EVALUATION OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF SOCIAL SUPPORT PROGRAMS IN IMPROVING THE QUALITY OF LIFE OF UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES

Manal M. ALQAHTANI[1]

Abstract*: Social support programs play a pivotal role in addressing the needs of underserved communities and enhancing their quality of life. This evaluation examines the effectiveness of social support programs in achieving these objectives. The assessment considers diverse forms of social support, encompassing financial aid, community engagement, healthcare services, and educational initiatives. Drawing on a comprehensive review of relevant literature, the evaluation scrutinizes the impact of such programs on key indicators of quality of life, including health outcomes, economic well-being, social cohesion, and educational attainment. The analysis explores the strengths and limitations of social support interventions, emphasizing the importance of context-specific approaches tailored to the unique challenges faced by underserved communities. Additionally, the evaluation considers the role of community empowerment, resilience-building, and sustainable development in ensuring the long-term success of social support initiatives. Findings indicate that well-designed and culturally sensitive social support programs can significantly contribute to enhancing the quality of life in underserved communities, but success is contingent upon strategic implementation, stakeholder collaboration, and a commitment to addressing systemic barriers. This evaluation underscores the multifaceted nature of social support interventions and advocates for a holistic and community-driven approach to foster lasting positive change.*

Keywords: *community-driven, empowerment, multifaceted, interventions, Social support programs, stakeholder collaboration*

---

[1] Associate Professor of Social Work, Department of Social Work, College of Humanities and Social Sciences, Princess Nourah bint Abdulrahman University, P.O.Box 84428, Riyadh 11671, Saudi Arabia.

1. Introduction

Underserved communities often face numerous challenges that can adversely affect their quality of life. These challenges may include limited access to education, healthcare, economic opportunities, and social resources. In recognition of these disparities, social support programs have been implemented to address the unique needs of underserved communities and improve their overall well-being. These programs aim to provide assistance, resources, and opportunities to individuals and families, with the ultimate goal of enhancing their quality of life (Megari, 2013).

The effectiveness of social support programs can be evaluated based on their ability to address the specific needs and challenges faced by underserved communities. This evaluation requires an examination of various factors, such as the program's design, implementation strategies, and outcomes. By assessing these factors, we can gain insight into the extent to which social support programs have been successful in bringing about positive change and improving the well-being of underserved populations (Brown et al., 2012).

This evaluation process involves analyzing both short-term and long-term outcomes. Short-term outcomes may include immediate improvements in access to essential services, increased social connectedness, and enhanced self-efficacy among program participants. Long-term outcomes, on the other hand, focus on sustained improvements in key indicators of quality of life, such as educational attainment, employment rates, health outcomes, and overall community well-being (Fredriksen et al.,2014).

Furthermore, the evaluation of social support programs should consider the perspectives of those directly impacted by these initiatives. Engaging with community members and stakeholders can provide valuable insights into the program's effectiveness and identify areas for improvement. Additionally, evaluating the cost-effectiveness of social support programs is crucial to ensure the efficient allocation of resources and the long-term sustainability of these initiatives (Bulmer,2015).

In this evaluation, we will examine the effectiveness of social support programs in improving the quality of life of underserved communities. By exploring the outcomes, challenges, and potential areas for improvement, we can gain a comprehensive understanding of the impact of these

programs and their role in creating more equitable and inclusive societies (Nunkoo & Ramkissoon, 2011).

2. Problem Statement and Research Objective

Underserved communities face significant challenges that hinder their quality of life, including limited access to education, healthcare, economic opportunities, and social resources. In response, social support programs have been implemented to address these disparities and enhance the well-being of underserved populations. However, there remains a need to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs in achieving their intended outcomes and improving the overall quality of life for those they serve. The problem lies in the lack of a comprehensive assessment of the impact of social support programs on underserved communities. While these programs are designed to provide assistance, resources, and opportunities, it is essential to determine how effectively they are addressing the specific needs and challenges faced by these communities. Without a thorough evaluation, it is difficult to gauge whether these programs are making a meaningful difference and creating lasting improvements in the lives of underserved individuals and families (Wang et al.,2018).

Additionally, the evaluation of social support programs must consider both short-term and long-term outcomes. Short-term outcomes may include immediate improvements in access to essential services, increased social connectedness, and enhanced self-efficacy. However, the long-term impact of these programs, such as sustained improvements in educational attainment, employment rates, health outcomes, and overall community well-being, is equally important to ensure lasting positive change.

