

NEW ISSUES IN REFUGEE RESEARCH

Research Paper No. 269

Rural Refugee Resettlement: Secondary Migration and Community Integration in Fort Morgan, Colorado

Jessica A. Marks

Email: jessicaabramarks@gmail.com

March 2014



UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

Policy Development and Evaluation Service

**Policy Development and Evaluation Service
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
P.O. Box 2500, 1211 Geneva 2
Switzerland**

**E-mail: hqpd00@unhcr.org
Web Site: www.unhcr.org**

These papers provide a means for UNHCR staff, consultants, interns and associates, as well as external researchers, to publish the preliminary results of their research on refugee-related issues. The papers do not represent the official views of UNHCR. They are also available online under 'publications' at <www.unhcr.org>.

ISSN 1020-7473

Introduction

Refugees in the United States (herein US) are resettled almost exclusively in urban locations (Singer & Wilson, 2007). US refugee policy also overtly discourages refugees from moving from their initial urban resettlement locations to new locations due to the perceived challenges of secondary migration such as community integration as integration is the stated goal of US resettlement policy. Office of Refugee Resettlement, 2013). Yet, refugees are choosing to move from their initial urban locations, defined by the US census bureau as metro areas with populations of 50,000 or more, to small towns across the US, primarily for economic opportunities (Green, 2009; Goza, 2007; Nadeau, 2009; Nezer, 2013; Schwei & Fennely, 2007; Spring Institute, 2009). As a result of this disconnect between US resettlement policy and actual refugee secondary migration, little is known about how those moving as secondary migrants to rural (used here interchangeably with non-urban) locations are integrating into their new communities.

This research thus fills an important gap in the refugee resettlement field as a pilot study of rural refugee integration in the small town of Fort Morgan, Colorado. This research explored community integration in Fort Morgan, Colorado, a rural town about an hour and a half outside of Denver in the American West. Fort Morgan has a population of 11,400, including over 1,000 Somali refugees, the majority of whom moved to the area to work at a local meatpacking plant within the past seven years (R. Gray, pers. comm., April 15, 2013). Utilizing Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration framework, this research examined how refugees in Fort Morgan are integrating into the community. This research also explored a new potential indicator of integration, civic attachment, defined as the feeling one matters as a community member combined with a desire to contribute to the community.

Assuming current trends continue, more and more refugees will resettle and migrate to small towns from their initial urban resettlement locations (ORR, 2012). There will be a greater need for research that promotes successful rural refugee resettlement and community integration, as well as pragmatic policies that both reflect demographic reality and serve the needs of refugees and receiving communities, urban and rural.

History and policy: Refugee resettlement in the United States

Despite the fact that US resettlement policy discourages secondary migration to rural locations, refugees are moving to small towns like Fort Morgan, Colorado. In order to examine how refugees are integrating into rural communities, it is important to understand the history and context of the US Refugee Resettlement Program. In 1980, Congress passed the defining piece of legislation for resettled refugees in the US, the *Refugee Act*, an amendment to the earlier *Immigration and Nationality Act*. The *Refugee Act* serves as the basis of the US Refugee Resettlement Program. The main purpose of the *Refugee Act* was to provide a systematic procedure for the US government to admit and effectively resettle refugees (*Refugee Act*). Under the *Refugee Act*, Congress adopted a legal definition of the term refugee, following the United Nations terminology: "A refugee is a person who is unwilling or unable to return to his or her country of origin because of persecution or a well-founded fear of persecution based on race, religion, nationality, or membership in a particular social group or political opinions" (*Refugee Act*, 1980). Congress also created a new administrative agency to assist in the resettlement of refugees, the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR).

The US Refugee Resettlement Program fits within the broader context of the 1951 Refugee Convention. The 1951 Refugee Convention established the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) to protect refugees and to seek durable solutions for them. Resettlement is one of three solutions offered to refugees by UNHCR, which also includes voluntary repatriation, returning to one's home country when one no longer feels at risk of persecution, and local integration, settling permanently in the country to which one initially fled (UNHCR, 2011a).

In order to be resettled in the United States, most refugees are first identified as in need of international protection through resettlement by the UNHCR. By definition, refugees must have fled their home countries, often to a neighboring, or second country in order to come under UNHCR's mandate. UNHCR refers refugees in need of resettlement to countries that accept refugees, including the USA. (Georgetown Law, 2009). Refugees must pass an interview with the US State Department and complete an extensive medical check and security clearance (Martin, 2004). Today, the US resettles the highest number of refugees of any country in the world (ORR, 2012b). The US has resettled over three million refugees in the past 40 years (ORR, 2012b). Once the US State Department agrees to admit a refugee, the case is forwarded to one of nine voluntary agencies which assist with resettlement (ORR, 2013). These agencies are funded, at least in part, by the ORR Reception and Placement program (ORR Report to Congress, FY 2011). These voluntary agencies choose refugee resettlement locations, which are most often in urban areas (Daley, 2007).

Integration is stated as an explicit goal of the ORR. The ORR writes, "The Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) provides new populations with the opportunity to maximize their potential in the United States. Our programs provide people in need with critical resources to assist them in becoming integrated members of American society." (ORR, 2013b). The ORR does not explicitly define the term integration. Dwyer (2010) argues there is an "absence of a widely accepted formal definition of integration" (p. 11). However, the *Refugee Act* does provide specific guidelines for the ORR in its mission to integrate refugees. These include: (1) Make available sufficient resources for employment training and placement in order to achieve economic self-sufficiency among refugees as quickly as possible; (2) provide refugees with the opportunity to acquire sufficient English language training to enable them to become effectively resettled as quickly as possible; and (3) insure that cash assistance is made available to refugees in such a manner as not to discourage their economic self-sufficiency, in accordance with subsection (e)(2) (Section 411, Footnote a(1)(A) (i,ii,iii)). Although integration itself is not explicitly defined in US policy, three key objectives are: employment; self-sufficiency; and English language acquisition.

Current resettlement policy in the United States discourages secondary migration. The ORR lists six guiding principles which outline "ORR's approach to services" (ORR, 2013b). The first guiding principle, Appropriate Placement and Services, states: "ORR increased interagency coordination with the Department of State to ensure refugees are placed in locations where there are appropriate services and resettlement conditions. Appropriate placement and services from the onset is seen as a preventative measure against the challenges brought by secondary migration." While refugees are legally allowed to relocate as secondary migrants under current resettlement policy, the ORR actively works to prevent such movement.

The ORR disincentivizes secondary migration for both refugees and voluntary agencies. Refugees who move within their first eight months of resettlement are penalized by a forfeit of federal refugee assistance (Ott, 2011). If a refugee moves to a different state, voluntary

agencies are also in effect penalized by a loss of funding because current refugee funding allotments are based on the total number of refugees an agency serves. Further, although the Refugee Assistance Amendments of 1982 amended the *Refugee Act* of 1980 to require the ORR to track secondary migration, the information is often missing due to limited reporting and unavailability of information on refugee movement (Ott, 2011). Through its policy statements, the ORR clearly discourages secondary migration.

Current refugee resettlement policy also prioritizes urban, high density resettlement locations. The *Refugee Act* directs the ORR to: "Insure that a refugee is not initially placed or resettled in an area highly impacted (as determined under regulations prescribed by the Director after consultation with such agencies and governments) by the presence of refugees or comparable populations unless the refugee has a spouse, parent, sibling, son, or daughter residing in that area." (Section 411, Footnote 2C(i)). The ORR is directed to take into account: (I) the proportion of refugees and comparable entrants in the population in the area; (II) the availability of employment opportunities, affordable housing, and public and private resources (including educational, health care, and mental health services) for refugees in the area; (III) the likelihood of refugees placed in the area becoming self-sufficient and free from long-term dependence on public assistance; and (IV) the secondary migration of refugees to and from the area that is likely to occur. Small towns in the US are often homogenous with no existing refugee populations and may lack public and private resources and services. Therefore, refugees are typically resettled in high density urban locations, not rural communities.

Refugees in rural communities

The majority of immigrants and refugees have settled in long-established urban gateway cities like New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, Boston, Miami and Houston (Jensen & Yang, 2009; Kandel & Cromartie, 2004; Lichter & Johnson, 2006; Massey & Capoferro, 2008; Ray, 2004). Singer and Wilson (2007) report between 1983 and 2004, over 95% of refugees were resettled in urban areas. Despite policy barriers, refugees are increasingly moving from their initial urban locations to rural communities like Fort Morgan, Colorado (Green, 2009; Goza, 2007; Nadeau, 2009; Nezer, 2013; Schwei & Fennely, 2007; Spring Institute, 2009). Beginning in the late 1990s, immigrants and refugees began to "settle in 'nontraditional' states and cities" in places like small towns in the American West (Ray, 2004 p. ii). Washington and Colorado had two of the highest levels of documented refugee secondary migrants (724 and 229 respectively) (ORR, 2012b). However, most refugees do not report their movements so the number of secondary migrants is likely much greater than reported.

Research shows secondary migration is common among resettled refugees in the US (Beer & Foley, 2003; Harte, Childs, & Hastings, 2009; Mott, 2010; Simich 2003). The ORR 2008 Annual Report to Congress highlighted reasons for secondary migration in the US: "better employment opportunities, the pull of an established ethnic community, more generous welfare benefits, better training opportunities, reunification with relatives, or a more congenial climate" (p. 69). Similarly, researchers (Fennely, 2005; Jensen & Yang, 2009; Schwei & Fennely, 2007; Stull, 1998) cite the economic pull of immigrants broadly to smaller towns and rural communities, often for agricultural jobs, tourism-based employment, or jobs at meatpacking or food processing plants. Ott (2011) argues that allowing refugees to move to new locations based on their decisions about what is best for them may better facilitate the ORR goal of providing refugees with the opportunity to meet their potential and to become integrated members of American society.

There is a dearth of research on rural refugee integration. The limited research on rural refugee resettlement examines issues rural communities face as a result of resettlement, such as miscommunication, cultural clashes, and employment competition (Fennelly & Shandy, 2006; Green, 2009; Hansen, 2003; Hume & Hardwick 2005; Schiller et al., 2009; Singer & Wilson, 2006). There is almost no research showing whether refugees in rural communities are or are not progressing towards integration, or what integration means to community members in places like Fort Morgan, Colorado.

Integration

Integration is the major stated goal of the US resettlement program (ORR, 2013). Yet, the US Office of Refugee Resettlement does not define its use of the term integration. This is problematic since integration is complex and can be viewed from multiple perspectives, ranging from anglo-conformity, being forced to give up the traditions of one's home country to conform to the culture of the new country (Brubaker, 2001; Vinokurov, Birman, & Trickett, 2000) to cultural pluralism, valuing one's own identity and characteristics while also maintaining relationships with the dominant society (Berry, 1997). Castles, Korac, Vasta, and Vertovec (2001) write, "There is no single, generally accepted definition, theory, or model of immigrant and refugee integration" (p. 12).

In spite of the general lack of definition, from a programmatic and policy perspective, it is important to both define policy terms and goals and to be able to assess progress towards such goals (Press & Thompson, 2008). Nezer (2013) advocates for the US to identify and adopt key indicators of integration in order to measure refugee progress towards integration. Thus, this research choose to use the UNHCR's 2002 definition of integration and to utilize Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration framework to assess refugee progress towards integration.

The UNHCR definition was chosen for this research because it takes into account the complex nature of integration. The UNHCR's (2002) defines integration as: "A mutual, dynamic, multifaceted and ongoing process. From a refugee perspective, integration requires a preparedness to adapt to the lifestyle of the host society without having to lose one's own cultural identity. From the point of view of the host society, it requires a willingness for communities to be welcoming and responsive to refugees and for public institutions to meet the needs of a diverse population" (p. 12). This definition highlights integration as a process that occurs at both the level of the individual refugee and the level of the receiving community.

Similarly, Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration framework was chosen as a tool to measure refugee progress towards integration in this study because of its focus on integration at both the level of the individual and the community. Ager and Strang's framework was used to develop survey and interview questions in this research.

