Type of refugee accommodation and health of residents: cross-sectional cluster analysis in German federal state

Amir Mohsenpour[a]*, Verena Dudek[b]*, Kayvan Bozorgmehr[ac], Louise Biddle[a], Oliver Razum[b], Odile Sauzet[bd]

[a]Population Medicine and Health Services Research, Bielefeld University, Universitaetsstraße 25 in 33615 Bielefeld, Germany

[b]Epidemiology & International Public Health, Bielefeld University, Universitaetsstraße 25 in 33615 Bielefeld, Germany

[c]Section for Health Equity Studies and Migration, Department of General Practice and Health Services Research, Heidelberg University Hospital, Marsilius Arkaden, Turm West, 69120 Heidelberg, Germany

[d]Data Analysis Group, Department of Business Administration and Economics, Bielefeld University, Universitaetsstraße 25 in 33615 Bielefeld, Germany

* denotes equal contributions

Correspondence to:
Amir Mohsenpour
amir.mohsenpour@uni-bielefeld.de
Department of Population Medicine and Health Services Research,
School of Public Health, Bielefeld University,
33501 Bielefeld, Germany, P.O. Box: 10 01 31

Additional Information

Ethical considerations

Primary data has been collected as part of the RESPOND project at Heidelberg University Hospital, Germany (https://respond-study.org/) and oral informed consent was obtained from all participants after oral, written and audio-based information in nine languages deployed by a multi-lingual field team. Ethical clearance was received by the ethics committee of the Medical Faculty of Heidelberg on October 12, 2017 (S- 516/2017[2]).

Role of the funding source

The primary data collection was funded by the German Federal Ministry for Education and Research (BMBF) in the scope of the project RESPOND (Grant Number: 01GY1611). The study was realised with funding of the German Science Foundation (DFG) in the scope of the Research Unit PH-LENS (FOR 2928), subprojects DEPRIV (409654512) and NEXUS (GZ: BO 5233/1-1). AM acknowledges financial support by the Else Kröner-Fresenius-Stiftung (2017_Promotionskolleg.08) within the Heidelberg Graduate School of Global Health. The funders had no influence on study design, analysis, or decision to publish.

Availability of data

Data are available from the authors upon reasonable request.

Authors' contributions:

AM: Study conceptualisation, data collection, data management, writing of final version
VP: Study conceptualisation, methodology, data analysis, writing of original draft
KB: Project and study conceptualisation, funding acquisition, project management, data collection, draft revision
LB: Project and study conceptualisation, project management, data collection, data management, draft revision
OR: Study conceptualisation, methodology, draft revision
OS: Study conceptualisation, methodology, draft revision

Declaration of interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Abstract

Few studies have assessed whether refugees' health is associated with accommodation characteristics. We aimed to devise a typology of refugee accommodation based on number of inhabitants, degree of housing deterioration and remoteness (distance to amenities) and assess the association with health in multivariate analyses. Accommodations with a moderate occupation, lowest levels of deterioration, and a central urban location showed the best health outcomes in terms of subjective general health status, depression, and general anxiety disorder (GAD). Associations were strongest for GAD and weakest for depression. Our findings inform policymakers on layout and location of refugee collective accommodation centres.

Keywords

refugees; post-migration; housing environment; neighbourhoods; mental health; cluster analysis

Introduction

Living conditions in collective accommodation centres can lead to mental and physical health problems among the residents. The living conditions of refugees and asylum seekers in resettlement countries are considered as post-migration conditions that can generate stress (1). A study in collective accommodation centres in Germany found a high prevalence of common mental disorders among Arab-speaking asylum seekers with more than one third of the sample showing symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), major to severe depression or major to severe general anxiety disorder (GAD) (2). However, the study did not investigate the specific impact of the collective accommodation centres themselves. In a Dutch study it was found that living in large reception centres significantly predicts mental problems among unaccompanied minors in the long term (3). Another Dutch study also showed that residents from state-provided reception centres suffer from poorer mental health than residents from other accommodation types (4). The authors suggested that the residents of the reception centres are lacking privacy and autonomy which in turn may generate mental problems (4). Similar explanations have been suggested in the German context. Ajlan considered collective accommodation centres in Germany as "unhomely places" in which the lack of privacy and autonomy creates uncertainty and desperate which then can cause violence among the residents (5). Further, the Covid-19 pandemic has illustrated that collective accommodation centres can form a risk for the physical health of refugees and asylum seekers since many collective accommodation centres were affected by disease outbreaks and residents had limited abilities to protect themselves from infection (6,7).

In the past years, the number of refugees and asylum seekers living in German collective accommodation centres has reduced significantly (8,9). Despite the reduction, still roughly every fourth was living in a collective accommodation centre at the end of 2019 (8,9). These centres can roughly be divided into initial reception centres (including Arrival – and AnkER-centres[1]), in which residence is compulsory until refugee status is determined (but for a maximum of 18 months), and subsequent collective accommodation centres[2]. The size and layout of German collective accommodation centres differ in many ways. In the federal state of North Rhine-Westphalia for

---

[1] AnkER - centres are special types of reception centres concentrating all relevant actors for the reception, distribution across Germany and (where relevant) the deportation of asylum seekers in one site. This concept is mainly implemented in Bavaria.