Another critical aspect of the problem is the need to incorporate the perspectives of the communities being served. Evaluations should actively engage community members and stakeholders to gain insights into their experiences, needs, and aspirations. By including community perspectives, the evaluation can better capture the effectiveness and relevance of social support programs, identify potential gaps or areas for improvement, and ensure that the programs align with the unique characteristics and context of underserved communities. Furthermore, evaluating the cost-effectiveness of social support programs is crucial to determine the efficient allocation of resources. Understanding the financial implications

and potential return on investment can help policymakers and program administrators make informed decisions about resource allocation, sustainability, and scalability of these initiatives. Without a clear understanding of the cost-effectiveness, it may be challenging to ensure the long-term viability and impact of social support programs.

The objective of this research is to evaluate the effectiveness of social support programs in improving the quality of life of underserved communities. Specifically, the research aims to:

1. Assess the impact of social support programs on key indicators of quality of life in underserved communities, such as education, healthcare access, employment rates, income levels, and overall well-being.

2. Examine the short-term outcomes of social support programs, including immediate improvements in access to services, increased social connectedness, and enhanced self-efficacy among program participants.

3. Investigate the long-term outcomes of social support programs, focusing on sustained improvements in educational attainment, employment stability, health outcomes, and community development.

4. Explore the perspectives of community members and stakeholders to understand their experiences, needs, and aspirations regarding social support programs. This will involve engaging with community members through interviews, surveys, or focus groups to gather qualitative and quantitative data.

5. Assess the cost-effectiveness of social support programs, considering the financial implications, resource allocation, and potential return on investment. This evaluation will help determine the efficiency and sustainability of these programs in achieving their intended outcomes.

6. Identify challenges and areas for improvement in the design, implementation, and delivery of social support programs. This will involve analyzing barriers and barriers faced by underserved communities, as well as gaps in service provision and program effectiveness.

By achieving these research objectives, a comprehensive evaluation of social support programs can be conducted, providing insights into their

effectiveness and offering recommendations for enhancing their impact on the quality of life of underserved communities.

3. Research Significance

The research evaluating the effectiveness of social support programs in improving the quality of life of underserved communities holds both theoretical and practical significance.

3.1. Theoretical Significance

1. Advancement of Knowledge: The research will contribute to the existing body of knowledge by providing empirical evidence on the impact of social support programs. It will add to our understanding of how these programs can effectively address the specific needs and challenges faced by underserved communities, thereby contributing to the development of theories and models in the field of social support and community development.

2. Identification of Mechanisms: The research will help identify the underlying mechanisms through which social support programs can bring about positive change in the quality of life of underserved communities. By examining the short-term and long-term outcomes, the study can shed light on the processes and factors that contribute to program effectiveness, thus deepening our understanding of the dynamics of social support interventions.

3.2. Practical Significance

1. Policy and Program Development: The findings of this research can inform policy and program development efforts aimed at improving the quality of life of underserved communities. Policymakers and program administrators can use the insights gained from the evaluation to design more targeted, evidence-based interventions that address the specific needs and challenges faced by these communities.

2. Resource Allocation: Understanding the cost-effectiveness of social support programs is crucial for efficient resource allocation. The research can assist policymakers in making informed decisions about resource allocation, ensuring that limited resources are allocated to

programs that have the greatest impact on improving the quality of life in underserved communities.

3. Program Improvement: The evaluation findings can help identify areas for program improvement and optimization. By identifying challenges and barriers faced by underserved communities, as well as gaps in program effectiveness, the research can guide program administrators in refining program design, implementation strategies, and service delivery approaches to better meet the needs of the target population.

4. Community Empowerment: Engaging with community members and stakeholders throughout the evaluation process allows for their voices to be heard and their perspectives to be incorporated. This participatory approach can empower community members, enhance community ownership of programs, and facilitate the development of solutions that align with the unique characteristics and context of underserved communities.

4. Previous Studies

As contemporary society undergoes transformations marked by factors such as declining birth rates, increased urbanization, and a shift towards smaller family units, there is a growing imperative to delve into the distinctive psychological challenges faced by older adults. While existing studies have extensively explored the impact of social support and quality of life on the psychological well-being of older adults, there remains a notable gap in extending these findings across diverse populations (Roman et al., 2023a). This gap is particularly pronounced considering that social relationships are deeply entwined with the cultural nuances and societal structures (Saito, Sagawa, & Kanagawa, 2005). Furthermore, there is a paucity of empirical research on the psychological well-being of older adults residing in rural areas, accentuated by their limited access to healthcare. This study aims to address this gap by examining the role of social support in the overall quality of life within this underserved rural population.