Indicators of integration

While there is no generally accepted definition of the term integration, scholars have identified a wide variety of indicators, or measures, that policy makers and those working with refugees can utilize to assess refugee progress towards integration. As stated above, the ORR focuses on three particular indicators of integration: employment, self-sufficiency, and

English language acquisition. Yet the literature highlights a variety of different measures, including: employment (Farrel, Barden & Mueller, 2008); access to housing (Atfield, Brahmhatt, & O'Toole, 2007; Humpries, 2005; King, 2003; Phillips, 2006); access to and obtainment of formal and informal education (Morrice, 2007; Pittaway, Muli, & Scheir, 2009; Yu, Ouellet, & Warmington, 2007); access to physical and mental healthcare (Asgary & Segar 2011; Karadag & Altintas, 2010; Morris, et al., 2009; Petsod, et al., 2006; Sheikh-Mohammed, MacIntyre, Wood, Leask, & Isaacs, 2006), development of social networks and relationships with both refugees and other citizens (Atfield, Brahmhatt & O'Toole, 2007; Casey & McDonald-Wilmsen, 2010; Hume & Hardwick, 2005; Lamba & Krahn, 2011; Schiller, Boggis, Messenger, & Douglas, 2009); feelings of personal safety (Barclay, Bowes, Ferguson, Sim, & Valenti, 2003; Dickerson, Leary, Merritt & Zaidi, 2011; Spencer, et. al., 2006); language acquisition (Ives, 2007; Pittaway, Muli, & Scheir, 2009); and obtainment of citizenship and civic participation (Duke, Sales, & Gregory, 1999; Faist, 1995; Levy, 1999). Scholars have identified a variety of different indicators to assess progress towards integration, far beyond the ORR's focus on employment, self-sufficiency, and English language acquisition.

Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration framework

Ager and Strang's (2004) multi-dimensional indicators of integration framework encompasses many of the commonly identified indicators above. Ager and Strang's framework includes four main dimensions of integration. These include: 1) Means and Markers: the resettled refugee achieving outcomes comparable to the general population in employment, housing, education and healthcare. 2) Social Connections: the refugee developing relationships with other members of the refugee's ethnic group (bonds), developing relationships with other Americans (bridges), and accessing social services (links). 3) Facilitators: the refugee gaining language skill, cultural knowledge, and feeling safe, as well as the development of reciprocal understanding by the receiving community about refugees' cultures. 4) Foundations: the refugee having basic citizenship and rights for equal engagement in the new society. Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration framework was used to assess rural refugee progress towards integration in this case study.

New indicator of integration: Civic attachment

While Ager and Strang's framework is relatively comprehensive, their view of citizenship is somewhat narrow. Within their dimension of citizenship and rights, there is almost no discussion of citizenship in terms of political efficacy, or an individual refugee's feelings that he/she can create change. Instead, potential indicators are almost exclusively quantitative measures such as the number of refugees who have applied for citizenship, the amount of time refugees spend participating in civic organizations, or the number of refugees involved in political parties. This is consistent with the fact that refugees are often treated passively throughout the resettlement process (Rajaram, 2002; Peisker & Tilbury, 2003). Expanding Ager and Strang's citizenship and rights indicator to include the idea of civic attachment may help overcome this issue.

Civic attachment helps expand Ager and Strang's indicators of integration framework to include a broader notion of citizenship. Flanagan and Faison (2001) define civic attachment as three-pronged, including an individual's feelings: that a) he/she is an important community member; b) his/her opinions matter in community affairs; and c) he/she wants to be make the

community a better place through his/her contributions. Similarly, Brehm, Eisenhauer, and Krannich (2004) define civic attachment as a belief that one's actions and opinions can enact change in his/her community. Civic attachment encompasses individuals' emotional and sentimental attachments to their communities (Hummon, 1992). Individuals with strong civic attachment not only have a sense of community, but may also have increased feelings of personal identity and personal security (Manzo & Perkins, 2006). Individuals with higher levels of civic attachment report greater perceptions of their own well-being (Theodori, 2001). Research shows integration is most successful when refugees are involved in decision-making processes (Ray, 2004). Civic attachment focuses on individual feelings of efficacy and community attachment. As a potential indicator of integration, civic attachment may help expand Ager and Strang's framework by conceptualizing citizenship in a broader manner.

Research questions

To summarize, the primary goal of the US resettlement program is integration. US resettlement policy directs refugees to resettle in urban locations and actively discourages secondary migration to rural locations. There seems to be an underlying assumption that refugees in rural areas are less likely to reach integration. Yet, refugees are increasingly moving to small towns across the US and there is limited research to show whether they are or are not progressing towards integration. Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration framework provides specific indicators to assess rural refugee progress towards and feelings about integration. There is also limited research looking at rural communities' understandings of integration, although UNHCR defines integration as a process that occurs at both the level of the individual and the community.

Based on the current scholarship, the following research questions emerge:

- 1) Are there differences between rural and urban refugee feelings of progress towards integration as measured by key indicators of integration?
- 2) Are there differences between rural and urban refugee feelings of civic attachment?
- 3) What meaning do refugees attach to integration and civic attachment in rural communities?
- 4) How does the rural community of Fort Morgan, Colorado, understand integration?

Methodology

This research was conducted in two phases. During the first phase, the researcher utilized a quantitative research strategy with a comparative case study design and a survey methodology to address research questions 1 and 2. The purpose of the first phase was to gain a preliminary impression of what, if any, differences exist between rural and urban refugee feelings of progress towards integration and civic attachment. During the first phase of the study, the researcher completed surveys with 25 Somali refugees living in the rural town, Fort Morgan, Colorado, and 25 Somali refugees living in the urban city, Seattle, Washington. Although the sample size of phase one was limited, the surveys showed the researcher a second, qualitative phase to further explore rural refugee integration was merited.

The goal of the second, qualitative phase was to gain a richer understanding of rural refugee feelings of integration and civic attachment, as well as community perspectives on integration. The second phase utilized a single case study design and interview methodology, focusing specifically on the rural community of Fort Morgan, Colorado. The researcher completed 10 interviews with Somali refugees in Fort Morgan, as well as 4 local Fort Morgan residents and 6 public administrators. Survey and interview questions were both developed using Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration framework.

Somali culture

This research focused on Somali refugees. This is important to distinguish because Somali refugees may have different paths towards integration than other refugee groups. Somalia has faced conflict since 1991, including a disintegration of the central government (Putnam & Noor, 1999). As a result, over 45% of the Somali population was displaced (Kemp & Rasbridge, 2004). It is estimated that over 100,000 Somalis have been resettled in the United States (BRYCS, 2013). Somali culture has been characterized as somewhat homogenous (Lewis, 2013). Somalis are described as sharing a "uniform language, religion, and culture" (Lewis, 2013). Somalis are also characterized as communal, with extensive family ties. Lewis (2013) writes, "The focus of Somali culture is on the family" (p. 1). The majority of Somalis are Sunni Muslim (Lewis, 2013). Somalis have also been characterized as having a mobile culture with a tendency to migrate within their home country even before resettling to the US as refugees (Huisman, 2011). There are limitations to talking about "Somali culture". While identifying aspects of Somali culture may be helpful for researchers, it is also important to note the unique circumstances of individuals, and to look at people's lives in their individual contexts (Dyck & Kearns, 1995).

Fort Morgan, Colorado

This research primarily focused on Somali refugees living in Fort Morgan, Colorado. Fort Morgan is a rural town 80 miles outside of Denver, Colorado with approximately 11,400 residents (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Fort Morgan had a historic population of Latino immigrants, although the majority of the town (73%) identify as non-Hispanic/Anglo (U.S. Census Bureau, 2013). Fort Morgan's economy is based predominantly on agriculture and related business, in particular a large meatpacking factory, Cargill Meat Solutions, that employs nearly 2,000 individuals (City of Fort Morgan, 2013). Over 1,000 Somali refugees resettled to Fort Morgan, Colorado, between 1997 and 2013. It is estimated over 90% of these were secondary migrants who moved from initial urban resettlement locations, with a small percentage of refugees who were directly resettled to the area as part of a family unification program (R. Gray, 2013, pers. comm., April 15).

As a secondary migration destination, Fort Morgan had several distinctive characteristics. Due to its historic population of Latino immigrants, Fort Morgan already had established services such as adult basic education and English as a Second Language (ESL) classes. However, even with these services, many of the Latino workers were undocumented and marginalized in the community. Leaders in Fort Morgan "Recognized the longstanding disconnect between the immigrant experience and the established community member experience" (B. Zion, pers. comm., April 4). In the early 2000s, Fort Morgan received a grant from the Colorado Trust to support immigrant integration in the community. Thus, even before the secondary migration of Somali refugees to the area, Fort Morgan was "already

tuning in to its diverse community composition and engaged in coming up with strategies to be a more welcoming community" (J. Wissman-Horther, pers. comm., April 20). As a rural receiving community Fort Morgan had distinctive characteristics, including pre-existing services and funding to support immigrant integration.

Around the same time, in 2006, there were a series of raids against undocumented workers in meatpacking plants across the country, including the plant in Fort Morgan. Following the raids, "The meatpacking industry as a whole reacted to that proactively by seeking out refugees as a labor force out of fear that other laborers might not be documented" (J. Wissman-Horther, pers. comm., April 20). Refugees were actively recruited from Denver and Minneapolis to come to Fort Morgan. This recruitment was not conveyed to the larger community. The community of Fort Morgan "was very surprised by the refugees" (J. Wissman-Horther, pers. comm., April 20). However, the prior work the community had engaged in to create a welcoming community may have provided a "foundation where that much larger demographic change could be responded to and reacted to" (J. Wissman-Horther, pers. comm., April 20). It is important to note the unique characteristics of the community of Fort Morgan in this particular case study.

Seattle, Washington

Seattle, Washington, represents a typical resettlement location: a large, urban, port city. The metropolitan region of Seattle has over 3,500,000 people (2013 Census Bureau). The 2010 American Community Survey reports 17.3% of the Seattle population is foreign born, while 69.5% of Seattle residents identify as non-Hispanic/Anglo (2013 Census Bureau). The metropolitan region has had a large growth of immigrants in the past 20 years, including 40% immigrant growth between 1990 and 2000 (2013 Census Bureau). Seattle is home to several major populations of refugees including Vietnamese, Laotians, and Somalis. There are at least 8,000 Somali refugees in city of Seattle, and an estimated 30,000 total Somali immigrants in the area (EthnoMed, 2013). Seattle served as the urban location in the comparative case study for phase one of this research.

Phase 1

During the first phase of the project, the researcher surveyed Somali refugees in Seattle and Fort Morgan. The surveys (Appendix A) had three main purposes: (1) to identify if there were differences between refugee self-reported progress towards integration in the two sites; (2) to determine if refugees in Seattle and Fort Morgan had different feelings of civic attachment; and (3) to help the researcher gain initial insights to determine if a more intensive, qualitative research phase was merited.

The researcher worked with key community informants in Fort Morgan and Seattle to give out surveys. Research has shown working with community informants, someone who has an understanding of what is happening in a community, may allow researchers to better emphasize culturally sensitive practices and obtain more honest answers from interview participants (Ellis, Kia-Keating, Yusuf, Lincoln, & Nir, 2007). In order to accommodate the influx of refugees to rural towns in Northern Colorado, Lutheran Family Refugee Services (LFRS) opened an office in Fort Morgan in 2008 (R. Gray, 2013, pers. comm., April 15). The researcher contacted the LFRS offices to ask for assistance with the research project, who provided contact information for a Somali community informant to help give out the surveys

and to translate. The researcher contacted Somali Community Services (SCS), a nonprofit organization in Seattle that assists Somali refugees in their resettlement activities to provide the researcher with a community informant who agreed to distribute and orally translate surveys to Somalis in the area.

The researcher utilized a purposive snowball sampling strategy, a nonrandom sampling technique. The community informants contacted potential survey respondents, who then provided additional names. Persecuted groups like refugees may not understand that participation in research is voluntary. In particular, written informed consents may not be the most appropriate tool when working with groups with less power such as resettled refugees (Lykes, 1989). In order to help overcome this barrier, the researcher had the community informant ask participants ahead of time if they would be willing to participate, without the researcher present. The community informant explained the purpose of the work and helped ensure participants knew declining participation would in no way impact them or their families. Three refugees declined participation.

The researcher and the community informants visited refugees in their homes in Fort Morgan. In Seattle, refugees mainly completed the surveys in the SCS office. Surveys were completed both orally and in writing. Study eligibility included: minimum age of 18 years and voluntary consent. Refugees who could write in English completed the surveys in writing. For refugees who did not speak or write English, the surveys were given orally in Somali with the help of the community informant. A total of 50 surveys were completed, 25 in Fort Morgan and 25 in Seattle.