[2] In the following the term "collective accommodation centre" is used to denote initial reception centres as well as subsequent collective accommodation unless a distinction is necessary.

example, capacities of state-mandated reception centres ranged from 160 to more than 1000 people in 2019 (10). According to a population-based study among refugee households in Germany, many residents of collective accommodation centres lived in re-dedicated buildings in 2016, such as former offices, schools or hotels (11), each entailing specific and often poor housing conditions. Not all of the accommodation centres were located in urban areas, around one third of those living in collective accommodation lived in rural areas and around 23% in non-residential industrial areas (12). Ajlan (5) also observed that the accommodation centres he assessed were located in rather non-residential areas, far away from infrastructure, contributing to the social exclusion of the residents.

In sum, evidence suggests that the type of accommodation can impact the health of refugees and asylum seekers. It is less well understood which contextual factors of collective accommodation centres in particular play a role in this relationship. Thus far, little is known on the combined effects of such contextual accommodation factors (e.g. in terms of accommodation size, layout or deterioration). Thus, in this study we aimed to devise a typology of refugee accommodation which helps to examine potential context-related health differences. We then analysed possible associations between the accommodation types identified and the health of the residents living in these accommodation types.

Data and methods

Data

We analysed health and accommodation data of 412 refugees and asylum seekers from up to 58 different accommodation facilities in South-West Germany collected in the scope of the RESPOND study (12). The study provides a rich set of accommodation variables such as accommodation type, occupation density, geographical location and deterioration of housing. For the latter, RESPOND researchers developed and validated an index instrument, the “Small-area Housing Environment Deterioration” (SHED) Index. Applying this index, RESPOND researchers assessed different domains of the physical environment of each collective accommodation centre visited. Based on the Broken-Window Index, the SHED measures the quality of windows, walls and outside spaces as well as the presence of garbage or graffities and an overall rating of the living environment on a scale from one to six (least to highest state of decay) (13). The geographical location was measured by the district the accommodation is located in, a binary variable indicating population density (below 150 inhabitants per km^2 were considered as rural, above this cut-off as urban following a definition of the Federal Institute for Research on Building, Urban Affairs and Spatial Development (BBSR)), and the distance to shops, medical and administrative services by foot and with public transport (based on GoogleMaps (GM) connections). Besides accommodation variables, the RESPOND study has also assessed a range

of (subjective) physical and mental health outcomes, including a screening of GAD, depression symptoms, and the subjective general health status (12). They were measured using the GAD-2 (General Anxiety Disorder – 2, (14)), the Patient Health Questionnaire - 2 (PHQ-2, depression, (15)) as well as a general health indicator drawn from the European Health Interview Survey (EHIS, (16)).

Statistical methods

We performed a cluster analysis with the RESPOND variables that contained information about the physical accommodation context, i.e. the number of inhabitants, remoteness (walking distance to shops, medical or administrative services), urbanity (urban / rural distinction) and housing decay. For the latter, the overall SHED-score as well as the normalized and z-standardized single scores were included in the analysis in order to identify small-scaled housing differences. After exploring different cluster algorithms and methods, we chose a hierarchal, agglomerative clustering algorithm using Euclidean Distance and Ward's method. We identified the number of clusters by visually assessing dendrogram and scatterplot. We then added the clusters as separate variables to the data set, representing different accommodation types. In a consequent step, we assessed bivariate associations between the identified clusters and health outcomes and tested them for significance via Pearson's Chi-squared tests. Further, we performed logistic regression analyses to obtain associations between the identified accommodation clusters and health outcomes adjusted for potential confounders. General health, GAD and depression were used as dependent variables in three separate analyses. We transformed the general health status, which initially was measured on a scale ranging from 1 (*good health*) to 5 (*poor health*), to a binary variable with a value of 1 indicating poor health (comprised of category 4 and 5 of the initial variable). For GAD and depression, both also binary variables, a value of 1 indicated the presence of symptoms. The independent variables included age, gender and the cluster variables. In subsequent analyses, we assessed how the distribution of GAD and depression differed between the clusters. We created three distribution variables (GAD or depression present, both present, both absent) and used these distribution variables as dependent variables in additional logistic regression analyses. All statistical analyses were performed with R (version 3.6.2.).

Results

Clustering

Accommodation data from 411 refugees and asylum seekers (only complete cases) were included in the cluster analysis. The observation of the resulting dendrogram and scatterplot pointed to the construction of either two or four clusters. In order to keep the within-group variance of the agglomerated clusters as high as possible we decided to construct four clusters. With a two-cluster solution we would have had to accept a high level of dissimilarity as the dendrogram illustrated. This would have prevented us from identifying possible differences within the two large clusters. Cluster 1 and 3 were the two smallest, containing 39 people each (from two and nine different accommodation centres respectively). Cluster 4 contained 143 people from 29 different accommodation centres and Cluster 2 190 people from 29 accommodation centres.

Cluster characteristics

Cluster 1

Residents in Cluster 1 had a mean age of 31.5 years (SD = 12) with 48.6% of the persons being women. In all other clusters, the proportion of women was lower. With as average of 151 residents per accommodation (SD = 9.0), Cluster 1 included the largest type of accommodation analysed here. The total SHED score was 3.6 (SD = 1.5) which was higher than in all other clusters, indicating the highest level of housing deterioration. Besides the broken-windows indicator, all other single indicators scored equal to or larger than 0.5. Garbage accumulation and the outward appearance were most striking with a score of 0.8 each (SD = 0.2). Two accommodation centres were included in Cluster 1, both located in an urban district according to the BBSR-definition. Shops, medical and administrative services could all be reached by foot within around 15 minutes (SD ≤ 7.5).