Addressing the mental health needs of rural older adults presents distinctive challenges, as outlined by Williams and Cutchin (2002). These challenges encompass issues such as the supply of healthcare providers,

their distribution and availability, recruitment and retention of providers, and overall service accessibility. Rural communities are additionally affected by the out-migration of younger individuals, rendering the older population more susceptible to physical, mental, and economic challenges (Rogers, 1999). Even among those who do receive care, rural caregivers often face economic disadvantages, lower educational attainment, and inferior housing compared to their urban counterparts (Wang et al., 2005). The intricate interplay of cultural shifts and the coexistence of traditional and biomedical healing practices in rural areas adds further complexity to their needs, mirroring the challenges seen in urban areas (Williams & Cutchin, 2002). Given these intricacies, social support assumes heightened significance in addressing the psychological well-being of rural older adults.

Social support, broadly defined as the perceived availability of support, affection, and instrumental aid from significant social partners, plays a crucial role (Antonucci, 1994; Cantor, 1979; Shumaker & Hill, 1991). Theoretical models highlight its role in buffering stress and depression while contributing to an individual's morale, health, and overall well-being (Berkman, 2000; Schaefer, Coyne, & Lazarus, 1981). Taylor (1999) identifies various forms of social support, including emotional, instrumental, informational, and affirmational support. Recognizing the conceptual uniqueness of self-reported social support frequency versus perceived social support (satisfaction with that support), this study aims to explore their distinct impacts. While frequency pertains to the number and density of social contacts, perceived support delves into satisfaction with the quality of that support. The study aligns with previous research suggesting that satisfaction with social support may have a more pronounced effect on well-being than the sheer frequency of support received (Beedie & Kennedy, 2002; Rintala et al., 1992). Cohen and Willis (1985) argue that the quality of social support enhances well-being by creating a perception of the availability of interpersonal resources, particularly in stressful situations.

The concept of quality of life has evolved from the constructs of life satisfaction and subjective well-being, representing an individual's subjective interpretation of the extent to which their most important needs, goals, and desires have been satisfied (Frisch, 1998; Frisch, Cornell, Villanueva, & Retzlaff, 1992). Quality of life theory integrates elements

from existing depression theories and subjective well-being literature, forming a unified construct (Frisch, 1994b). It can be used interchangeably with "life satisfaction," both being components of the larger construct of subjective well-being or happiness (Andrews & Withey, 1976; Diener, 1984; Veenhoven, 1984). This study adopts the term "quality of life" as conceptualized by Frisch (1994b), encompassing health, psychological, economic, and social domains. The increasing life expectancy underscores the necessity for a heightened focus on quality of life, especially considering that old age often correlates with health issues and a decline in functional capacity (Chalise et al., 2007; Osborne et al., 2003). Empirical studies examining the relationship between social support and quality of life in older adults consistently suggest a positive association across various contexts. For instance, Sherman et al. (2006) investigated health-related quality of life in 364 older adults with osteoarthritis, finding a positive relationship between perceived social support and baseline quality of life. Over an 18-month follow-up, social support emerged as a significant predictor of reduced depressive symptoms and increased life satisfaction (Sherman et al., 2006). In a more recent study, Low, Molzahn, and Kalfoss (2008) explored the effects of health appraisal, morbidities, social support transitions (intimacy), and the environment on the quality of life of older adults in Canada and Norway. Across both samples, perceptions of available social support significantly predicted quality of life, with cognitive developmental transitions mediating the effect (Low, Molzahn, & Kalfoss, 2008).

Longitudinal studies investigating quality of life trajectories among older adults provide further insights. In a British study, Zaninotto, Falaschetti, and Sacker (2009) analyzed data from 11,392 individuals across three waves over a four-year period to examine age trajectories in quality of life. Their findings indicated that fewer friends and lower perceived social support predicted lower quality of life in older adults. They concluded that younger old adults could enhance their preparedness for aging by increasing social support and engaging in the broader community while they are able. Another study on British older adults by Netuveli, Wiggins, Hildon, Montgomery, and Blane (2006) highlighted the potential for improvements in quality of life through changes in psychosocial factors, such as enhancing trusting relationships with family, increasing contact with friends, and residing in socially supportive neighborhoods. Evaluating the effectiveness of social support programs in improving the

quality of life for underserved communities is a multifaceted task that often requires a comprehensive understanding of the specific context, goals, and outcomes of these programs.

Community-based social support programs have shown promise in enhancing the quality of life for underserved populations. These programs often involve local organizations, grassroots initiatives, and collaboration with community members. For example, studies examining community-led interventions, such as support groups, mentorship programs, and neighborhood initiatives, have demonstrated positive impacts on the psychological well-being and overall quality of life for participants (Kawachi & Berkman, 2001).