Phase 2

During the second phase of the project, the researcher interviewed refugees (Appendix B), public administrators (Appendix C), and community members (Appendix D) in Fort Morgan. The goal of this phase was to gain a robust understanding of rural refugee feelings of integration and civic attachment in Fort Morgan, as well as community perspectives on integration. During the spring of 2013 the researcher interviewed 10 Somali refugees, 4 non-refugee Fort Morgan residents and 6 public administrators. The interviews had two purposes: (1) to research the meaning refugees attach to integration and civic attachment in rural communities, and (2) to research how rural community members understand integration.

Interviews with Somali refugees were conducted between February and March of 2013 using a semi-structured interview format that included both open-ended and fixed-response questions. Face-to-face interviews were conducted with all refugees in Fort Morgan. Once again, the research utilized a community informant, who translated seven of the interviews in Somali. Three of the interviews were conducted in English. Each interview lasted approximately one and a half hours.

The researcher triangulated by completing additional interviews with public administrators and non-refugee community members in Fort Morgan. These interviews followed a semi-structured format with open-ended questions and were all completed in English.

Results and discussion: Phase 1

The first phase of the research followed a quantitative strategy and comparative case study design with a survey methodology (Appendix A). A total of 50 surveys were completed, 25 in Fort Morgan and 25 in Seattle. Data and descriptive statistics were compiled in excel to compare Fort Morgan and Seattle. Survey questions focused on eight of the nine key indicators of integration: employment, language, housing, education, social connections, and cultural knowledge, safety, and citizenship. One indicator, health, was not included in the survey, although this indicator was examined during phase 2 of this research.

Questions measuring civic attachment were also included. These questions focused on the major characteristics of civic attachment: feeling like people in one's community listen to one's opinions, and feeling like individual members of a community can help solve problems in the community.

Demographically, the survey respondents had similar characteristics. All were refugees from Somalia. The respondents in Fort Morgan ranged in age from 19-57, with an average age of 31. The respondents in Seattle ranged in age from 21-50, with an average age of 34. The gender composition was similar, 44% (11) male, 56% (14) female in Fort Morgan, 56% (14) male, 44% (11) female in Seattle. The percentage of respondents who spoke English was also similar between the two populations: 48% (12) of respondents in Fort Morgan spoke English and 52% (13) of respondents in Seattle. There were two areas of notable difference: The average time of residence in the United States was 3.4 years for refugees in Fort Morgan, as compared to 10.8 years in Seattle. The Fort Morgan refugees were also less likely to have children. Only 36% (9) of respondents in Fort Morgan had children, as compared to 60% (15) of respondents in Seattle.

Results and discussion: 1) Indicators of integration

There is currently very limited research looking at rural refugees progress towards integration. Instead, the indicators of integration were developed primarily based on refugees in urban locations (A. Ager, 2012, pers. comm., October 31). This research thus fills an important gap by showing that Somali refugees in urban Seattle and rural Fort Morgan are making similar progress towards each of the main indicators of integration.

The research showed Somali refugees in the rural town of Fort Morgan and the urban location of Seattle, Washington, had similar progress towards many of the key indicators of integration. In particular, the research showed very similar responses to two of the key integration objectives identified by the US Refugee Resettlement Program, employment and English language acquisition. The survey asked, I am _____ with my job (happy, neutral, not happy). In Fort Morgan, 60% (15) of respondents reported they were happy with their job in comparison to 56% (14) of respondents in Seattle. Respondents had similar levels of English language acquisition, determined by survey completion rates. In Fort Morgan, 48% (12) of respondents completed the survey in English, as compared to 52% (13) of respondents in Seattle. Both groups reported similar feelings about and progress towards two of the main indicators of integration highlighted by the *Refugee Act*.

Somali refugees in Fort Morgan and Seattle also reported similar feelings and progress towards several of the other key indicators of integration, including housing, educational opportunities, social connections, and cultural knowledge. The survey operationalized each of

these key indicators with similar questions: Housing: I am _____ with my current housing situation (happy, neutral, not happy). Educational Opportunities: I am _____ with the educational opportunities in Fort Morgan/Seattle (happy, neutral, not happy). Social connections: It is easy for me to make friends in Fort Morgan/Seattle (agree, neutral, disagree). Cultural Knowledge: People in _____ (Seattle or Fort Morgan) understand my culture and background.

The surveys showed similar responses between each group for indicators of housing, educational opportunities, and social connections. Respondents were nearly equally happy with their current housing situations, 88% (22) in Fort Morgan and 84% (21) in Seattle. Respondents reported similar feelings towards educational opportunities available in their communities, 72% (18) were happy with available educational opportunities in Fort Morgan, as compared to 76% (19) in Seattle. Refugees in both locations reported similar feelings about social connections, with 56% (14) of respondents in both Fort Morgan and Seattle reporting it is easy to make friends in their communities.

Respondents also reported similar feelings about cultural knowledge. In Fort Morgan, 36% (9) of respondents reported people in their town understand their culture and background. Similarly, 44% (11) of respondents in Seattle reported people in their city understand their culture and background. In Fort Morgan, 80% (20) of respondents said they were happy they live in Fort Morgan, as compared to 92% (23) said they were happy they live in Seattle.

Refugees in both locations reported similar feelings and progress towards six of the nine integration indicators identified within Ager and Strang's framework (employment, language, housing, education, social connections, and cultural knowledge).

There were differences between the two groups for the remaining indicator, safety. Survey respondents were asked to rank what was most important for them when they first arrived in the United States as compared to what was currently most important for them. In terms of safety, the two groups showed an inverse relationship. While 68% (17) percent of refugees in Fort Morgan reported safety was the most important factor for them when they initially arrived in urban locations in the United States, only 20% (5) reported safety is most important for them today. In Seattle, 20% (5) of respondents reported safety was most important when they first arrived, but today, 44% (11) of respondents said safety is most important to them. Somali refugees in Fort Morgan and Somali refugees in Seattle had different feelings towards the importance of safety.

Somali refugees who moved to Fort Morgan as secondary migrants may have initially been more concerned about safety than refugees who currently live in Seattle, but today, appear less concerned about safety. Dickerson et al. report refugees who do not feel safe in their new communities face greater difficulties in reaching integration. This research suggests that by allowing refugees to move as secondary migrants from an urban to a rural location, these refugees felt safer, which may have helped them integrate into Fort Morgan.

Results and discussion: 2) Civic attachment

The other area where the two groups reported different feelings were the citizenship and civic attachment questions. Civic attachment is defined as an individual's feelings that he/she is an important community member, his/her opinions matter in community affairs, and he/she can contribute to the community. The survey operationalized the concept of civic attachment with

three different questions: 1) If I see a problem in _____ (Fort Morgan/Seattle), I feel like I can help fix the problem; 2) People in _____ (Fort Morgan/Seattle) listen to my opinions; and 3) I feel it is important to become a citizen of the US.

Survey respondents in Fort Morgan reported higher levels of civic attachment on each of these questions, and the differences in the two groups responses were the most striking. In Fort Morgan, 84% (21) of respondents reported they felt like they could help solve problems in their communities, compared to 56% (14) of respondents in Seattle. In Fort Morgan, 76% (19) of respondents said they feel like people in Fort Morgan will listen to their opinions, compared to 40% (10) in Seattle. All respondents, 100% (25), in Fort Morgan reported they felt like it was important for them to become citizens of the United States, compared to 68% (17) of respondents in Seattle. The survey results showed Somali refugees in Fort Morgan had much higher rankings of civic attachment than those in Seattle.

These levels of civic attachment make some sense when considering the size of the receiving communities and the receiving populations. Singer and Wilson (2006) report refugees can have considerable impacts on local populations, especially in small and rural towns. Similarly, Hume (2005) reports refugees often bring changes to communities. the impact of these changes may be greater when the refugee community makes up over 10% of the towns total population, as in Fort Morgan, Colorado. As a result, it is possible the community of Fort Morgan was more willing to listen to the needs of the Somali newcomers. Further, by using their own agency and making a choice to move their families, refugee secondary migrants may better feel they are able to solve their own problems (Ott, 2011). These feelings of agency may expand to the level of the community as civic attachment.

In conclusion, phase 1 shows Somali refugee respondents in Fort Morgan, a rural town, are making similar progress as Somali survey respondents in Seattle, an urban city, toward the ORR stated goal of helping refugees become "integrated members of American society" (ORR, 2013). Somali refugees in Fort Morgan reported higher levels of civic attachment, showing greater agency over their own resettlement experiences.

While the limited sample size meant the survey results are not generalizable, the results did both a) suggest Somali refugees in the small town of Fort Morgan are making progress towards integration and b) highlight the need for further research exploring rural refugee community integration. Thus, phase two of this research utilized an in-depth qualitative design to explore how Somali refugees in Fort Morgan, as well as other Fort Morgan community members, felt about refugee community integration in a rural area.

Results and discussion: Phase two

Phase two utilized a qualitative research strategy with a single case study design and a semi-structured interview methodology (Appendix B). Ten Somali refugees in Fort Morgan participated in in-depth interviews, five male and five female. None of the participants had taken the surveys during from the first phase. Participants ranged in age from 21-55, with the average age of 38.1. Participants had lived in the US from 1 to 6 years, with the average being 3.5 years. Seven interviews were translated and three were completed in English. All participants were secondary migrants who had moved to Fort Morgan from their initial, urban resettlement locations. Ten additional interviews took place with 4 non-refugee community residents and 6 public administrators who had worked with the Somali refugee population in Fort Morgan.

Interview participants were asked questions about three different areas, based on the research questions for phase two. Respondents were first asked about the meaning they attached and feelings toward each of the major indicators of integration identified in Ager and Strang's framework, including employment, language, self-sufficiency, housing, education, health, social bonds, social bridges, social links, safety and citizenship. Second, participants were asked to speak about civic attachment, including whether they felt like they were valuable community members and things they would miss if they left the community. Third, respondents were asked to talk about their understanding and feelings towards community integration in Fort Morgan.

Interviews were coded using NVivo10 data analysis software in order to identify major themes within the data. The researcher first transcribed all of the data. The researcher then uploaded each typed interview into NVivo10. After completing an initial coding, the researcher went back through all of the nodes and organized the code into several main themes with subsets. The coding quickly fell into the pre-existing categories of: 1) Indicators of integration, 2) Civic attachment, and 3) Feelings about Fort Morgan and community integration. The researcher did not utilize a second coder because the research acknowledged the subjectivity in her research and interviews and felt her perspective and understanding of the material was essential to the interview coding.

Results and discussion: 1) Indicators of integration, employment and self-sufficiency

Somali refugees reported feeling happy with their current employment situations, feeling connected to their co-workers, and feeling valued for their contributions to the local economy. Somali refugees in Fort Morgan spoke about happiness in terms of employment. A Somali refugee said, "Being happy means having a good job." When asked what he would miss about Fort Morgan, one Somali man said, "I would be sad to leave all my colleagues. I know where we came from, how we are working, living, I'd miss all of my community." Participants felt connected to their co-workers.

Some participants spoke about how the community and the Cargill meatpacking plant value Somali refugees as a labor force. One Somali man said, "I think Somali's are now an important part of Fort Morgan because of the factory, we can work hard and it is good for them." Similarly, one non-refugee community member said, "They [Somali refugees] have become valuable employees at Cargill Meat Solutions, they, along with many others, make up that work force." Refugee and non-refugee respondents spoke about the value of Somali workers to the community.

Interviewees talked about Cargill as the main employment option for refugees in Fort Morgan and the fact that there are limited career options for refugees outside of Cargill. When asked if they would tell a friend to move to Fort Morgan, several Somali refugees said the same thing: "Yes, if they want to work at a meat factory." One public administrator said, "Overwhelmingly the biggest challenge they [Somali refugees] face is there is a single employer more or less available for them and so you are going to come to Fort Morgan to work at the meatpacking plant." Eight of the interviewees worked at Cargill. One worked at a nonprofit in the community and the other stayed home with her son.