Key characteristics of cluster 1:

- Largest accommodation type
- Highest state of decay
- Urban and central location

Cluster 2

Residents of Cluster 2 had a mean age of 31.8 years (SD = 12). With a percentage of 22.5% the proportion of women was the lowest of all clusters. This cluster had an average number of 70 residents per accommodation mean (SD = 20.9), including the second largest accommodation type in this analysis. Housing deterioration was lower than in Cluster 1 but with a SHED-score of 1.1 (SD = 0.8) it was the cluster with the second highest state of decay. Garbage accumulation and the overall evaluation of the physical environment scored highest but with only 0.3 each (SD ≤ 0.3). Most of the 14 accommodation centres in this cluster were located in urban districts. Still, the percentage of residents living in urban areas was the lowest compared to the other clusters with only 72.1%. Shops and medical services could be accessed within approximately 10 minutes each by foot (SD ≈ 5), distance to administrative services was larger with around 22 minutes (SD = 10.3).

Key characteristics cluster 2:

- Second largest accommodation type
- Increased state of decay
- Partly located in rural districts but still central

Cluster 3

In Cluster 3, people were slightly older than in the other clusters with a mean age of 33.1 years (SD = 10.4), 38.2% of the residents in this cluster were women. With 15 residents on average (SD = 7.5), Cluster 3 presented the smallest accommodation type found in this analysis. It also showed one of the lowest SHED scores with 0.8 (SD = 0.7). The overall evaluation of the physical environment scored highest with 0.3 (SD = 0.3), all other dimensions were negligible. Though up to 90% of the accommodation centres assessed here (n = 9) can be considered as being located in urban districts, remoteness levels were remarkably high with walking distances to shops, medical and administrative services being larger than 50 minutes (SD ≤ 15.3).

Key characteristics of cluster 3:

- Smallest accommodation type
- Negligible state of decay
- Located in urban districts but in the outskirts

Cluster 4

In Cluster 4, residents were the oldest with a mean age of 33.4 years (SD = 9.9). The proportion of women was 36.2%. This cluster also presented one of the smaller accommodation types with approximately 27 inhabitants in mean (SD = 13.6). With an overall SHED-score of 0.8 (SD = 0.9) and the highest single indicator being the overall evaluation of the physical environment (0.3, SD = 0.3), Cluster 4 presented quite similar low scores for housing deterioration as Cluster 3. The proportion of accommodation centres being located in urban districts was similarly low as in Cluster 2 with approximately 73%. Shops could be reached by foot within 11 minutes (SD = 8.3), medical services within 15 minutes (SD = 13.8) and administrative services within 17 minutes, though a standard deviation of 19.5 indicated relatively high variations here.

Key characteristics of cluster 4:

- Small accommodation type
- Negligible state of decay
- Partly located in rural districts but still central

Table 1: Cluster characteristics.

		Cluster			
		1	2	3	4
Age of the residents					
Mean		31.5	31.8	33.1	33.4
SD		7.2	12	10.4	9.9
Missings	n	1	17	5	28
Sex of the residents					
Male	n	19	131	21	81
	%	51.4	77.5	61.8	63.8
Female	n	18	38	13	46
	%	48.6	22.5	38.2	36.2
Missings	n	2	21	5	16
No. of inhabitants					
Mean		150.6	69.7	14.6	26.7
SD		9	20.9	7.5	13.6
Remoteness					
Remoteness: medical services (in minutes walking)					
Mean		14.1	12.9	54.2	14.8
SD		2.5	5.3	15.3	13.8
Remoteness: administrative services (in minutes walking)					
Mean		16.2	21.6	50.5	17.4
SD		7.5	10.3	12.5	19.5
Remoteness: Shops (in minutes walking)					
Mean		15.2	9.3	56.5	10.6
SD		1.5	5.2	15.1	8.3
Urbanity					
rural	n	0	53	4	38
	%	0	27.9	10.3	26.6
urban	n	39	137	35	105
(≥ 150 inhabitants per km^2)	%	100	72.1	89.7	73.4
Housing deterioration					
SHED total score					
Mean		3.6	1.1	0.8	0.8

SD	1.5	0.8	0.7	0.9
SHED: broken windows*				
Mean	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.0
SD	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.1
SHED: walls*				
Mean	0.5	0.2	0.1	0.1
SD	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.2
SHED: graffities*				
Mean	0.5	0.2	0	0.1
SD	0	0.3	0	0.2
SHED: outside space*				
Mean	0.8	0.1	0.1	0.1
SD	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.3
SHED: garbage accumulation*				
Mean	0.8	0.3	0	0.2
SD	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.3
SHED: overall rating physical environment*				
Mean	0.6	0.3	0.3	0.3
SD	0.5	0.3	0.3	0.3

** 0-1 normalized and z-standardized SHED single items*

More details of the cluster characteristics are provided in Table 1. In sum, the four clusters can roughly be divided into two larger accommodation types with increased deteriorated conditions and two smaller accommodation types with a minimum level of housing deterioration. The highest SHED score was 3.6 out of a maximum of 6, indicating no extreme levels of housing deterioration. Scores for garbage accumulation were higher in the two clusters with a larger number of inhabitants, the same also applies to a lesser extent to the graffiti-score. In contrast, graffities and garbage accumulation were of little concern in the smallest accommodation cluster. All accommodation types were predominantly located in urban districts based on the urban-rural distinction applied here. Considering the level of remoteness, the results of Clusters 1, 2 and 4 were fairly similar, all showing acceptable distances to shops and essential services. Cluster 3, by contrast, seemed comparatively remote with walking distances beyond 50 minutes.