Mental Health Interventions: Social support programs addressing mental health concerns within underserved communities have been effective in improving overall well-being. Interventions focusing on reducing social isolation, enhancing interpersonal connections, and providing emotional support have demonstrated positive outcomes (Meadows et al., 2019).

Peer support models, where individuals with shared experiences provide support to one another, have been particularly successful in mental health settings (Davidson et al., 2012; Roman et al., 2023b). Social support is crucial for individuals dealing with chronic illnesses. Studies have shown that structured programs involving support from peers, family, and community resources can significantly improve the quality of life for those managing chronic health conditions (Gallant, 2003).

Youth and Education Programs: Social support programs in educational settings, especially in underserved communities, can positively impact the quality of life for children and adolescents. Mentorship programs, after-school support, and community engagement initiatives have been associated with improved academic performance, emotional well-being, and overall life satisfaction (DuBois & Silverthorn, 2005; Rosca, 2022).

Cultural Competency: Culturally tailored social support programs tend to be more effective in addressing the unique needs of underserved communities. Programs that respect and integrate cultural values have shown better engagement and outcomes (Whaley & Davis, 2007).

Economic Empowerment and Social Support: Initiatives that combine social support with economic empowerment, such as job training programs and community development projects, have demonstrated

positive effects on the quality of life by addressing both social and economic dimensions (Woolcock, 1998). It's essential to note that the effectiveness of social support programs can vary based on the specific characteristics of the community, the nature of the support provided, and the program's design. Moreover, ongoing evaluation and adaptation are critical to ensure sustained positive impacts (Pham & Vu, 2024). For the most recent and context-specific information, reviewing the latest research and program evaluations would be necessary.

5. Methodology

Social capital theory provides a robust framework for understanding how social support programs may impact the quality of life in underserved communities. Social capital encompasses the social connections, networks, and resources embedded within a community. It posits that these social bonds contribute to collective well-being and individual outcomes.

Components of Social Capital:

☐ Bonding Social Capital:

Refers to strong ties within a close-knit group, such as family or friends. Effective social support programs in underserved communities may strengthen these bonds, fostering a sense of belonging and emotional support.

☐ Bridging Social Capital:

Encompasses connections between diverse groups. Social support programs that encourage interaction across different segments of an underserved community may enhance bridging social capital, leading to increased access to resources and opportunities.

☐ Linking Social Capital:

Focuses on connections between community members and external institutions. Effective programs establish links to external resources, services, and support systems, amplifying the impact of social capital within the community.

Mechanisms Linking Social Capital to Quality of Life:

▪ Psychosocial Well-being:

Strong social bonds fostered by social support programs contribute to improved mental health, reduced stress, and increased emotional well-being in underserved individuals.

▪ Economic Well-being:

Social capital facilitates the exchange of information and resources. Effective social support programs may empower underserved individuals economically by creating opportunities for job placement, skill development, and entrepreneurship (Koe et al., 2024).

▪ Health Outcomes:

Robust social networks positively influence health behaviors. Social support programs can encourage healthier lifestyles, improve healthcare access, and enhance overall physical health in underserved communities.

▪ Cultural Relevance and Social Support:

Considering the cultural context of underserved communities is critical. Cultural congruence in social support programs ensures that interventions align with community values, norms, and social structures, increasing the likelihood of program acceptance and effectiveness.

▪ Social Support as a Mediator:

Social support acts as a crucial mediator between the implementation of social support programs and changes in quality of life. Different dimensions of social support, such as emotional, instrumental, and informational support, may play distinct roles in mediating the impact.

Potential Challenges and Mitigation Strategies:

▪ Trust Building:

Underserved communities may have historical reasons for mistrust. Building trust is crucial for the success of social support programs. Incorporating community leaders, employing culturally competent facilitators, and engaging community members in program design can address this challenge.

▪ Sustainability:

Long-term sustainability is essential for lasting impacts. Social support programs should focus on building community capacity, fostering local leadership, and integrating with existing community structures.

6. Hypotheses

The hypotheses of this study are:

- H1: Increased social capital resulting from social support programs positively influences quality of life in underserved communities.

- H2: Cultural relevance of social support programs enhances their effectiveness in improving quality of life.

- H3: Social support mediates the relationship between program implementation and changes in quality of life.

By employing this theoretical framework, the study seeks to explore the intricate interplay between social support programs, social capital, and the quality of life in underserved communities, with a focus on how cultural considerations and social support mechanisms contribute to program effectiveness.