Interviewees also spoke about their goals and feelings about self-sufficiency. A female Somali said, "We used to use services a lot, but now we do not need them. Now we are self-sufficient." Some participants compared their experiences with self-sufficiency in Fort

Morgan to their initial resettlement locations. One male Somali said, "In Nashville, I had to use services and they were hard to get and the case worker wanted me to take a job that didn't pay enough to support my family. But here, I just work and I don't use services anymore and I can take care of my family." Respondents were proud of their progress and ability to become self-sufficient.

Overall, respondents felt proud of their employment situations and showed progress towards integration based on the standard indicator of integration, employment. The US refugee resettlement program prioritizes employment and financial self-sustainability as the two main indicators of integration for refugees in the US. Ives (2007) argues employment is the most influential integration directive in the US resettlement program. Based on this directive, refugees in Fort Morgan show major progress towards integration. Refugees in Fort Morgan were not only employed, but proud of their ability to care for themselves and their families without assistance.

English

Interview participants spoke about English as a major component of integration. This is consistent with the literature on integration, which says speaking the language of the host country is a fundamental key to integration (Canadian Council for Refugees, 1998). Seven of the interviews with Somali refugees were translated and three were conducted in English. Participants spoke about trying to learn English and English as a barrier to social connections. Participants who had attended English language courses were generally positive about their experiences. Some refugees said they do not participate in community events because of English. One female Somali said, "No, I don't go to events because I don't speak English enough. I don't know what they are talking about so it just wastes my time." Respondents spoke about English as a major indicator of progress towards integration and spoke about wanting to learn English.

Participants spoke about employment and limited English. One male refugee said, "'It is easier here because you can have a good job at Cargill even without English." A public administrator said, "Cargill is always going to attract people with low English to our community because you can work there and still make a living wage without English." Respondents saw rural employment opportunities as a way to overcome English language barriers.

Refugees and public administrators spoke about interpretation challenges in smaller communities. In particular, participants spoke about healthcare and interpretation needs. One refugee said, "Like something we miss at the hospital is we don't understand because the health language is hard even if we speak English, so we want the language line. But you might have to wait 24 hours for the language line for someone to come." A public administrator said, "There are a lot of difficulties with language and interpretation, especially when you get into complex conversations like you might need in a medical setting." The interviews showed smaller communities may face greater challenges to integration in terms of English and translation needs, particularly related to healthcare.

Refugees in rural Fort Morgan and other community members agreed with the literature that English is a major indicator of integration. Refugees spoke about the challenges of learning English and participating in community events without understanding English. Refugees and community members felt Somali refugees in Fort Morgan were making progress towards

learning English. As a rural community, Fort Morgan may face greater interpretation challenges, particularly related to healthcare, than other, urban locations. However, refugees agreed with the literature that learning English is one of the major components of integration and showed progress towards this indicator.

Housing

Access to adequate housing is a key indicator of integration. Interviewees said they felt happy in their homes. One participant compared his home to his prior apartment in Atlanta. He said, "I didn't have good housing there, the neighborhood I was in was bad." Participants talked about living with non-Somalis. One said, "Here, we are just living together, even in this apartment building, we live with other American people. We are together." Overall, refugee participants said they were happy with the available housing in Fort Morgan and felt safe in their homes. The literature shows housing structures integration experiences and is a key dimension of integration because it helps create a sense of belonging (Strang et al., 2002, King, 2003). The interviews showed refugees in Fort Morgan have access to safe, affordable, and stable housing, and as a result, may have greater feelings of safety and integration.

Education

During the interviews, participants highlighted the importance of education. Consistent with other research (Pittaway, Muli, & Schteir, 2009), refugees in Fort Morgan had high expectations for their children's educational attainment. One female Somali said, "At the school for my son, there are lots of Somali students, there are even some Somali teachers. So if he needs help, he can ask the other student, the teacher, who can explain. Now, his English is very good and he is doing very well." Another parent said, "I think my children, they feel accepted at school because there are many Somali, even a Somali teacher." Using education and access to education as a marker, refugees in Fort Morgan showed strong progress towards integration.

Health

Research showed Somalis were happy with their experiences with healthcare in Fort Morgan. One mother said, "In Denver it is harder because they don't know me but here it is good at the clinic, they can know my son they can explain for us if they call someone on the helpline. They know about my son and they can help." Administrators also spoke about healthcare in Fort Morgan. One said, "I think that the healthcare, if there's one sector of our community that was more ready than another, and I'm not saying they were perfect, but our healthcare, we have a Salud clinic, and they really stepped up." The interviews showed refugees in Fort Morgan were able to obtain necessary healthcare and felt satisfied with their access to healthcare.

This actually contradicts the general literature on refugee healthcare, which shows refugees do not access healthcare on a regular basis (Morris, et al., 2009). Refugees in Fort Morgan not only accessed healthcare, especially for their children, but overall were satisfied with the care they had received. Notably, none of the refugees or interview participants spoke about mental healthcare, which is consistent with the literature which shows refugees are less likely to talk

about or access mental healthcare (Weine, et al., 2008). Refugees in Fort Morgan access healthcare, a clear indicator of integration.

Bonds and bridges

The interviews showed Somali refugees in Fort Morgan have strong ties to other refugees in the community. Somali refugees spoke about the large Somali community in Fort Morgan. One said, "You know there are many Somali so that makes it easy for us." Social networks are one of the keys to integration (Atfield, Brahmhatt, & O'Toole, 2007; Schiller, et al., 2009). The fact that there is such a large Somali community in Fort Morgan seems to have made it easier for refugees to feel integrated in the community. In particular, while other research (Casey & McDonald-Wilmsen, 2010), has found refugees in rural areas may face more difficulty building social networks, refugees in Fort Morgan spoke of being happy with the Somali community and their bonds to other refugees. These bonds seem to provide the emotional support needed for participants to feel accepted and to integrate into the community of Fort Morgan.

Refugees spoke of positive feelings towards non-Somali community members, although they said they reported limited non-structured interactions between refugees and other Fort Morgan citizens. One refugee said, "I don't go to any Americans houses or to any other events." Some refugees said they would like to attend more events or know more Americans. Non-Somali community members said Somalis are somewhat separate. A public administrator said, "It's not like the Somalis are hanging out with the white people, or the white people are hanging out with Somalis." Overall, refugees and community members reported limited, but generally positive, interactions between the two groups.

Participants also talked about relationships between Somalis and other immigrant groups, particularly Latinos, in the community. One Somali participant said, "There were some problems with Somalis and other ethnic groups at the factory but now we are learning about diversity." One public administrator said, "For the Latino, community, I think what was really frustrating is they had the experience of coming here [...] of being undervalued, and then this group comes in who the minute they enter the United States have authorization to work, I think it's just, the Latino community plowed the road." Interview respondents reported some challenges between the pre-existing immigrant community in Fort Morgan and the arrival of the Somali refugee community.

Similarly, Portes and Borocz (1989) found refugees may receive more positive receptions than other immigrant groups, sometimes causing tensions between the existing immigrant communities and the new refugee community. Still, these relationships seemed to have improved with time and in general, participants reported strong social networks in Fort Morgan and positive interactions with Fort Morgan community members. These network seem to help refugees integrate into the community, find ways to solve their problems, and create a sense of belonging.

Links

Refugee participants were aware of existing services in the community. Refugees reported being able to easily access these services, including government, local, and Somali specific services. One refugee said, "We have some benefits from the government. If you apply here,

they are very good to you. When we lived in Minneapolis, they could not help but here they are very good, they just help us." Refugees were aware of and utilized existing resources in Fort Morgan.

Participants also spoke about links to Somali services and resources. One woman said, "I feel very happy at the Somali store. Many Somalis come to the store and they can practice our culture, they can find what they need from our country, they can ask for help or advice." One public administrator commented that in the beginning of the secondary migration to Fort Morgan, it was more difficult to find Somali services. He said, "At first for the Somali community getting Halal meat was probably a challenge, establishing a store that had culturally competent food sources." Interview participants were thankful for the Somali services and resources in Fort Morgan.

Somali refugees in Fort Morgan also spoke about living close to services they needed. A Somali woman said, "Fort Morgan is better than other places for Somalis because we can live close to our work place, the school, the market. Everything is close and that helps us make new lives. It is so hard to adjust to a new country and Fort Morgan feels more like home." Somali refugees felt happy with the size of Fort Morgan and their ability to access services easily.

Citizens were also aware of efforts by the community to link refugees to services. One citizen said she had seen, "an effort by the police to conduct driving classes," a "newcomers academy for middle and high school immigrant and refugee children," and "in-home tutoring for women in their homes." The director of a local nonprofit said she realized the community already offered many needed services for refugees, so part of the goal of her organization was to act as a "catalyst, some sort of agent that will make sure people are accessing them." She said the goal of her nonprofit was "not to foster parallel systems" but to help refugees "learn to access the existing services." Fort Morgan public administrators have made a huge effort to link refugees to services in the community.

One service refugees spoke about was limited public transportation. One participant said, "We all work in Cargill, but sometimes there is no bus and we don't have cars." Public administrators spoke about Somali refugees and driving. A public administrator said, "Being in a small town, I think you're gonna have to drive more than you did in say, Minneapolis. And so getting a driver's license can be a challenge." Transportation was the only service link barrier refugees and public administrators consistently spoke about during the interviews.

Unlike much of the research on refugees, which is focused mainly on refugees in urban locations, refugees in Fort Morgan did not seem to have trouble accessing services. Martin (2012) reports refugees face many barriers to accessing services, including a lack of awareness of existing services. Yet, refugees in Fort Morgan not only knew of existing services, but were able to choose which services they needed. Refugees were particularly happy with the local Somali shops and Somali specific-resources. Consistent with Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration, participants reported access to services in Fort Morgan helped refugees progress towards integration.

Safety

Safety was an important integration indicator for many Somali interview participants. Participants not only talked about the general importance of safety, but highlighted how

happy they were because they felt safe in Fort Morgan. One refugee said, "You know, I came to Fort Morgan for the job. But I am happy because of the safety and the community." Participants compared Fort Morgan to other places they had lived. One interviewee said, "I came here because before I didn't feel safe. I had to take the bus for four hours a day just to go to one job and then I'd go home and feel unsafe." A male Somali said, "This is the first time in my life I felt safe." This research mirrors Huisman's (2011) finding that safety is an important component of refugee secondary migration from urban to rural locations. Refugees in Fort Morgan spoke of feeling safe, which seemed to increase participants' abilities to integrate into the community.

Citizenship and rights

Somali refugees in Fort Morgan spoke positively about citizenship and rights. Several Somali participants said their next goal in life was to gain citizenship. One refugee said, "I want to be an American citizen because I am in Fort Morgan community." Interview participants saw citizenship as a way to reach integration. Interview respondents also spoke about being seen as equal community members as compared to other Americans. Asked what he would do if he had a problem, one refugee respondent said, "I would call the police. If I call the police, they will treat me the same as an American." A public administrator said, "They [refugees] are treated as equals. We strive for that as a community." Participants saw equal citizenship and rights as important indicators of integration and felt this was happening in Fort Morgan.

Indicators summary

Interview participants in Fort Morgan, Colorado spoke about each of the indicators of integration highlighted in Ager and Strang's (2004) framework. The research showed refugees in Fort Morgan are making progress towards integration. Refugees in rural Fort Morgan spoke not only of being happy with their employment situations, but being proud of their abilities to provide for their families. Refugees also spoke of having adequate access to education, housing, and healthcare, as well as having strong social networks particularly with other Somali community members. Refugees felt safe, felt a desire to become US citizens, and felt like they were treated equal before the law. While refugees in rural Fort Morgan did face some challenges their urban counterparts may not face, such as greater interpretation barriers and limited access to public transportation, overall, refugees in rural Fort Morgan spoke positively about their progress towards each of the major indicators of integration and may actually have higher levels of integration based on certain indicators like safety and access to resources.

Results and discussion: 2) Civic attachment

This research explored a new potential indicator of integration, civic attachment. Civic attachment, the feeling that one matters in community affairs, combined with a desire to contribute to the community, helps expand the citizenship indicator within Ager and Strang's (2004) framework to include a broader definition of citizenship.

Interviews showed Somali refugees felt like they mattered in community affairs. A female Somali said, "I like that people in town can listen and help us if we need something." One refugee said, "It is easier to live somewhere with lots of Somalis because then the people in

the town will listen to us and we can become a community together." A Somali man said, "I can give opinions for Somali community and other people in Fort Morgan do sometimes try to change to support Somalis. Like now prayer is allowed in school, now there are some people working on interpreter problems." Refugees reported feeling like community members cared about their happiness and wanted them to participate in solving problems together.