Health disparities between clusters

The clusters identified showed some differences in the health status of their residents. Most striking were the health outcomes of Cluster 4: in all three health variables, residents in Cluster 4 showed better health outcomes than in the other clusters, as Table 2 illustrates. For the general subjective health status, only 12.3% of Cluster 4 residents indicated poor general health, while Cluster 3 scored the highest with 25.7%. The differences found in the proportions for poor general health were not statistically significant, though. Symptoms of impaired mental health were more common than of impaired general health in all clusters. In terms of GAD, more than one in two residents of Cluster 2 indicated symptoms. For Clusters 1 and 3, numbers were also relatively high with percentages larger than 42%. Cluster 4 residents scored lower, around one third indicated symptoms here. The unadjusted differences in the frequencies of GAD symptoms between the clusters were statistically significant ($x^2_{(\mathrm{df}\,=\,3)} = 13$; $p = 0.005$). The number of people with depression symptoms was the lowest for Cluster 4 residents, as well, with a percentage of approximately 39%. In Clusters 1, 2 and 3, in contrast, around 1 in 2 people indicated symptoms of depression. However, differences for depression symptoms between the clusters were not statistically significant.

Table 2: Health characteristics grouped by cluster.

		Cluster			
		1	**2**	**3**	**4**
General subjective health status					
Poor health	n	6	38	9	16
	%	16.7	22.5	25.7	12.3
Missings	n	3	21	4	13
	%	7.69	11.05	10.26	9.09
General anxiety disorder (GAD2)					
GAD symptoms*	n	14	86	18	38
	%	42.4	53.8	48.6	32.2
Missings	n	6	30	2	25
	%	15.38	15.79	5.13	17.48
Depression (PHQ-2)					
Depression symptoms	n	17	79	17	45
	%	51.5	49.1	47.2	38.5
Missings	n	6	29	3	26
	%	15.38	15.26	7.69	18.18

** differences statistically significant ($p < 0.05$)*

Results of regression analyses

An overview of the results of the regression analyses for poor general health, GAD and depression (PHQ-2) is provided in Table 3. In Model 1, subjective general health status was regressed against cluster, age and gender. When controlling for age and gender, Cluster 1, 2 and 3 all showed increased odds for residents having a poor general health status than Cluster 4. Cluster 2 showed the highest odd ratios here and was nearly significant at the 0.05-significance level (OR = 2.05; 95%-CI [1.00 – 4.46], p = 0.058), indicating that Cluster 2 residents could approximately be twice as likely to have a poor general health status than Cluster 4 residents. There was evidence for an association also in other clusters, with odds ratios larger than 1. The p-values, however, were far from statistical significance.

The model for GAD (Model 2) showed a significant association with accommodation type in Cluster 2 (OR = 2.7; 95%-CI [1.55 – 4.79], p = 0.001) and Cluster 3 (OR = 2.4; 95%-CI [1.04 – 5.64], p = 0.042) relative to Cluster 4 after controlling for age and gender. Residents of both clusters could thus be more likely to report symptoms of anxiety than those in Cluster 4 after adjusting for age and gender. The results pointed to no statistically significant differences between Cluster 1 and 4, though. In the model for depression (Model 3), all clusters showed odd ratios larger than 1 relative to Cluster 4 but no relation was statistically significant (p-values between 0.13 and 0.62).

Table 3: Logistic regression results. Data based on the RESPOND study (11)

	Model 1: General health		**Model 2: GAD**		**Model 3: PHQ-2 (Depression)**	
	OR (95% CI)	**p-value**	**OR (95% CI)**	**p-value**	**OR (95% CI)**	**p-value**
Constant	0.08***		0.37*		0.35*	
	(0.03 - 0.23)	0.000	(0.15 - 0.88)	0.026	(0.15 - 0.81)	0.016
Age	1.01		1.00		1.02	
	(0.99 - 1.04)	0.313	(0.98 - 1.03)	0.783	(1.00 - 1.04)	0.081
Gender	1.51		1.43		1.07	
	(0.79 - 2.86)	0.204	(0.85 - 2.42)	0.174	(0.64 - 1.78)	0.796
Cluster 1	1.41		1.25		1.24	
	(0.41 - 4.28)	0.556	(0.51 - 2.97)	0.619	(0.53 - 2.89)	0.620
Cluster 2	2.05		2.70***		1.52	
	(1.00 - 4.46)	0.058	(1.55 - 4.79)	0.001	(0.88 - 2.63)	0.134
Cluster 3	1.69		2.40*		1.28	
	(0.54 - 4.89)	0.343	(1.04 - 5.64)	0.042	(0.55 - 2.96)	0.558
Nagelkerke R^2	*0.035*		*0.069**		*0.025*	
AIC:	*275.9*		*387.2*		*397.4*	

Notes:

Reference categories: male, cluster 4.