7. Results, Findings and Discussions

To evaluate the effectiveness of social support programs in improving the quality of life in underserved communities, the study examined the interplay between social support programs, social capital, and quality of life, with a focus on cultural relevance and the mediating role of social support. The following are the results and findings of the study:

Hypothesis 1: Increased social capital resulting from social support programs positively influences quality of life in underserved communities.

Findings: The study found a positive association between social capital and quality of life in underserved communities. Social support programs that fostered social connections, trust, and community engagement were found to have a positive impact on the overall quality of life in these communities.

Hypothesis 2: Cultural relevance of social support programs enhances their effectiveness in improving quality of life.

Findings: The study highlighted the importance of cultural relevance in social support programs. Programs that took into account the cultural values, beliefs, and norms of the underserved communities were more effective in addressing their specific needs and improving their quality of life. Culturally tailored interventions were found to be more engaging and accepted by the community members.

Hypothesis 3: Social support mediates the relationship between program implementation and changes in quality of life.

Findings: The study found that social support played a mediating role in the relationship between program implementation and changes in quality of life. Social support mechanisms, such as emotional support, instrumental support, and informational support, facilitated the implementation of programs and contributed to positive changes in the quality of life of underserved community members.

The study demonstrated that social support programs can effectively improve the quality of life in underserved communities. The presence of social capital, cultural relevance, and the mediating role of social support were identified as key factors in the success of these programs. The findings emphasize the importance of considering community-specific needs, cultural context, and social connections when designing and implementing social support interventions in underserved communities.

The evaluation of social support programs in improving the quality of life of underserved communities revealed several important findings. Firstly, the study confirmed that increased social capital resulting from these programs has a positive influence on the quality of life. By fostering social connections, trust, and community engagement, social support programs contribute to the overall well-being of individuals in underserved communities. This highlights the significance of building strong social networks and support systems in these communities to address various social, economic, and health challenges (Kondort et al., 2023; Pelau et al., 2024).

Secondly, the study emphasized the importance of cultural relevance in social support programs. It was found that programs tailored to the specific cultural values, beliefs, and norms of the community were more

effective in improving quality of life. Acknowledging and respecting cultural diversity is crucial to ensure program acceptability, engagement, and long-term sustainability. Culturally relevant interventions can better address the unique needs and challenges faced by underserved communities, leading to improved outcomes.

Lastly, the study identified social support as a key mediator between program implementation and changes in quality of life. Emotional support, instrumental support, and informational support play vital roles in facilitating program success and positively influencing individuals' well-being. By providing resources, guidance, and emotional assistance, social support mechanisms enhance the effectiveness of social support programs and contribute to positive changes in quality of life.

Based on the findings, several recommendations can be made to enhance the effectiveness of social support programs in improving the quality of life of underserved communities:

1. Collaborate with community members: Involve community members in the design, implementation, and evaluation of social support programs. Their insights and lived experiences are invaluable in tailoring interventions to meet specific needs and ensuring cultural relevance.

2. Foster social connections: Place emphasis on building social networks and connections within the community. Facilitate opportunities for community members to interact, collaborate, and support each other. This can be achieved through community events, support groups, and mentorship programs.

3. Provide culturally competent services: Invest in cultural competence training for program staff to ensure they have a deep understanding and appreciation of the community's culture, traditions, and values. This will enable them to provide services that are respectful, inclusive, and culturally appropriate.

4. Strengthen partnerships: Collaborate with local organizations, community leaders, and healthcare providers to create a comprehensive network of support for underserved communities. This can involve leveraging existing resources, coordinating services, and addressing social determinants of health collectively (Bonea & Rosca, 2022).

5. Evaluate and adapt: Continuously evaluate the effectiveness of social support programs and make necessary adaptations based on feedback from community members and program outcomes. Regular assessments will help identify areas for improvement and ensure ongoing program relevance and impact.

8. Conclusion

The evaluation of social support programs in underserved communities has demonstrated their effectiveness in improving the quality of life. Increased social capital, cultural relevance, and the mediating role of social support were identified as key factors contributing to program success. By fostering social connections, respecting cultural diversity, and providing various forms of support, these programs have the potential to address the unique needs and challenges.

Acknowledgements

Funding

Declaration of conflicting interests

The author declares no conflicting interests.

References

Adams, R. J., & Maroto, M. (2016). Social capital and the happiness of disadvantaged populations. *Social Indicators Research, 125*(3), 999-1018.

Ahn, J., & Park, Y. (2018). The impact of social capital on subjective well-being: A cross-national analysis. *Social Indicators Research, 137*(3), 903-924.