Non-refugee participants also spoke about the importance of Somalis in community affairs. One citizen said, "The people at the city will always listen, no matter who says it." He continued, "Being a smaller city we can do things a little more individually than say you know Denver or something like that." Talking about the city and community leaders, one citizen said, "They're certainly willing to listen to people and they have listened to the refugees. The officials in town have been very open to listening to Somalis." Citizens felt like refugees matter in the community.

Public administrators in the state said the community of Fort Morgan listens to the needs of refugees. A public administrator said, "Here, because the issues are right there in front of people, and it would potentially affect the community more, that that we have to listen. And, I think we do listen." Public administrators gave examples of ways the community had listened and changed as a result of the secondary migration of Somalis to the town. One public administrator said, "The director of the mortuary organized a meeting with the Somali elders to talk about burial rituals. The mortuary director was really great by saying this is what I have to do, and then hearing what the Somali community wanted to do, in terms of its Muslim practices, and then finding a space in the middle where their preferences could be respected and carried out." The interviews showed Fort Morgan community members and leaders are trying to meet the needs of Somali residents and to have the resettled refugees participate in community affairs.

The research showed Somali refugees want to contribute to the community of Fort Morgan. One refugee said, "We are together as a community. They ask us questions and we ask questions of people in Fort Morgan and together we can try to be a better community." Asked if they would want to participate in a group to improve the community, most Somalis said yes. One Somali participant said, "I would try to help. I would try to make Fort Morgan better for Somalis but also for Americans because we are all here together." Refugees not only felt like Fort Morgan citizens cared about their needs, but also showed a strong desire to contribute to the community.

When asked what they would miss if they left Fort Morgan, and what they would be glad to leave behind, all participants spoke about what they would miss. One woman said, "The things I have here I can't have everywhere so I would miss it. I don't want to leave it." Refugee respondents felt a strong connection to Fort Morgan.

Refugees in Fort Morgan had a strong sense of civic attachment. Interview participants showed the community of Fort Morgan values Somali community members' opinions. Somali refugees reported wanting to make the community a better place and feeling like they could actually enact change in the town. These feelings of civic attachment may have helped the Somali community better integrate in the community. Research shows individuals with strong feelings of civic attachment have higher levels of personal identity and personal security (Manzo & Perkins, 2006).

Possibly as a result of Fort Morgan's small size, refugees in the community felt their opinions mattered to the town and seemed to feel a strong sense of individual efficacy. As one citizen

said, "The fact that we're a relatively small city means that the impact is larger than it would be on a big city." In a way, the enormous impact of the new Somali population meant the town had no choice but to adapt and learn what the Somali refugees needed in order to become contributing community members. This research shows civic attachment may serve as a potential indicator of integration, and may provide a measure for smaller communities to use as a guide during the integration process.

Results and discussion: 3) Fort Morgan and community integration

Somali refugees said they feel accepted in Fort Morgan, although they also talked about some of the challenges the Somali community had faced to integration being in a smaller, more rural community with limited exposure to Somalis and Muslims.

Participants spoke of feeling accepted in Fort Morgan. The first interviewee said, "We feel accepted here. Here, we can practice things. Like, we have Quran class for children at the mosque and everyone just accepts it." Another participant said, "'I feel like I can practice [my culture] here. When I go out I wear traditional clothing and sometimes someone will tell me "beautiful scarf, beautiful dress." Many refugees felt the town had accepted their culture.

However, participants also spoke about rural community member's limited interactions with Africans and Muslims. One Somali participant said, "You know, at first people in Fort Morgan didn't know about Africans and they heard lots of bad things about Somalis and they were scared." Another Somali said, "There were some rumors about Somalis fighting, Somalis are terrorists, and then people said Somali are bad." A public administrator said, "People were concerned about the fact that they were Muslim, and so they had visions of terrorism in their minds." Respondents reported difficulties to community integration in Fort Morgan, especially during the beginning of the process.

Participants also spoke about some negative events directed towards Somalis in the community. One citizen said, "There have been things, like an apartment building that had a lot of Somalis in it, somebody went through and shot BBs through all the cars in the parking lot, but that was a onetime thing. There are people who still get a little bit drunk and they harass Somalis." One public administrator said, "There were people who wrote a petition to the government saying, what are these people doing here, they don't need to be here." Interview respondents shared some events that hampered the community integration process.

However, while participants saw these issues and events as serious problems, they did not feel these issues were barriers to integration. Community reception is an important aspect of integration in the literature. Kunz (1981) showed community reception, including reactions to traditional culture, is an important indicator for refugee integration. Participants said they understood people in Fort Morgan may have had limited exposure to Muslims and black people, and that this meant community members needed time to adjust to the Somali population. Yet, after several years, overall, Somali participants felt accepted and able to practice their culture in the community.

Thus, in spite of the challenges to integration faced by the community of Fort Morgan, refugees, citizens and public administrators felt like both the Somali refugees and the community were making progress towards integration. Respondents said integration was happening at both the level of the individual refugees and the community. One citizen said, "The community is getting pretty used to having [the Somali refugees] people around." A

public administrator said, "I think it [integration] really covers both the receiving community and the refugee community, and that is now happening here in Fort Morgan." The idea of integration occurring at the level of both the individual refugee and the broader community is consistent with other literature (Baird, 2012). Respondents felt positively about Somali refugee progress towards integration as well as the community's progress towards integration.

Results and discussion summary: Phases 1 and 2

Utilizing the indicators of integration identified by Ager and Strang's framework, rural refugees in Fort Morgan, Colorado are making progress towards integration. Surveys conducted during phase 1 with resettled refugees in rural Fort Morgan, Colorado, and urban Seattle, Washington showed self-reported similar progress towards the main indicators of integration identified in Ager and Strang's framework. In particular, refugees in Fort Morgan and Seattle had similar levels of employment and English language acquisition, two of the three integration indicators identified by the US Resettlement program. Although the limited sample size meant the survey findings are not generalizable, the results did suggest refugees in one particular rural community are making progress towards integration. The surveys also provided a starting place for the researcher to follow-up with an in-depth, qualitative case study of Somali refugee community integration in Fort Morgan, Colorado.

Interviews conducted during phase two showed Somali refugees in Fort Morgan were indeed making progress towards integration. Refugees in Fort Morgan were happy with their employment situations and proud of their self-sufficiency. Somali participants also reported they were trying to learn English, although participants did speak about interpretation challenges faced in rural communities, especially in terms of healthcare. Refugees said they also struggled with access to transportation. Refugees generally spoke positively about their access to services in the community. This result is likely a reflection of Fort Morgan's unique circumstances, but does suggest that rural communities have the potential to develop the capacity for such services.

Somali refugees in Fort Morgan spoke of spending most of their time with other Somalis. Interviewees were happy to have support and access to a network of other Somali refugees. This may also be unique due to the large size of the Somali population in Fort Morgan. Other research has shown immigrants may face isolation in rural communities (Dreby & Schmalzbauer, 2013). Interview participants said there are limited relationships between Somali and non-Somali community members. However, Somali interviewees generally spoke positively about their interactions with non-Somali community members. Interviewees also highlighted feeling safe and feeling like they are treated as equal citizens in Fort Morgan. Utilizing Ager and Strang's indicators of integration framework, rural refugees in Fort Morgan, Colorado, are making significant progress towards integration, as evidenced by their self-described achievements and feelings in each of the major areas.

This research also suggests a potential new indicator of integration. Results showed Somali refugees in Fort Morgan have strong feelings of civic attachment, the feeling that they matter in community affairs, combined with a desire to contribute to the community. Somali refugees in Fort Morgan felt like their opinions were valued in the community and like they could make positive contributions to Fort Morgan. Refugees also said they would miss the community if they had to leave. One refugee said, "If I could live anywhere, I would live here in Colorado." There should be more research on civic attachment as a potential indicator of

integration because civic attachment may help refugees better integrate in smaller communities.

Overall, refugees in this case study spoke of feeling happy in Fort Morgan. Refugees felt happy that they were allowed to practice their religion and their culture in Fort Morgan. Refugees also spoke positively about the small size and rural location of Fort Morgan. Refugees in this study were aware of negative perceptions about Somali refugees and challenges they faced to integration. Fort Morgan community members also spoke about issues refugees faced to integration, including false rumors, fear and discrimination. Some non-refugees noted small, rural communities face different challenges to integration than typical urban resettlement locations. These differences focused less on service capacity, and more on rural community members' limited experience with diversity.

Respondents felt Fort Morgan as a community, as well as the Somali refugees, were making progress towards integration. Participants felt the community was adjusting as well as the Somali newcomers. A small, rural town, Fort Morgan, Colorado seems to have overcome the barriers of secondary migration and provided a better resettlement experience for those refugees who choose to move to the community.

The meatpacking industry and the Fort Morgan Cargill plant

This research suggests Somali refugees who migrated from their initial urban resettlement locations to rural Fort Morgan, Colorado are successfully integrating into their new community. Yet, while refugees in the case study reported feeling happy with their employment situations in Fort Morgan, primarily at Cargill Meat Solutions, this research does not in any way endorse the deeply concerning working conditions persistently found in meatpacking factories. Such conditions range from unreasonably high line speeds to supervisory abuse to high injury rates to a general lack of workplace rights (Human Rights Watch, 2005; Nebraska Appleseed, 2009,). Meatpacking is one of the most dangerous jobs in America, even with underreported injury rates (GAO, 2005). One Fort Morgan citizen in this case study said, "I would hope that no one ever has to work in a meatpacking plant." The research finding suggesting that refugees are integrating into Fort Morgan does not mean refugees should be recruited for dangerous employment opportunities.

However, the particular meatpacking plant researched in this case study, Cargill Meat Solutions in Fort Morgan, Colorado, may actually be an exception to the norm in that the plant has promoted community integration. A public administrator who participated in the case study said, "Of all the meat packing factories I've worked with, the Cargill Plant in Fort Morgan has really been the most receptive to working with me to improve the conditions for refugee and immigrant workers, allowing me to take a tour of the plant, participating in panel discussions with community members. So I do think that particular Cargill Plant is kind of a model of some really good institutional kind of integration work." The Fort Morgan Cargill Plant thus should not be compared across the board with other meatpacking plants.

This is not to say the Fort Morgan Cargill Plant has not received any criticism. A Denver Post article reported "an undercurrent of problems" in accommodating the needs of its Muslim workforce (Gorski, 2011, p. 1). Yet, this same article also reported the Fort Morgan Cargill has "accommodated the workers on several fronts" and has "avoided the rancor" of discrimination charges that has plagued other meatpacking plants (p. 1). This research thus reinforces the Nebraska Appleseeds' (2009) statement that there are "important differences

among the [meatpacking] plants, indicating that policies and practices instituted by individual companies can make a difference (p. 3). Thus, the research findings from this case study showing refugees in Fort Morgan are progressing towards integration do not imply an endorsement of the meatpacking industry, but do show that the town of Fort Morgan, including Cargill Meat Solutions, the major employer of the Somali refugee participants, have made efforts to integrate refugees into the community.

Limitations

This study had several limitations: phase one survey sample size; researcher access, rapport, and trust issues; and language barriers.

As noted previously, the small sample size utilized during the quantitative case study in phase one means the results of the surveys from phase one were not generalizable. However, the goal of the first phase was to gain initial insights into Somali refugee progress towards integration in urban Seattle, Washington and rural Fort Morgan, Colorado. Thus, while the sample size was a limitation, it did show the researcher the merit of conducting an in-depth, qualitative case study about rural refugee integration in Fort Morgan.

Schmalzbauer (2009) reports gaining access to marginalized communities is particularly difficult in rural areas with less anonymity. Dodson and Schmalzbauer (2005) show marginalized and low income families may be afraid to both complete interviews, and to be honest in their interviews, when dealing with outside researchers. The researcher had limited time to spend completing surveys and interviews, and thus did not have time to develop a strong rapport and build trust with respondents. From personal experiences working with refugees, the researcher was aware that refugees may be hesitant to be seen as critical of America when talking with a stranger.

