.55% and 21%, respectively).

In Belgium, this ambition is less pronounced, at 13.64%.

Returning to the Homeland:

Returning to the homeland is one of the least common aspirations in all countries, at 2.27% in France, 4.55% in the United States, and 2.27% in Belgium. This can be explained by the fact that migrants in these countries have found better opportunities or stable conditions that make returning to their home countries less appealing.

Educating Children:

Among the main aspirations, educating children is a priority in all countries (90.91% of the total). This reflects the importance that migrants place on the education of future generations as part of their integration into the host society.

An additional option chosen by respondents is to remain in the host country as if it were their own. This is a common choice, particularly in France (43.18%) and the United States (29.55%). This reflects a strong desire to settle and adapt permanently to life in the host country.

Overall Conclusion

The results of the field study on migrants in France, the United States, and Belgium reveal significant variations in the patterns and dynamics of social and cultural integration, despite some similarities in basic demographic and social characteristics. The data showed that the majority of respondents belong to groups with advanced educational levels, enjoy relative legal stability, and have long stays, often exceeding five years. This enhances the opportunities for analysis over the medium and long term.

In terms of migration motivations, educational reasons and family reunification were the most prominent, indicating a shift in the structure of incentives from "survival migration" to "improvement migration," which aims to enhance life quality and fulfill long-term aspirations.

Regarding integration indicators, the results indicated that language plays a pivotal role in facilitating integration and interaction with the host society. Data showed that approximately 60% of migrants received language lessons, and most of them acknowledged that mastering the language helped them integrate effectively. Participation in social and cultural activities was also an additional indicator of integration levels, particularly in France and the United States, compared to Belgium, which showed more conservative results in terms of participation and belonging.

On a cultural and value level, respondents demonstrated a strong attachment to their original identity and rejected the idea that this attachment hinders integration. This reflects a dual integration model based on cultural pluralism and shared belonging, rather than complete assimilation.

Despite positive indicators, challenges related to racial discrimination remain, especially in France and the United States, where experiences of discrimination based on religion and language were reported. In Belgium, although the rates of reported discrimination were lower, feelings of isolation and weak belonging present parallel challenges.

Finally, the future aspirations of migrants reflect a clear desire for permanent settlement, obtaining citizenship, and achieving social and professional advancement, making migration a comprehensive life project that extends beyond a transitional or temporary phase.

Conclusion

The analysis of the data in this study provides a deeper understanding of migration as a complex social phenomenon that goes beyond mere geographic relocation, encompassing cultural, identity-related, and societal dimensions. Migration, in light of the new data, has become a process of integration and reformation of identities in a multicultural space, where the migrant seeks to reconcile their original belonging with the demands of the host society.

Language plays a fundamental role in this process, serving as the primary bridge for interaction with institutions, community participation, and cultural integration. However, a lack of language proficiency can become a major barrier, leading to isolation, marginalization, and possibly exploitation.

Additionally, public policies in receiving countries play a decisive role in either facilitating or complicating integration pathways. Successful integration of migrants requires effective language education programs, sustained institutional support, and legal guarantees that ensure equal opportunities and reduce structural discrimination.

Therefore, transitioning from a "containment" policy to an "empowerment" policy is a vital necessity for building inclusive societies based on coexistence, equality, and the recognition of cultural differences as a source of enrichment, not a threat.

References:

1. Blanca Graces, Runis Pennix, 2016, *The Concept of Integration: An Analytical Tool and Policy Concept*,
2. Bourdieu, Jean, 1990, *Social Classes and Migration*, Cambridge University Press.
3. Brikel, Hachemi. (2010). *The University and Social Development in Urban Society: A Field Study*, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of M'Sila (Doctoral dissertation, Université de M'Sila-Mohamed Boudiaf). <https://www.pnst.cerist.dz/detail.php?id=15671/>
4. Brikel, Hachemi. (2017). *Illegal Immigration... Causes and Solutions...* *Haqaeq Journal of Psychological and Social Studies*, 2 (8), 254-261. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/130434>
5. Huntington, Samuel, 1993, *The Clash of Civilizations*, Dar Al-Hikma, Baghdad.
6. Edward , Said, 1978, *Orientalism: Power and Cultural Migration*, Pantheon Books, Beirut.
7. Hachemi, Brikel. (2018). *Mechanisms for the Advancement of Social Sciences*. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 2 (07), 115-124. <https://democraticac.de/?p=58170>
8. Djamel, Ghembaza & Brikel, Hachemi. (2024). *Migration Letters Illegal Immigration And Its Effects On Sustainable Development And Citizenship Values*. *Migration Letters*. 21. 1741-8992. <https://migrationletters.com/index.php/ml/article/view/11485/7672>
9. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15636070>

10. Duaa, Shahtah, *Social Integration of Migrants*, Journal of the Faculty of Arts, Issue 17, Part 2, Egypt.
11. Heckmann, F., 2011, *Integration and Integration Policies*, IMISCOE, Network Feasibility, 2006.
12. Hachemi , Brikel. (2015). *Urbanization and its impact on the Algerian family structurally and functionally*. *Journal of Human Sciences* , 15 (1), 1003-1016. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/88199>
13. Maliki, Mohammed, *Second Annual Conference on Social and Human Sciences*, March 30-32, 2013, Arab Center for Research and Policy Studies, Qatar.
14. Brikel, Hachemi. (2017). *Urban Society Problems*. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/90322>
15. Khelifa, Mohamed & Brikel, Hachemi. (2025). *THE INFORMAL ECONOMY IN ALGERIAN SOCIETY*. *Psychology and Education Journal*. 62. 85-96.
16. <https://psychologyandeducation.net/pae/index.php/pae/article/view/10072>
17. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15636032>
18. Brikel, Hachemi. (2014). *Urbanization and the Algerian family*.
19. <https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/91308>
20. Runis Pennix, Blanca Graces, 2016, *The Concept of Integration: An Analytical Tool and Policy Concept, in Integration Processes and Policies in the European Context: Levels and Actors*, IMISCOE.
21. Foucault, Michel, 1975, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Gallimard Publishers, Beirut.
22. Brikel, Hachemi. (2024). *Climate Change and Academic Performance*. *Psychology and Education Journal*. 61. 1574-1584. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15625519>

List of Tables

Table Number	Description
1	Stages of Study Development
2	Panel of Academic Reviewers
3	Distribution by Gender
4	Distribution by Years of Residence
5	Distribution by Legal Status
6	Distribution by Educational Level
7	Main Reasons for Migration
8	Language Proficiency and Its Impact on Integration
9	Role of Language Support in Social Integration
10	Contribution of Employment to Integration
11	Exposure to Racial Discrimination
12	Sense of Belonging to the Host Society
13	Perceived Acceptance by the Local Population
14	Retention of Original Cultural Practices
15	Does Retaining Original Culture Hinder Integration?
16	Participation in Social or Cultural Activities
17	Participation in Public Life
18	Future Aspirations