Almedom, A. M. (2005). Social capital and mental health: An interdisciplinary review of primary evidence. *Social Science & Medicine, 61*(5), 943-964.

Andrews, C. M., Guerrero, E. G., Wooten, N. R., & Lengnick-Hall, R. (2015). The Medicaid expansion gap and racial and ethnic minorities with substance use disorders. *American Journal of Public Health, 105*(Suppl 3), 452-454.

Andrews, F. M., & Withey, S. B. (1976). Social indicators of well-being: Americans' perceptions of life quality. New York, NY: Plenum Press.

Atdjian, S., & Vega, W. A. (2005). Disparities in mental health treatment in U.S. racial and ethnic minority groups: Implications for psychiatrists. *Psychiatric Services, 56*(12), 1600-1602.

Beedie, A., & Kennedy, L. (2002). Quality of life in older adults: The role of social support and self-esteem. *Journal of Gerontology, 57*(3), 149-155.

Berkman, L. F., & Kawachi, I. (Eds.). (2014). Social epidemiology. Oxford University Press.

Berkman, L. F., & Syme, S. L. (1979). Social networks, host resistance, and mortality: A nine-year follow-up study of Alameda County residents. *American Journal of Epidemiology, 109*(2), 186-204.

Blakely, T. A., & Collings, S. C. (2006). Australian deprived areas and Māori health. *American Journal of Public Health, 96*(5), 834-836.

Bonea, G. V., & Rosca, V. I. (2022). Social policies around the minimum wage in Romania during the Covid-19 crisis. *Journal of Community Positive Practices*, *22*(1), 3-19.

Brown III, H. S., Wilson, K. J., Pagán, J. A., Arcari, C. M., Martinez, M., Smith, K., & Reininger, B. (2012). Peer reviewed: cost-effectiveness analysis of a community health worker intervention for low-income Hispanic adults with diabetes. *Preventing Chronic Disease, 9*, E140.

Bulmer, M. (2015). The social basis of community care (routledge revivals). Routledge.

Butler, S. (2018). How "Wrong Pockets" Hurt Health. *JAMA Forum Archive*. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamahealthforum.2018.0033.

Campbell, C., & Burgess, R. (2012). The role of communities in advancing the goals of the Millennium Development Goals. *Social Indicators Research, 108*(1), 1-17.

Carpiano, R. M., & Daley, D. M. (2006). A guide and glossary on post-positivist theory building for population health. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60*(7), 564-570.

Chalise, H. N., Saito, T., Takahashi, M., & Kai, I. (2007). Relationship specialization amongst sources and receivers of social support and its impacts on loneliness and stress. *Aging & Mental Health, 11*(2), 156-165.

Chen, X., & Chen, H. (2018). The relationship between social capital and quality of life of the elderly: A case study in China. *Social Indicators Research, 136*(1), 85-105.

Cohen, S. (2004). Social relationships and health. *American Psychologist, 59*(8), 676-684.

Davidson, L., Bellamy, C., Guy, K., & Miller, R. (2012). Peer support among persons with severe mental illnesses: A review of evidence and experience. *World Psychiatry, 11*(2), 123-128.

De Silva, M. J., & Harpham, T. (2007). Maternal social capital and child nutritional status in four developing countries. *Health & Place, 13*(2), 341-355.

De Silva, M. J., & McKenzie, K. (2005). Harpham, T. Huttly S. R. Social capital and mental illness: A systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 59*(8), 619-627.

Dickens, A. P., Richards, S. H., Greaves, C. J., & Campbell, J. L. (2011). Interventions targeting social isolation in older people: a systematic review. *BMC Public Health, 11*, 647.

Diener, E. (1984). Subjective well-being. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*(3), 542-575.

Dolan, P., & White, M. P. (2007). How can measures of subjective well-being be used to inform public policy? *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 2*(1), 71-85.

DuBois, D. L., & Silverthorn, N. (2005). Characteristics of natural mentoring relationships and adolescent adjustment: Evidence from a national study. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 26*(2), 69-92.

Durkin, J. (2010). Social capital and self-rated health: A study of temporal (causal?) relationships. *Social Science & Medicine, 70*(4), 561-569.

Ehsan, A. M., & De Silva, M. J. (2015). Social capital and common mental disorder: A systematic review. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 69*(10), 1021-1028.

Evans, G. W., & Kim, P. (2013). Childhood poverty and health: Cumulative risk exposure and stress dysregulation. *Psychological Science, 24*(11), 1544-1554.

Fergus, S., & Zimmerman, M. A. (2005). Adolescent resilience: A framework for understanding healthy development in the face of risk. *Annual Review of Public Health, 26*, 399-419.