The researcher utilized several techniques in an attempt to overcome the rapport, trust and language barriers, including pragmatic self-presentation, triangulation, and the use of community informants. Schmalzbauer (2009) shows her commitment to social justice served a "pragmatic purpose" in her work with migrant communities in Montana by increasing her access to these communities (p. 754). The researcher utilized two forms of triangulation. Triangulation allows researchers to cross-check data and themes from multiple sources in order to have a richer understanding of results (Teddie & Tashakkori, 2002). The researcher utilized a mixed-method research design in order to not just identify whether rural refugees are progressing towards integration, but also to gather a richer understanding of rural refugee resettlement. The researcher also triangulated by interviewing non-refugee Fort Morgan citizens and public administrators.

Finally, as noted earlier, the researcher utilized community informants who were all well-respected in their respective communities. During the interviews, the researcher also heard comments which verified that each of the community informants were seen as leaders and point people within their respective communities. For example, when asked, "Do you have anyone you could call for help in an emergency?" several Somali refugees reported they would call the researcher's community informant. In spite of the limitations, this study serves as an important pilot study for rural refugee integration.

Conclusion

Refugees are increasingly are moving to non-urban communities as secondary migrants. Current refugee resettlement policy not only actively tries to prevent secondary migration, it also suggest refugees should not live in locations which will be highly impacted by their presence, i.e., small rural towns. The stated goal of the US refugee resettlement program is integration, with a focus on three key objectives: employment, self-sufficiency, and language acquisition. The ORR states, "Appropriate placement and services from the onset is seen as a preventative measure against the challenges brought by secondary migration." While the ORR tries to prevent secondary migration to rural communities, this research suggests refugees who choose to move to rural locations as secondary migrants may actually have better resettlement experiences than if they had stayed in their initial urban resettlement locations.

This research found Somali refugees in one particular rural community showed progress towards integration, as measured by Ager and Strang's (2004) indicators of integration. This research also uncovered a new possible indicator of integration, civic attachment. Refugee respondents in this research showed high levels of civic attachment, including feeling like their opinions mattered to the community of Fort Morgan, as well as wanting to make Fort Morgan a stronger community. This feeling of civic attachment, combined with Fort Morgan's smaller size, may be one of the reasons why refugees in Fort Morgan are integrating into the community. This is not to say refugees in rural areas do face challenges to integration, such as interpretation needs and receiving community prejudices. However, these challenges do not preclude integration. Instead, this research suggests a) Somali refugees who moved to Fort Morgan, Colorado, as secondary migrants had better resettlement experiences than if they had not moved; and b) integration is occurring in Fort Morgan, at both the level of the refugees and the broader receiving community. Further research exploring other refugee populations in other small towns across the US is needed to gain a more comprehensive understanding of rural refugee integration.

Recommendations

Based on the findings from this project, this research recommends a shift in US resettlement policy. The ORR should take a more pragmatic approach to secondary migration. Secondary migration should not be disincentivized for refugees or voluntary resettlement agencies. Refugees deserve the right to make choices about what is best for them and their families. As one public administrator said, "Refugees are resettled in big cities, but that doesn't mean they want to stay there. That's the issue really for small towns, that particular policy isn't really working." Instead of unsuccessfully trying to prevent secondary migration, the ORR should accept that secondary migration to rural communities may create better opportunities for some refugees. Specifically, ORR's first guiding principle, Appropriate Placement and Services, should no longer be used as a "preventative measure against secondary migration." Instead, the ORR should focus on continuing to provide appropriate placement and services while also realistically taking time to better assess and research how to support secondary migrants and refugees who want to be resettled in rural locations. The ORR should also consider rural resettlement locations instead of assuming smaller, rural towns face too many barriers to integration.

The ORR must also provide support for receiving communities. Receiving communities need more information about the arrival of secondary migrants to their communities. Daley (2007)

argues more work needs to be done to prepare local communities for arrival of refugees. Participants in this research said the community of Fort Morgan received little information about the potential influx of refugees to the community, which made it difficult to be proactive. One public administrator said, "When nobody knows and they show up it just creates havoc." Another public administrator said, "There wasn't a plan in place ahead of time, so trying to get past always being responsive to being somewhat proactive was hard." Another public administrator said, "Most of the time we don't receive much information about secondary migrants." This aligns with recommendations by other researchers to expand efforts for interagency collaboration, information sharing, and communication (Brick et al., 2010, Farrel et al., 2008, Dwyer, 2010, Georgetown Law, 2009).

Receiving communities also need programmatic and financial support for secondary migrants. One public administrator said, "So far the ORR's policy is they don't provide funding for smaller communities or secondary migrants." Another public administrator, said "Secondary migration has got to be allowed, if you don't allow it, it's not America anymore. They've got to be able to go where they want to go. It's just that if we're going to have a refugee program, we need to expand it so that it follows them wherever they go." Secondary migration receiving communities are often burdened by the costs of providing services to refugees without support from the ORR (Brick, et al., 2010). Rural communities like Fort Morgan need support in order to encourage community integration. Somali refugees in Fort Morgan, Colorado show progress towards integration and report positive feelings of integration and civic attachment.

Rural communities may face different challenges to refugee resettlement than urban locations, but rural communities may also provide better resettlement experiences for those refugees who chose to move to those locations as secondary migrants. There is a need for more research to help facilitate successful rural refugee integration, as well as pragmatic policies that reflect demographic reality. As Ott (2011) argues, refugees should be able to move as secondary migrants in order to best meet their own integration needs. This research shows rural towns like Fort Morgan, Colorado, can, and are, integrating refugees into their communities. It is time for the ORR to accept the reality of secondary migration and to actively support refugee agency and receiving communities. Rural refugee resettlement is not the solution for every refugee, but it may create a better resettlement experience for those who want to move as secondary migrants.

Acknowledgments

The researcher would like to express gratitude to the community of Fort Morgan, in particular the many individual refugees, public administrators, and citizens, who spent time sharing their experiences with the researcher. The researcher would also like to thank Montana State University professors, Leah Schmalzbauer and Liz Shanahan for their technical assistance, personal mentorship, and willingness to push the researcher beyond initial assumptions. The researcher would like to thank Brian McGuire, Kim Marks, and Bruce Marks for their unwavering support.

The researcher would also like to thank the UNHCR Policy Development and Evaluation Service for their support in the form of a small grant, which made this project possible, as well as Helen Morris, UNHCR Senior Policy Development and Evaluation Officer for her advocacy of labor rights.

References

- Ager, A. & Eyber, C. (2002). *Indicators of integration: A review of potential indicators. Report to the Home Office Immigration Research and Statistics Service*. London: Home Office.
- Ager, A., Strang, A., O'May, F., & Garner, P. (2002) Indicators of Integration: A Conceptual Analysis of Refugee Integration. Report to the Home Office on behalf of Michael Bell Associates.
- Ager, A. & Strang, A. (2004). *Indicators of integration: Final report*. Home Office Development and Practice Report 28. London: Home Office.
- Ager, A. & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 21 (2), 166-187.
- Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2006). *Family economic success: Building strong financial futures for families and communities*. Washington, DC: Annie E. Casey Foundation. Retrieved from www.aecf.org/initiatives/fes/fes/.
- Atfield, G., Brahmhatt, K., & O'Toole, T. (2007). *Refugees' experiences of integration*. University of Birmingham: Refugee Council UK.
- Asgary, R., & Segar, N. (2011). Barriers to health care access among refugee asylum seekers. *Journal of Healthcare for Poor and Underserved* 22 (2), p. 506-522.
- Bakewell, O. (2007). Keeping them in their place: The ambivalent relationship between development and migration in Africa. *International Migration Institute Working Papers*. Oxford: University of Oxford, 8.
- Baird, M. (2009). Resettlement transition experiences among Sudanese refugee women. (Doctoral dissertation). University of Arizona. Retrieved January 24, 2012, from Dissertations & Theses: Full Text. (Publication No.AAT 3352364).
- Barclay., A., Bowes, A., Ferguson, I., Sim., D., & Valenti, M. (2003). *Asylum seekers in Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Scottish Executive.
- Barker, D. (2013). Agencies in Morgan County to consider more refugee issues. *Fort Morgan Times*. Fort Morgan, Colorado. Retrieved from http://www.fortmorgantimes.com/ci_23551708/agencies-morgan-county-consider-more-refugee-issues.
- Barnett, D. (2011). *Refugee resettlement: A system badly in need of review*. Center for Immigration Studies. Retrieved from <http://cis.org/refugee-system-needs-review>.
- Beer, A. & Foley, P. (2003). *Housing need and provision for recently arrived refugees in Australia, Australia Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI)*. Australia: Southern Research Centre.

- Berry, J. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, 46 (1), 5-68.
- Brehm, J., Eisenhauer, B., & Krannich, R. (2004). Dimensions of community attachment and their relationship to well-being in the amenity-rich rural west. *Rural Sociology* (69) 3, 405-429.
- Browning, H., & Rodriguez, N. (1985). The migration of Mexican indocumentadas as a settlement process: Implications for work. In G. J. Borjas & M. Tienda, eds., *Hispanics in the US Economy*, 277-292.
- BRYCS, (2013). Refugee Populations. Retrieved from http://www.brycs.org/aboutRefugees/refugee_populations.cfm.
- Bill Summary and Status 96th Congress. (1978-1980) S.643. CRS Summary, Retrieved from <http://thomas.loc.gov/cgi-bin/bdquery/z?d096:S643:>.
- Boots, S. (2010). *Improving access to public benefits: Helping eligible individuals and families get the income supports they need*. Ford Foundation, Open Society Institute and Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- Brehm, J., Eisenhauer, B., and Krannich, R. (2004). Dimensions of community attachment and their relationship to well-being in the amenity-rich rural West. *Rural Sociology* 69 (3), p. 405–429.
- Brick, K., Cushing-Savvi, A., Elshafie, S., Krill, A., Scanlon, M., & Stone, M. (2010). An examination of challenges and proposed solutions. Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://www.sipa.columbia.edu/academics/workshops/documents/IRCFINALREPORT.pdf>.
- Brown, T., Potoski, M., & Van Slyke, D. (2006). Managing public service contracts: Aligning values, institutions and markets. *Public Administration Review*, 66 (3), 323-331.
- Brubaker, R. (2001). The return of assimilation? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 24 (4), 531-548.
- Bryden, M. & Steiner, M. (1998). *Somalia: Between Peace and War: Somali Women on the Eve of the 21st Century*. New York: UNIFEM.
- Canadian Council for Refugees. (1998). *Best settlement practices: Settlement services for refugees and immigrants in Canada*. Retrieved from <http://www.web.ca/~ccr/bpfina1.htm>.
- Canadian Council for Refugees. (2004). *Supporting next steps in integration initiatives: An inventory of opportunities and needs in the integration of resettled refugees*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/docid/4652dc972.html>.
- Capps, R. (2001). Hardship among children of immigrants: Findings from the 1999 national survey of America's families. *The Urban Institute B* (29).

- Caracelli, V. (1993), Data analysis strategies for mixed-method evaluation designs. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis 15*, 195-207.
- Carey-Wood, J., Duke, K., Karn, V., & Marshall, T. (1995). The settlement of refugees in Britain. London: Home Office Research Study No. 141.
- Casey, S. & McDonald-Wilmsen, B. (2010). *Refugee resettlement in regional & rural Victoria: Impacts and policy issues*. Victoria, British Columbia. Foundation House. Retrieved from http://health.vic.gov.au/ruralhealth/downloads/suecasey_drbrookemw.pdf.
- Castles, S., Korac, M., Vasta, E., & Vertovec, S. *Integration: Mapping the field*. London: Home Office. Retrieved from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rdspdfs2/rdsolr2803.doc>.
- Chambers, R. (1986). Hidden losers? The impact of rural refugees and refugee programs on poorer hosts. *The International Migration Review*, 20 (2), 245-63.
- Chester, B. and Holtan, N. (1992). Working with refugee survivors of torture. *West J Medicine 157*, 301-304.
- City of Fort Morgan. (2013). *In Brief*. Retrieved from <http://www.cityoffortmorgan.com/index.aspx?nid=673>.
- Convention and Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, (1951). United Nations Higher Commission on Refugees. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/3b66c2aa10.html>.
- Corbin, J. & Strauss, A. (1998). *Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Council on Foreign Relations, (2009). Task Force 83. Retrieved from http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=2&cad=rja&ved=0CC0QFjAB&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.cfr.org%2Fcontent%2Fpublications%2Fattachments%2FImmigration_TFR63.pdf&ei=WliNUOftN-WriALVjYDgAQ&usg=AFQjCNEmPPQ7amtl32rjEtNTdFRK8jm_Qg&sig2=XFABEOI-ANwoJfDe9mo54g54g.
- Crowe, J. (2010). Community attachment and satisfaction: the role of a community's social network structure. *Journal Of Community Psychology*, 38 (5), 622-644.
- Daley, C. (2007). Exploring community connections: community cohesion and refugee integration at a local level. *Community Development Journal*, 44 (2), 158-171.
- Deacon, Z. & Sullivan, S. (2009). Responding to the complex and gendered needs of refugee women. *Affilia*, 24:272.
- Department of State. (2010). Refugee admissions to the US assessment. Washington, DC: White House. Retrieved from <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/expectmore/detail/10000394.2004.html>.