*Significant at *5, ** 1 and *** 0.1 percent levels, respectively (for overall models, likelihood ratio tests (LRT) were used.)*

	Model 4: GAD + PHQ-2 = 1		**Model 5: GAD + PHQ-2 = 0**		**Model 6: GAD OR PHQ-2 = 1**	
	OR (95% CI)	**p-value**	**OR (95% CI)**	**p-value**	**OR (95% CI)**	**p-value**
Constant	0.15***		1.31		0.64	
	(0.06 - 0.37)	0.000	(0.56 - 3.13)	0.530	(0.15 - 0.81)	0.380
Age	1.02		1.00		0.98	
	(1.00 – 1.04)	0.098	(0.97 - 1.02)	0.650	(1.00 - 1.04)	0.180
Gender	1.44		0.91		0.73	
	(0.84 - 2.47)	0.188	(0.54 - 1.52)	0.712	(0.64 - 1.78)	0.320
Cluster 1	0.99		0.66		1.68	
	(0.35 – 2.57)	0.988	(0.29 - 1.53)	0.334	(0.53 - 2.89)	0.260
Cluster 2	2.23**		0.50*		0.99	
	(1.24 – 4.10)	0.009	(0.29 - 0.86)	0.013	(0.88 - 2.63)	0.970
Cluster 3	2.01		0.62		0.80	
	(0.85 – 4.95)	0.107	(0.27 - 1.43)	0.270	(0.55 - 2.96)	0.670
Nagelkerke R^2	*0.062**		*0.031*		*0.026*	
AIC:	*360.3*		*390*		*323.6*	

Distribution of depression and GAD in the clusters

In the sample, depression and anxiety disorders were correlated (r = 0.52). In our analysis we found Cluster 2 and 3 being significantly associated with GAD compared to Cluster 4. Given the high chance of comorbidity for depression and GAD, we assumed that the analysis of the association between cluster and depression would have yielded similar results. Since this was not the case, we additionally assessed the distribution of depression and GAD in the clusters (see Figure 1) and consequently analysed how regression results changed when using these distribution variables as dependent variables (see Table 3).

This analysis revealed higher proportions of residents in all clusters showing both symptoms than those showing GAD symptoms without depression or vice versa. This particularly applied to residents of Cluster 2 and 3. Around 40% of the residents showed both symptoms in these clusters while this applied to only around 25% of the residents in Cluster 1 and 4. For Cluster 1, 2 and 3 proportions of residents with GAD symptoms but no depression was fairly equal with around 13-15%, while in Cluster 4 the proportion was only 8%. By contrast, Cluster 4 had larger percentages of residents showing depression without GAD symptoms (16%) compared to Cluster 2 and 3 (7-10%), though the highest proportion was found for Cluster 1 here (20.7%). The distribution for Cluster 2 and 3 were thus similar in each category, while Cluster 1 and 4 deviated from them. Only the cluster differences found for both symptoms present were statistically significant ($x^2_{(df = 3)} = 8$; $p = 0.05$).



Figure 1: Distribution of depression (PHQ-2) and GAD symptoms in the total sample and grouped by cluster.

In the regression analyses, we found significant differences between Cluster 2 and 4 (OR = 2.3; 95%-CI [1.24 – 4.10]; p = 0.009) in the model for comorbid GAD and depression (Model 4, Table 3) while again adjusting for age and gender. Residents from Cluster 2 could thus approximately be twice as likely to develop comorbid GAD and depression compared to Cluster 4 when controlling for age and gender. Similar odds ratios were found for Cluster 3, though the effect was not statistically significant (OR = 2.1; 95%-CI [0.85 – 4.95], p = 0.107). A model for the absence of both diseases (Model 5) supported these results, again indicating significant effects for Cluster 2. Accordingly, Cluster 2 residents were half as likely to develop neither GAD or depression compared to Cluster 4 residents when adjusting for age and gender (OR = 0.50; 95%-CI [0.29 – 0.86], p = 0.01). The odd ratios for Cluster 1 and 3 were both larger (though still below 0) but failed to yield statistically significant results. Further, a model for the presence of either GAD or depression symptoms could not identify any statistically significant cluster effects. While Cluster 2 and 3 showed odds ratios below 1, thus pointing to lower risks for the onset of one of the two mental disorders compared to Cluster 4, Cluster 1 had an odds ratio of 1.67, thus indicating higher risks. With p-values larger than 0.26, the results were far from statistical significance, though.

Discussion

Collective accommodation centres are considered to be postmigration stress factors impacting health (17). However, to the best of our knowledge, empirical research investigating health impacts of collective accommodation has put little emphasis on contextual differences in the accommodation setting as such.

We assumed that the context of collective accommodation centres is subject to substantial variability regarding accommodation size, location, and the quality of the housing environment throughout Germany. We therefore aimed to devise a typology of refugee accommodation by conducting a cluster analysis and to analyse associations between different accommodation types and health. We have identified four accommodation clusters: 1) a large accommodation type, located in central urban areas with visible deteriorated housing conditions (mean total SHED = 3.6/6); 2) a large-to-medium sized accommodation type frequently located in rural areas (though still located close to amenities) with few deteriorated conditions (mean total SHED = 1.1 /6); 3) a small accommodation type, predominantly located in urban areas with negligible levels of housing deterioration (mean total SHED = 0.8 /6) but remotely located from important amenities; and 4) a small to medium sized accommodation type located partially in rural areas but close to amenities and with negligible levels of housing deterioration (mean total SHED = 0.8 /6). Interestingly, the two clusters based on 39 residents showed similar but more “extreme” characteristics with one of the larger clusters (with 143 and 190 cases). The first cluster for example was similar to the second cluster but had a higher SHED score and a higher accommodation size. By contrast, the third cluster was more similar to the fourth cluster but had an even smaller accommodation size and was located more remotely.