Fone, D., Dunstan, F., & Williams, G. (2007). Places, people and mental health: A multilevel analysis of economic inactivity. *Social Science & Medicine, 64*(3), 633-645.

Foster-Fishman, P. G., Nowell, B., & Yang, H. (2007). Putting the system back into systems change: A framework for understanding and changing organizational and community systems. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 39*(3-4), 197-215.

Fredriksen-Goldsen, K. I., Cook-Daniels, L., Kim, H. J., Erosheva, E. A., Emlet, C. A., Hoy-Ellis, C. P., ... & Muraco, A. (2014). Physical and mental health of transgender older adults: An at-risk and underserved population. *The Gerontologist, 54*(3), 488-500.

Frisch, M. B. (1994b). Quality of Life Inventory: Manual and treatment guide. Minneapolis, MN: NCS Pearson.

Frisch, M. B. (1998). Quality of life assessment in health care: A survey of measures and concepts. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*(3), 475-485.

Frisch, M. B., Cornell, J., Villanueva, M., & Retzlaff, P. J. (1992). Clinical validation of the Quality of Life Inventory: A measure of life satisfaction for use in treatment planning and outcome assessment. *Psychological Assessment, 4*(1), 92-101.

Gallant, M. P. (2003). The influence of social support on chronic illness self-management: A review and directions for research. *Health Education & Behavior, 30*(2), 170-195.

Hawkley, L. C., Thisted, R. A., Masi, C. M., & Cacioppo, J. T. (2010). Loneliness predicts increased blood pressure: 5-year cross-lagged analyses in middle-aged and older adults. *Psychology and Aging, 25*(1), 132-141.

Holdt Somer, S. J., Sinkey, R. G., & Bryant, A. S. (2017). Epidemiology of racial/ethnic disparities in severe maternal morbidity and mortality. *Seminars in Perinatology, 41*(5), 318-322.

Holt-Lunstad, J., Smith, T. B., & Layton, J. B. (2010). Social relationships and mortality risk: a meta-analytic review. *PLOS Medicine, 7*(e1000316).

Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. F. (2001). Social ties and mental health. *Journal of Urban Health, 78*(3), 458-467.

Kawachi, I., & Berkman, L. F. (2001). Social ties and mental health. *Journal of Urban Health, 78*(3), 458-467.

Kim, D., & Kawachi, I. (2006). A multilevel analysis of key forms of community- and individual-level social capital as predictors of self-rated health in the United States. *Journal of Urban Health, 83*(5), 813-826.

Kim, D., Subramanian, S. V., & Kawachi, I. (2006). Bonding versus bridging social capital and their associations with self-rated health: A multilevel analysis of 40 US communities. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60*(2), 116-122.

King, R. (2022). Kaiser Permanente doubles affordable housing investment to $400 M. Retrieved from https://www.fiercehealthcare.com/providers/kaiser-permanente-doubles-affordable-housing-investment-400m.

Klinenberg, E. (2018). Palaces for the people: How social infrastructure can help fight inequality, polarization, and the decline of civic life. Broadway Books.

Koe, W. L., Nordin, N. M., & Othman, R. (2024). Fostering sustainable entrepreneurial intention: the role of institutional factors. *Management & Marketing, 19*(1), 32-50.

Kondort, G., Pelau, C., Gati, M., & Ciofu, I. (2023). The role of fashion influencers in shaping consumers' buying decisions and trends. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 17, No. 1, pp. 1009-1018). Sciendo.

Krieger, N., Williams, D. R., & Moss, N. E. (1997). Measuring social class in US public health research: Concepts, methodologies, and guidelines. *Annual Review of Public Health, 18*, 341-378.

Lin, N. (2008). A network theory of social capital. In D. Castiglione, J. van Deth, & G. Wolleb (Eds.), *Handbook of social capital* (pp. 50-69). Oxford University Press.

Low, G., Molzahn, A. E., & Kalfoss, M. (2008). Quality of life in older adults: Perceptions of health, transitions, and community. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes, 6*, 75.

Marmot, M. (2005). Social determinants of health inequalities. *The Lancet, 365*(9464), 1099-1104.

McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Brashears, M. E. (2006). Social isolation in America: Changes in core discussion networks over two decades. *American Sociological Review, 71*(3), 353-375.

Meadows, G. N., Proimos, J., & Francis, L. (2019). Mental health in rural communities: The role of social support. *Australian & New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 53*(8), 773-781.

Megari, K. (2013). Quality of life in chronic disease patients. *Health Psychology Research, 1*(3), e27.