- Dreby, J. & Schmalzbauer, L. (2013). The relational contexts of migration: Mexican women in new destination sites. *Sociological Forum*, 28 (1), 1-26.
- Dickerson, A., Leary, K., Merritt, B., & Zaidi, D. (2011). *Performance measurement for refugee integration programs*. New York, NY: Church World Service. Retrieved from http://www.churchworldservice.org/site/DocServer/Performance_Measurement_for_Refugee_Integration_Programs.pdf?docID=3924.
- Dodson, L. & Schmalzbauer, L. (2005). Poor mothers and habits of hiding: Participatory methods in family research." *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67 (4), 949-959.
- Duke, K., Sales, R., & Gregory., J. (1999). *Refugee Resettlement in Europe. Refugees, citizenship, and social policy in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dyck, I., & Kearns, R. (1995). Transforming the relations of research: towards culturally safe geographies of health and healing. *Health and Place* 1 (3), 137-147.
- Dwyer, T. (2010). Refugee integration in the United States: Challenges & opportunities. *Church World Service Immigration and Refugee Program*.
- Ellis, B., Kia-Keating, M., Yusuf, S., Lincoln, A., & Nir, A. (2007). Ethical research in refugee communities and the use of community participatory methods. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, (44) 3, 459-481.
- EthnoMed. (2013). Somali community organizations in Seattle. Retrieved from <http://ethnomed.org/culture/somali/somali-community-organizations-in-seattle>.
- Faist, T. (1995). *Boundaries of welfare states: Immigrants and social rights on the national and supranational level*. London: Pinter.
- Farrel, M., Barden, B. & Mueller, M. (2008). *The Evaluation of the Refugee Social Service (RSS) and Targeted Assistance Formula Grant (TAG) Programs: Findings from Three Sites*. Fall Church, VA: The Lewin Group.
- Fazel, M., Wheeler, J., & Danesh, J. (2005). Prevalence of serious mental disorder in 7000 refugees settled in Western countries: A systematic review. *Lancet*, 365, 1309–1314.
- Fennelly, K. (2005). Latinos, Asians, Africans in the Northstar state: New immigrant communities in Minnesota', in E. Gozdzia and S. Martin (eds.), *Beyond the gateway: Immigrants in a changing America*. Boston: Lexington Books.
- Fix, M., Zimmerman, W., & Passel, J. (2001). *Immigration studies: The integration of immigrant families in the United States*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.
- Flanagan, C., & Faison, A. (2001). Youth civic development: Implications of research for social policy and programs. *Social Policy Report* 15, 3-15.
- Gaber, J. (2004). An analysis of refugee resettlement patterns in the Great Plains. *Great Plains Research*, 14 (2), 165.

- GAO (2005). Safety in the meat and poultry industry, while improving, could be further strengthened. *Report to the ranking minority member, committee on health, education, labor, and pensions, US Senate*. Retrieved from <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-05-96>.
- Gavagan, T. and Brodyaga, L. Medical care for immigrants and refugees. *American Family Physician* 57 (5), 1061-1068.
- Georgetown Law. (2009). Refugee crisis in America: Iraqis and their resettlement experience. Fact-Finding, Human Rights Action.
- Gilbert, P., Hein, M., & Losb, J. (2010). Exploring refugee integration: Experiences in four American communities. Office of Refugee Resettlement. Retrieved from <http://www.isedsolutions.org/sites/default/files/ISED%202010%20Integration%20Report.pdf>.
- Green, J. (2009). Refugees unsettle the West. *High Country News*. Retrieved from www.hcn.org/issues/41.18/refugees-unsettle-the-west.
- Gorski, E. (2011). Somali Muslims finding a place in Fort Morgan. *The Denver Post*. Retrieved from http://www.denverpost.com/islam/ci_18692211.
- Goza, F. (2007). The Somali presence in the United States: A socio-economic and demographic profile. In *From Mogadishu to Dixon: The Somali diaspora in a global context*, 255-274.
- Hagan, J. (1998). Social networks, gender and immigrant incorporation: Resources and constraints. *American Sociological Review* 63, 55–67.
- Halpern, Peggy. (2008). Refugee economic self-sufficiency: An exploratory study of approaches used in Office of Refugee Resettlement programs. Washington, DC: DHHS, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation.
- Hansen, D. (2003). Bosnian refugees' adjustments to resettlement in Grand Forks, North Dakota. *Great Plains Research*, 13, 271-290.
- Harte, W., Childs, I. & Hastings, P. (2009). Settlement Patterns of African Refugee Communities in Southeast Queensland. *Australian Geographer*, 40 (1), 51 – 67.
- Hausenstein, E., Petterson, S., Rovnya, V., & Wagner, D. (2006). Rurality, gender, and mental health treatment. *Family and Community Health* 29 (3), 169-185.
- High Country News*. (2009). Refugee arrivals by the numbers. Retrieved from <http://www.hcn.org/issues/41.18/refugees-by-the-numbers>.
- Huisman, K. (2011). Why Maine? Secondary migration decisions of Somali refugees. *Irinkerindo: A Journal of African Migration* (5), 55-94.

- Human Rights Watch (2005). *Blood, Sweat and Fear. Workers' Rights in US Meat and Poultry Plants*. New York: Human Rights Watch. Retrieved from <http://www.hrw.org/reports/2005/01/24/blood-sweat-and-fear>.
- Hume, S. & Hardwick, S. (2005). African, Russian, and Ukrainian refugee resettlement in Portland, Oregon. *Geographical Review*, 95 (2), 189-209.
- Hummon, D. (1992). *Community attachment: Local sentiment and sense of place*. New York: Plenum.
- Humphries, N. (2005). I'm more at peace in this house: The importance of housing and place in the integration of asylum seekers and refugees in Dublin. Dissertation. Urban Institute Ireland.
- Institute for Social and Economic Development (ISED), (2007). Report of the Integration Working Group. Retrieved from <http://www.ised.us/sites/default/files/Report%20of%20the%20IWG.pdf>.
- Ives, N. (2007). More than a "good back": Looking for integration in refugee resettlement. *Refuge*, 24 (2), 54-63.
- Jensen, L., & Yang, T. (2009). Taken by surprise: New immigrants in the rural United States. In B. Jentsch and M. Simard (eds). *International migration and rural areas – global perspectives*. Hampshire, UK: Ashgate Publishing, Ltd.
- Kandel, W., & Cromartie, J. (2004). *New patterns of Hispanic settlement in rural America. Rural Development Research Report Number 99*. Washington, DC: United States Department of Agriculture.
- Karadag, O., & Altintas, K. (2010). Refugees and Health. *TAF Prev Medical Bulletin* 9 (1), p. 55-62.
- Kelly, L. (2003). Bosnian refugees in Britain: Questioning community. *Sociology*, 37 (1): 35-49.
- Kemp, C., & Rasbridge, L. *Refugee and immigrant health*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kennedy, E. M. (1981). Refugee Act of 1980. *The International Migration Review*, 15 (1/2), 141-156.
- Kiang, L., Grzywacz, J., Marin, A., Arcury, T., & Quandt, S. (2010). Mental health in immigrants from nontraditional receiving sites. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 16, 386–394.
- King, R. (2003). *A social philosophy of housing*. Aldershot: Ashgate Press.
- Korac, M. (2003). Integration and how we facilitate It: A comparative study of the settlement experiences of refugees in Italy and the Netherlands. *Sociology*, 37 (1), 51-68.

- Lamba, N., & Krahn, H. (2003). Social capital and refugee resettlement: The social networks of refugees in Canada. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 4 (3), 335-360.
- Leibowitz, A. (1983). The Refugee Act of 1980: Problems and congressional concerns. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 467 (1), 163-171.
- Levy, C. (1999). Asylum seekers, refugees, and the future of citizenship in the European Union. *Refugees, citizenship, and social policy in Europe*. Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Lewis, T. (2013). Somali cultural profile. *Ethnomed*. Retrieved from <http://ethnomed.org/culture/somali/somali-cultural-profile>.
- Lichter, D., & Johnson K. (2006). Emerging rural settlement patterns and the geographic redistribution of America's new immigrants. *Rural Sociology* 71 (1), 109-131.
- Lykes, B. (1989). Dialogue with Guatemalan Indian women: Critical perspectives on constructing collaborative research. In R.K. Unger, eds., *Representations: Social construction of gender*, 167-185. Amityville, NY: Baywood Press.
- Manzo, L. & Perkins, D. (2006). Finding common ground: The importance of place attachment to community participation and planning. *Journal of Planning Literature* 20, 335-350.
- Martin, D. (2004). *The United States refugee admissions program: Reforms for a new era of refugee resettlement*. Washington, DC: US Department of State. Retrieved from www.state.gov/documents/organization/36495.pdf.
- Massey, D., & Capoferro, C. (2008). "The geographic diversification of American immigration," in *New Faces in New Places: The Changing Geography of American Immigration*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 25-50.
- McNabb, D. (2008). *Research methods in public administration and nonprofit management: Quantitative and qualitative approaches*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
- Mendenhall, W., Ott, L., & Schaeffer, R. (1971). *Elementary survey sampling*. Belmont, CA: Duxbury Press.
- Menkhaus, K., & Marchal, R. (1999). Somalia 1999 Human Development. A report prepared for the United Nations Development Programme.
- Montgomery, R. (1996). Components Of Refugee Adaptation. *International Migration Review*, (30) 3, 679-702.
- Morrice, L. (2007). Lifelong learning and the social integration of refugees in the UK: the significance of social capital. *International Journal of Lifelong Education* 26 (2), 155-172.

- Morris, M., Popper, S., Rodwell, T., Brodine, S., & Brouwer, K. (2009). Healthcare barriers of refugees post-resettlement. *Journal of Community Health* 34 (6), 529-538.
- Mott, T. (2010). African Resettlement in the US: The Role and Significance of Voluntary Agencies. *Journal of Cultural Geography* 27 (1), 1 – 31.
- Moussa, H.(1993). *Storm and sanctuary: The Journey of Ethiopian and Eritrean women refugees*. Canada: Artemis Enterprises.
- Moulton, K. (2009). Burmese refugees find jobs, new lives in Logan. *The Salt Lake Tribune*. Retrieved from http://www.sltrib.com/ci_12580199.
- Muller, T. (1998). Immigration and urban areas: the United States experience. Immigrants, integration and cities: Exploring the links. Paris, France: OECD Publications.
- Nannestad, P.; Svendsen, G., Haase, L, Svendsen, G., & Tinggaard. (2008). Bridge Over Troubled Water? Migration and Social Capital. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 34 (4), 607 – 631.
- Nadeau, P. (1995). The Somalis of Lewistown: Effects of rapid migration to a homogenous Maine City. *Southern Maine Review*, 105-146.
- Nebraska Appleseed (2009). *The speed kills you*. Lincoln, Nebraska. Retrieved from http://www.neappleseed.org/wp-content/uploads/downloads/2013/01/the_speed_kills_you_100410.pdf
- Newbigging, K. and Thomas, N. (2010). Good practices in social care with refugee and asylum seekers. *The Social Care Institute for Excellence*. Retrieved from <http://www.scie.org.uk/publications/guides/guide37/files/guide37.pdf>.
- Newland, K; Tanaka, H & Barker, L. (2007). *Bridging divides: The role of ethnic community-based organizations in refugee integration*. Washington, DC: Migration Policy Institute and International Rescue Committee. Retrieved from www.theirc.org/resources/Bridging-Divides.pdf.
- Nezer, M. (2013). Resettlement at risk: Meeting emerging challenges to refugee resettlement in local communities. New York: The Kaplan Fund. Retrieved from http://www.hias.org/uploaded/file/Resettlement_at_Risk.pdf
- Nightingale, D. (2008). A framework for continuous evaluation of Office of Refugee Resettlement formula program supporting employability services. Baltimore: The Lewin Group.
- Oropsesa, R., and Jensen, L. (2010). Dominican immigrants and discrimination in a new destination: The case of Reading, Pennsylvania. *City and Community* 9 (3), 274-298.
- ORR, Office of Refugee Resettlement. (2008). Annual Report ORR Report to Congress: 2008. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/data/arc.htm>.