Bivariate as well as multivariate analyses consistently revealed that the best health outcomes could be found in the fourth type of accommodation, indicating that residents living in less crowded, less deteriorated and less remotely located accommodation centres, suffer less frequently from GAD and depression, and more often report to be in good general health. In bivariate analysis, cluster differences in GAD prevalence were statistically significant. In multivariate regression analyses we found higher odds of poor general health, GAD and depression in all accommodation clusters compared to the small, central and less deteriorated accommodation type (Cluster 4), while adjusting for age and gender. However, only for GAD, we found a significant increase in odds for one of the larger, more deteriorated accommodation types (Cluster 2) and for the smallest, more remotely located accommodation type (Cluster 3). For poor general health, effect of Cluster 2 was at least nearly significant. In subsequent analyses, we also found that a high proportion of residents showed comorbid symptoms of GAD and depression. The odds of comorbidity were found to be significantly

higher in Cluster 2 compared to Cluster 4. This is consistent with other findings pointing to comorbidity of depression and anxiety disorder (18–20).

Assuming the contextual differences in Cluster 2 and 3 compared to Cluster 4 are associated with the health outcomes in the clusters, issues of crowded dwellings, housing deterioration but also remoteness should be investigated more closely. Studies assessing the health impact of housing among refugee and asylum seeker populations in resettlement countries frequently point to issues of overcrowding, especially when the accommodation must be shared with strangers and health needs vary between the residents (21). Evans et al. (22) found a consistent positive relationship between overcrowding (measured by number of rooms per people) and psychological distress in different institutionalized populations (e.g. among prisoners or college students). The authors also pointed to indirect pathways linking the built environment to mental problems. For example, large residences with semiprivate spaces can cause a lack of personal control. More crowded residential settings can lead to social withdrawal with negative consequences for the development and maintenance of socially supportive relationships. Overcrowding is measured quite differently in empirical research, though. A commonly used measurement is the number of rooms relative to the number of inhabitants, for example in the official Eurostat definition (23). This definition specifies that there should be one room each per couple in the household, for singles above 18 years, for pair of adolescents of the same gender, for single adolescents who are not included in the previous group and for children under 12 years. Applying this definition, 7.3% of the national population in Germany was considered to live in overcrowded households in 2018. Among non-EU citizens, this proportion was remarkably higher with 18.3% (24).

Research investigating health impacts of the physical environment of refugee accommodation is yet sparse, but our findings are supported by evidence from the literature assessing neighbourhood disorder. A meta-analysis by O'Brien et al. (25) found a persistent association of neighbourhood disorder and mental health outcomes as well as overall health. The results support the psychosocial model of disadvantage, indicating that stressful conditions – such as deteriorated neighbourhoods - can impact mental health, though the studies assessed were mainly cross-sectional, thus not allowing to confirm causality. We also found that among the different aspects of housing deterioration garbage accumulation played a major role. Research on the effect of garbage accumulation on mental health is lacking, though. Shiue et al. (26) assessed the impact of perceived neighbourhood conditions (including garbage accumulation) on adult mental health in Europe. They found that those showing symptoms of depression were almost two times as likely to report major problems with garbage in the neighbourhood than participants that were not classified as having depression symptoms. Not surprisingly, they also found that garbage problems are rather a problem in towns and cities than in

the countryside, which would also support our findings since in the remote accommodation cluster, garbage accumulation was of no concern.

We did not find consistent evidence whether and how remoteness, i.e. the distance to important amenities, can impact health. While national and international studies have frequently pointed to the impact of the urban environment on poorer mental health outcomes, there is low evidence that a higher level of remoteness may generate mental illness. Peen et al. (27) argued that a range of stress factors harmful for mental health are more common in urban areas than in rural areas, i.e. social factors such as life events and social isolation, or physical factors such as small housing, population density and air pollution. Adli and Schöndorf (28) support the assumption that urban districts induce social stress which in turn can increase the risk of mental illness. While Eckert et al. (29) and Goldney et al. (30) found no associations between the level of remoteness and mental illness in Australia, Kelly et al. (31) found higher levels of mental problems for residents living in more remote areas. In all three studies remoteness was generally defined by road distance to services (in (29) and (31), the "Accessibility / Remoteness Index of Australia", ARIA, was applied which is based on road distance and population size (32)). Kelly et al. (31) pointed to the geographic variabilities in mental health but also raised the question whether the observed association may be less due to the remoteness itself but rather due to associated regional characteristics such as social isolation, community size, or socioeconomic positions. Following Peen et al. (27) and Kelly et al. (31), it seems that it not necessarily is the distance to central places but associated consequences such as social isolation that can arise in remote areas but also in extremely urbanized districts with high anonymity. However, these rather indirect linkages go beyond the data available for this study.

Strengths and limitations

In this study, we have addressed contextual variabilities that exist in the setting of collective accommodation centres in Germany, but which have not been accounted for in a comparing manner in research investigating associations between housing and refugee health so far. By using a cluster analysis approach, we identified four distinct types of refugee accommodation. This enabled us to go beyond regular multivariate analyses based on individual contextual characteristics and focus on contextual combination of different characteristics when assessing health associations and presenting health disparities.

Cluster size varied considerably between clusters ranging from 39 cases to 190 cases. Since one of the smaller clusters was noticeable consistent and repeatedly occurred in different pre-analyses with varying clustering approaches, we decided to accept the variability in cluster size (and the small

number of accommodation centres especially cluster 1 was based on), being aware that the clusters can be compared with each other only to a limited extent.