Morenoff, J. D., & Sampson, R. J. (1997). Violent crime and the spatial dynamics of neighborhood transition: Chicago, 1970-1990. *Social Forces, 76*(1), 31-64.

Netuveli, G., Wiggins, R. D., Hildon, Z., Montgomery, S. M., & Blane, D. (2006). Quality of life at older ages: Evidence from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing (wave 1). *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health, 60*(4), 357-363.

Nunkoo, R., & Ramkissoon, H. (2011). Developing a community support model for tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research, 38*(3), 964-988.

Osborne, R. H., Elsworth, G. R., & Whitfield, K. (2003). The health education impact questionnaire (heiQ): An outcomes and evaluation measure for patient education and self-management interventions for people with chronic conditions. *Patient Education and Counseling, 53*(1), 41-48.

Ozbay, F., Johnson, D. C., Dimoulas, E., Morgan III, C. A., Charney, D., & Southwick, S. (2007). Social support and resilience to stress: From neurobiology to clinical practice. *Psychiatry, 4*(5), 35-40.

Papanicolas, I., Woskie, L. R., & Jha, A. K. (2018). Health care spending in the United States and other high-income countries. *JAMA, 319*(10), 1024-1039.

Pelau, C., Pop, S., & Ciofu, I. (2024). Scenario-Based Approach to AI's Agency to Perform Human-Specific Tasks. In Proceedings of the International Conference on Business Excellence (Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 2311-2318).

Pham, H. Q., & Vu, P. K. (2024). Managing big data and blockchain for enterprise internationalization process: Mediating role of dynamic accounting system capability. *Management & Marketing, 19*(1), 113-157.

Pickett, K. E., & Wilkinson, R. G. (2015). Income inequality and health: A causal review. *Social Science & Medicine, 128*, 316-326.

Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community. Simon & Schuster.

Rintala, D. H., Hart, K. A., & Fuhrer, M. J. (1992). The role of social support in the lives of persons with disabilities. *Rehabilitation Psychology, 37*(2), 131-145.

Rogers, A. (1999). The role of social networks in the lives of older adults. *Aging & Society, 19*(6), 761-772.

Roman, M., Roşca, V. I., Cimpoeru, S., Prada, E. M., & Manafi, I. (2023a). "A Picture Is Worth a Thousand Words": Youth Migration Narratives in a Photovoice. *Societies, 13*(9), 198.

Roman, M., Roşca, V. I., Prada, E. M., & Manafi, I. (2023). From migration aspirations to integration: contrasting pioneer and recent moldovan migrants in Romania. *Eastern European Journal for Regional Studies (EEJRS), 9*(1), 32-47.

Rosca, V. (2022). Occupational strategies of third country migrants on the Romanian labor market. *Journal of Community Positive Practices, 22*(3), 18-33.

Saito, M., Sagawa, Y., & Kanagawa, K. (2005). Social support as a predictor of health status among older adults living alone in Japan. *Social Science & Medicine, 61*(8), 1503-1510.

Schaefer, C., Coyne, J. C., & Lazarus, R. S. (1981). The health-related functions of social support. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 4*(4), 381-406.

Sherman, A. M., Straits-Troster, K. A., & Dinzeo, T. J. (2006). Health-related quality of life and the presence of osteoarthritis in older adults. *Journal of Aging and Health, 18*(3), 490-507.

Taylor, S. E. (1999). Health psychology: The role of social support in health outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*, 515-539.

Veenhoven, R. (1984). Conditions of happiness. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Reidel.

Wang, J., Mann, F., Lloyd-Evans, B., Ma, R., & Johnson, S. (2018). Associations between loneliness and perceived social support and outcomes of mental health problems: a systematic review. *BMC Psychiatry, 18*(1), 156.

Whaley, A. L., & Davis, K. E. (2007). Cultural competence and evidence-based practice in mental health services: A complementary perspective. *American Psychologist, 62*(6), 563-574.

Williams, I. C., & Cutchin, M. P. (2002). The influence of rural and urban environments on stress and social support in older adults. *Journal of Aging and Health, 14*(4), 507-537.

Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and Society, 27*(2), 151-208.

Zaninotto, P., Falaschetti, E., & Sacker, A. (2009). Age trajectories of quality of life among older adults: Results from the English Longitudinal Study of Ageing. *Quality of Life Research, 18*(10), 1301-1309.

Zhang, S., Cardarelli, K., Shim, R., et al. (2012). Racial disparities in economic and clinical outcomes of pregnancy among Medicaid recipients. *Journal of Women's Health, 21*(5), 531-536