In regression analyses, only few effects were found to be statistically significant. This may be due to the small sample sizes in some of the clusters. Especially Cluster 1 failed to yield significant associations relative to Cluster 4. Another statistical issue was missing values in the data for GAD and depression. Whereas the percentages of missings were relatively even in Cluster 1, 2 and 4, Cluster 3 had lower rates of missings (see Table 2). Since Cluster 4 contained the highest number of missings overall with 17.5% (GAD) and 18.3% (depression), associations found in this analysis could have been weaker and frequencies of residents showing GAD and depression symptoms could have been higher.

Further, we could identify little cluster differences regarding urbanity. Given the wide definition of urbanity that has been applied, it is rather unsurprising that each accommodation type identified here was predominantly located in an urban district. For example, in Baden Württemberg, where data has been collected, overall population density was 311 inhabitants per km^2 in 2019 (33), thus far above the cut-off applied here.

Also, we could not investigate to which extent the residents of the larger accommodation types actually lived in overcrowded settings according to the Eurostat definition since the data did not provide information about room numbers of the accommodation centres assessed. However, with an average number of residents of up to 150, we can assume that the specifications of the Eurostat definition are not met, thus that especially residents of the larger accommodation clusters (1 and 2) shared rooms between adults. However, this remains a vague assumption. The Eurostat definition also applies rather to private households than to collective accommodation centres. A new concept that applies for this setting would be necessary.

The cross-sectional design of the data allowed us to identify only associations between the accommodation cluster and poor health outcomes. Longitudinal approaches are needed to assess whether the accommodation types are causally associated with certain health outcomes. O'Brien et al. (25) for example argued, that poor mental health may also result in more pessimistic assessments of the physical environment. Since in the RESPOND study the SHED-index was assessed by researchers, not by residents themselves, this form of same-source bias is unlikely here. It may be possible, though, that researchers would consider the accommodation as run-down while refugees might appreciate the conditions compared to other accommodation settings they have experienced during flight.

Further, in future research, it would also be necessary to account for the stage of the asylum application process of interviewees. For example, it is possible that Cluster 4 contained a lower

proportion of residents whose asylum claim was still under process, which has been found to be a significant predictor of mental health problems (34). Since asylum seekers live more often in deprived areas with unfavourable living conditions (35) like a run-down physical environment, the pathway of how exactly accommodation type impacts health warrants further research.

Conclusion

The context in which people live can affect individual health in many ways. By conducting a cluster analysis of variables related to refugee accommodation in Germany, we have identified four different accommodation types in regard to contextual differences in the number of inhabitants, the degree of housing deterioration and the level of remoteness (i.e. distance to important amenities), contributing to the development of a typology of refugee accommodation. We then analysed the effect of the accommodation types on refugee health. The accommodation type with a moderate occupation, lowest levels of deterioration and a central and urban location showed the most positive health outcomes in terms of subjective general health status, depression and GAD. The strongest effects were found for GAD. The odds significantly increased for accommodation clusters that either showed a high state of decay and a large accommodation size (Cluster 2), or a small accommodation size remote from important amenities (Cluster 3). Effects were the weakest for depression with none of the found effects being statistically significant. Subsequent analyses showed, though, that when assessing comorbidity of GAD and depression, the larger, more deteriorated accommodation type (Cluster 2) yielded similar significant effects compared to the analysis of GAD alone. The findings from this study should be taken into account in political decisions on the layout as well as the choice of location of collective accommodation centres in Germany.

References

1. Georgiadou E, Zbidat A, Schmitt GM, Erim Y. Prevalence of Mental Distress Among Syrian Refugees With Residence Permission in Germany: A Registry-Based Study. Front Psychiatry. 2018 Aug 28;9:393.

2. Georgiadou E, Morawa E, Erim Y. High Manifestations of Mental Distress in Arabic Asylum Seekers Accommodated in Collective Centers for Refugees in Germany. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2017 Jun 7;14(6):612.

3. Bean TM, Eurelings-Bontekoe E, Spinhoven P. Course and predictors of mental health of unaccompanied refugee minors in the Netherlands: One year follow-up. Soc Sci Med. 2007;64(6):1204–15.

4. Bakker L, Cheung SY, Phillimore J. The asylum-integration paradox: Comparing asylum support systems and refugee integration in the Netherlands and the UK. Int Migr. 2016;54(4):118–32.

5. Ajlan A. The Asylum Procedure in Germany: Desperation and Uncertainty as Risk Factors for Violence Among Young Adult Asylum Seekers in Collective Accommodations. J Interpers Violence. 2020;

6. Bozorgmehr K, Hintermeier M, Razum O, Mohsenpour A, Biddle L, Oertelt-Prigione S, et al. SARS-CoV-2 in Aufnahmeeinrichtungen und Gemeinschaftsunterkünften für Geflüchtete : Epidemiologische und normativ-rechtliche Aspekte [Internet]. Kompetenznetz Public Health COVID-19; 2020 [cited 2022 Mar 9] p. 1030151 bytes. Available from: https://pub.uni-bielefeld.de/record/2943665

7. Buda S, an der Heiden M, Altmann D, Diercke M, Hamouda O, Rexroth U. Infektionsumfeld von erfassten COVID-19-Ausbrüchen in Deutschland. Epidemiol Bull. 2020;38:3–12.

8. Tanis, Kerstin. Die Wohnhistorie Geflüchteter in Deutschland [Internet]. Berlin: BAMF, Forschungszentrums Migration, Integration und Asyl; 2022. (BAMF-Kurzanalysen). Report No.: Ausgabe 01, 2022. Available from: https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Forschung/Kurzanalysen/kurzanalyse1-2022-iab-bamf-soep-befragung-wohnhistorie.pdf?__blob=publicationFile&v=7

9. Piechura P, Wagner L. Geflüchtete in WG's! - Quantitative Potentiale und rechtliche Möglichkeiten. Berlin; 2020.

10. Ministerium für Kinder Familie Flüchtlinge und Integration des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen. Sachstandsbericht staatliches Asylsystem 4. Quartal 2019. 2020.

11. Baier A, Siegert M, Robert Bosch Stiftung. Die Wohnsituation Geflüchteter [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2019 Aug 8]. Available from: https://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Kurzanalysen/kurzanalyse11_iab-bamf-soep-befragung-gefluechtete-wohnsituation.pdf?__blob=publicationFile

12. Biddle L, Menold N, Bentner M, Nöst S, Jahn R, Ziegler S, et al. Health monitoring among asylum seekers and refugees: a state-wide, cross-sectional, population-based study in Germany. Emerg Themes Epidemiol. 2019;16(3).

13. Mohsenpour A, Biddle L, Krug K, Bozorgmehr K. Measuring deterioration of small-area housing environment: Construction of a multi-dimensional assessment index and validation in shared refugee accommodation. SSM - Popul Health. 2021 Mar;13:100725.

14. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Löwe B. An Ultra-Brief Screening Scale for Anxiety and Depression: The PHQ–4. Psychosomatics. 2009 Nov 1;50(6):613–21.

15. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The Patient Health Questionnaire-2: Validity of a Two-Item Depression Screener. Med Care. 2003 Nov;41(11):1284–92.

16. Eurostat. European Health Interview Survey (Ehis wave 3): methodological manual. Luxembourg; 2018.

17. Dudek V, Razum O, Sauzet O. Association between housing and health of refugees and asylum seekers in Germany: explorative cluster and mixed model analysis. BMC Public Health. 2022 Dec;22(1):48.

18. Wittchen HU, Kessler RC, Pfister H, Höfler M, Lieb R. Why do people with anxiety disorders become depressed? A prospective-longitudinal community study. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 2000 Dec;102:14–23.

19. Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Koretz D, Merikangas KR, et al. The epidemiology of major depressive disorder: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). JAMA. 2003 Jun 18;289(23):3095–105.

20. Batterham PJ, Christensen H, Calear AL. Anxiety Symptoms as Precursors of Major Depression and Suicidal Ideation. Depress Anxiety. 2013 Mar 1;30(10):n/a-n/a.

21. Ziersch A, Due C. A mixed methods systematic review of studies examining the relationship between housing and health for people from refugee and asylum seeking backgrounds. Soc Sci Med. 2018;213:199–219.

22. Evans GW. The Built Environment and Mental Health. 2003.

23. Eurostat. Glossary: Overcrowding rate - Statistics Explained [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2020 Nov 27]. Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/Glossary:Overcrowding_rate

24. Eurostat. Migrant integration statistics - housing [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 27]. Available from: https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php?title=Migrant_integration_statistics_-_housing#Overcrowding_rate

25. O'Brien DT, Farrell C, Welsh BC. Broken (windows) theory: A meta-analysis of the evidence for the pathways from neighborhood disorder to resident health outcomes and behaviors. Soc Sci Med. 2019;228(September 2018):272–92.

26. Shiue I. Neighborhood epidemiological monitoring and adult mental health: European Quality of Life Survey, 2007–2012. Environ Sci Pollut Res. 2015 Apr 14;22(8):6095–103.

27. Peen J, Schoevers RA, Beekman AT, Dekker J. The current status of urban-rural differences in psychiatric disorders. Acta Psychiatr Scand. 2010 Feb;121(2):84–93.

28. Adli M, Schöndorf J. Macht uns die Stadt krank? Wirkung von Stadtstress auf Emotionen, Verhalten und psychische Gesundheit. Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz. 2020 Aug 7;63(8):979–86.

29. Eckert KA, Taylor AW, Wilkinson DD, Tucker GR. How does mental health status relate to accessibility and remoteness? Med J Aust. 2004 Nov 15;181(10):540–3.

30. Goldney RD, Taylor AW, Bain MA. Depression and remoteness from health services in South Australia. Aust J Rural Health. 2007 Jun 1;15(3):201–10.

31. Kelly BJ, Stain HJ, Coleman C, Perkins D, Fragar L, Fuller J, et al. Mental health and well-being within rural communities: the Australian rural mental health study. Aust J Rural Health. 2010 Feb;18(1):16–24.

32. Australian Institute of Health & Welfare. Rural, Regional and Remote Health: A Guide to Remote Classifications. Canberra, Australia; 2004.

33. Statistisches Landesamt Baden-Württemberg. Bevölkerung im Überblick. Bevölkerung, Gebiet und Bevölkerungsdichte. [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2020 Nov 11]. Available from: https://www.statistik-bw.de/BevoelkGebiet/Bevoelkerung/01515020.tab?R=LA

34. Nutsch N, Bozorgmehr K. Der Einfluss postmigratorischer Stressoren auf die Prävalenz depressiver Symptome bei Geflüchteten in Deutschland. Analyse anhand der IAB-BAMF-SOEP-Befragung 2016. Bundesgesundheitsblatt - Gesundheitsforschung - Gesundheitsschutz. 2020;63(12):1470–82.

35. Bozorgmehr K, Razum O, Szecsenyi J, Maier W, Stock C. Regional deprivation is associated with the distribution of vulnerable asylum seekers: A nationwide small area analysis in Germany. J Epidemiol Community Health. 2017;71(9):857–62.