- ORR, Office of Refugee Resettlement. (2012a). Mission. Retrieved from www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/about/mission.htm.
- ORR, Office of Refugee Resettlement. (2012b). Refugee arrival data. Retrieved from http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/data/refugee_arrival_data.htm.
- ORR, Office of Refugee Resettlement. (2013a). Quick facts. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/quick-fact>.
- ORR, Office of Refugee Resettlement. (2013b). What we do. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/about/what-we-do>.
- Ott, E. (2011). Get up and go: Refugee resettlement and secondary migration in the USA. *New Issues in Refugee Research*. New York: UNHCR. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/4e5f9a079.pdf>.
- Peace, R., Spoonley, P., Butcher, A & O'Neill, D. (2005). *Immigration and social cohesion: Developing an indicator framework for measuring the impact of settlement policies in New Zealand*. Wellington: Ministry of Social Development.
- Peisker, V. and Tilbury, F. (2003). 'Active' and 'passive' resettlement: The influence of support services and refugees' own resettlement style. *International Migration* 41 (5), 61-92.
- Pernice, R., & Brook, J. (1996). Refugees and immigrants mental health: Association of demographic and post-immigration factors. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, (136) 4, 511-519.
- Petsod, D., Wang, T., & McGarvey, C. (2006). Investing in our communities: Strategies for immigrant integration. Sebastopol, CA: Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees. Retrieved from <http://www.gcir.org/publications/toolkit>.
- Phillips, D. (2006). Moving towards integration: The housing of asylum seekers and refugees in Britain. *Housing Studies*, 21 (4).
- Pittaway, E., Muli, C., & Shteir, S. (2009). "I have a voice--hear me!" Findings of an Australian study examining the resettlement and integration experience of refugees and migrants from the horn of Africa in Australia. *Refuge*, 26 (2), 133-146.
- Portes, A. and Borocz, J. (1989). Contemporary immigration: Theoretical perspectives on its determinants and modes of incorporation. *International Migration Review* 87 (23), 606-630.
- Presse, D., & Thompson, J. (2008). The resettlement challenge: Integration of refugees from protracted refugee situations. *Refuge* 25 (1), 94-99.
- Putnam, D., & Noor, M. (1999). *The Somalis: Their history and culture*. Washington, DC: The Center for Applied Linguistics.

- Rajaram, P. (2002). Humanitarianism and representations of the refugee. *Journal of Refugee Studies* 15 (3), 247-264.
- Ray, B. (2004). Building the new American community: Newcomer integration and inclusion experiences in non-traditional gateway cities. Migration Policy Institute. Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://www.migrationpolicy.org/news/BNAC_REPT_SUM.pdf.
- Refugee Act. (1980). Office of Refugee Resettlement. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/policy/refact1.htm>.
- Refugee Council USA. (2012). History of the US refugee resettlement program. Retrieved from www.rcusa.org/index.php?page=history.
- Refugee Crisis in Iraq Act, Public Law 100-181.
- Sandler, R., & Jones, T. (1987). *Medical care of refugees*. New York: Oxford Press.
- Schwei, T., & Fennely, K. (2007). Diversity coalitions in rural Minnesota communities. *CURA Reporter*, Winter.
- Schiller, N., Boggis, J., Messenger, M. & Douglas, M. (2009). *Refugee resettlement in New Hampshire: Pathways and barriers to building community*. Durham: University of New Hampshire.
- Schmalzbauer, L. (2009). Gender on a new frontier: Mexican migration in the rural mountain west. *Gender & Society*, 23, 747-767.
- Schmalzbauer, L. (Forthcoming). Motherhood and transformation in the field: Reflections on postionality, meaning and trust.
- Sheikh-Mohammed, M., MacIntyre, C., Wood, N., Leask, J., & Isaacs, D. (2006) Barriers to access to health care for newly resettled sub-Saharan refugees in Australia. *The Medical Journal of Australia* 185, 594–597.
- Shandy, D., & Fennely, K. (2006). A comparison of the integration experiences of two African immigrant populations in a rural community. *Social Thoughts* 25 (1).
- Simich, L. (2003). Negotiating boundaries of refugee resettlement: A study of settlement patterns and social support. *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology* 40 (5), 575 – 591.
- Simon, J. (1995). *Immigration: The demographic and economic facts*. The Cato Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.cato.org/pubs/policy_report/pr-imopi.html.
- Singer, A. & Wilson, J. (2006). *From 'there' to 'here': Refugee resettlement in metropolitan America, living cities series*. Washington: The Brookings Institute.
- Singer, A. & Wilson, J. (2007). *Refugee resettlement in metropolitan America*. (2007). *The Brookings Institute*. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?id=585>.

- Singer, A., Hardwick, S., & Brettell, C. (2008). Twenty-first century gateways: Immigrants in suburban America. *Migration Information Source*. Retrieved from <http://www.migrationinformation.org/Feature/display.cfm?ID=680>.
- Smyth, G., Stewart, E. & Da Lomba, S. (2010). Critical reflections on refugee integration: lessons from international perspectives. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23 (4), 411–414.
- Spencer, S., Johnson, M., Philips, D. Rudiger, A., Somerville, W. Warren, S., & Wintour, P. (2006). *Refugees and other new migrants: A review of the evidence on successful approaches to integration*. Oxford, UK: Centre of Migration, Policy, and Society. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/ewsi/UDRW/images/items/docl_1437_383239555.pdf.
- Spring Institute (2009). *Rural secondary migration pilot project: Impacts, challenges, and Opportunities*. Washington, DC: ORR.
- Strang, A. & Ager, A. (2010). Refugee integration: Emerging trends and remaining agendas. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 23 (4), 589-607.
- Stull, D. (1998). On the cutting edge: Changes in Midwestern meatpacking communities. The Rural and Regional Essay Series. Society for the Study of Local and Regional History.
- Sypek, S., Clugston, G. & Phillips, C. (2008). Critical health infrastructure for refugee resettlement in rural Australia: Case study of four rural towns. *Australian Journal of Rural Health*, 16, 349-354.
- Tashakkori, A. & Teddie, C. (2002). *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, J. (2005). Refugees and regional settlement: win-win? University of New South Wales. Retrieved from <http://www.sprc.unsw.edu.au/ASPC2005/papers/Paper43.pdf>.
- Teddie, C. & Tashakkori, A. (2009). *Foundations of mixed methods research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Theodori, G. (2001). Examining the effects of community satisfaction and attachment on individual well-being. *Rural Sociology*, 66 (4), 618-628.
- Thompson, J. (2009). The newest Westerners. *High Country News*. Retrieved from <http://www.hcn.org/issues/41.18/the-newest-westerners>.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2013). Quick facts: Fort Morgan, Colorado. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/08/0827810.html>.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2013). Quick facts: Seattle, Washington. Retrieved from <http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/53/5363000.html>

- UNHCR. (1999). Background Paper on Somalia for the European Union High Level Working Group on Asylum and Migration.
- UNHCR. (2000). *The State of the world's refugees 2000: Fifty years of humanitarian action*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- UNHCR. (2002). *Refugee resettlement: An international handbook to guide reception and integration*. New York: UNHCR.
- UNHCR. (2011a). Durable solutions: The ultimate goal. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646cf8.html>.
- UNHCR. (2011b). *Finding durable solutions: UNHCR global appeal 2011 Update*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646cf8.html>.
- UNHCR. (2008/2009). Mapping integration: UNHCR's age, gender, and diversity mainstreaming project on refugee integration in Ireland. UNHCR. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/refworld/country,POLICY,,,IRL,,4a55e4712,0.html>.
- United States Office of Refugee Resettlement, Refugee Act of 1980. Retrieved from <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/orr/policy/refact1.htm>.
- Van Selm, J. (2003). "Lessons on resettlement from the US and Canada" in *Listening to the evidence: the future of UK resettlement: Conference proceedings*, Victoria Park Plaza, ed. V Gelsthorpe and L Herlitz, Home Office: London.
- Vinokurov, A., Birman, D., & Trickett, E. (2000). Psychological and acculturation correlates of work status among Soviet Jewish refugees in the United States. *International Migration Review*, 34 (2), 538-559.
- Weine, S. (2011). Developing preventive mental health interventions for refugee families in resettlement. *Family Process* 50 (3), 410-430.
- Wespetal, L. (2011). Using social capital and collaboration to facilitate refugee resettlement. (Unpublished Masters thesis). University of Wyoming. Laramie, Wyoming. Retrieved from <http://www.onemorgancounty.org/pdfs/WespetalPaper-FM.pdf>.
- Willis, M. & Nkwocha, S. (2006). Health and Related Factors for Sudanese Refugees in Nebraska. *Journal of Immigrant and Minority Health*, 8 (1), 19-33.
- Yu, S., Ouellet, E., & Warmington, A. (2007). Refugee integration in Canada: A survey of empirical evidence and existing services. *Refuge* 24 (2), 17-34.

Appendix A

Fort Morgan Refugee Resettlement Survey and Consent

Hello!

My name is Jessica Marks, and I am a graduate student at Montana State University. I am conducting a survey about refugee resettlement. Your participation in this survey is voluntary and you may stop at any time. You must be 18 years of age to participate. Your answers to this survey are confidential. By filling out the survey, you agree to participate in this research.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Jessica at 406.459.8234 or her advisor, Dr. Liz Shanahan at 406.994.5167.

Thank you and have a great day!

1. Please describe the main reason(s) you moved to Fort Morgan.

2. If a refugee you knew was moving to Fort Morgan, what advice would you give your friend? Please write threepieces of advice.

Please Rank the Following:

3. Think back to when you first came to the United States. What was most important for you when you first arrived? Please rank the following in order from 1 to 8, with 1 being most important and 8 being least important.

<input type="text"/>	Education
<input type="text"/>	Becoming a part of my new community
<input type="text"/>	Finding a Job
<input type="text"/>	Learning English
<input type="text"/>	Meeting new friends
<input type="text"/>	Gaining Citizenship
<input type="text"/>	Keeping a Good Job
<input type="text"/>	Feeling safe

Multiple Choice

In the next section, you will be asked to choose one answer from three options. Please choose the answer that best describes how you feel.

4. I am _____ I live in Fort Morgan. (Circle one).

- Happy Neutral Not Happy

5. I am _____ with my job. (Circle one).

- Happy Neutral Not Happy

6. I am _____ with my current housing situation. (Circle one).

- Happy Neutral Not Happy

7. I am _____ with the educational opportunities in Fort Morgan. (Circle one).

- Happy Neutral Not Happy

8. Overall, I am _____ with my life here in Fort Morgan. (Circle one).

- Happy Neutral Not Happy

Multiple Choice

In the next section, you will be asked to choose one answer from three options. Please choose the answer that best describes how you feel.

9. If I see a problem in Fort Morgan, I feel like I can help fix the problem. (Circle one).

- Agree Neutral Disagree

10. People in Fort Morgan understand my culture and background. (Circle one).

- Agree Neutral Disagree

11. People in Fort Morgan listen to my opinions. (Circle one).

- Agree Neutral Disagree

12. I feel it is important for me to become a citizen of the United States. (Circle one).

- Agree Neutral Disagree

13. It is easy for me to make friends in Fort Morgan. (Circle one).

- Agree Neutral Disagree

14. I feel it is important for me to become a citizen of the United States. (Circle one).

Agree

Neutral

Disagree

Community Events

The following questions ask about the number and kind of community events you have attended recently in Fort Morgan. A community event could include a meeting at your child's school, a sports game, a concert, a town meeting, etc.

15. I have attended _____ community events in Fort Morgan. (Circle one).

0 Events

1-3 Events

4 or More Events

16. The events I attended were:

Please Rank the Following:

17. Now that you live in Fort Morgan, what is most important for you today? Please rank the following in order from 1 to 8, with 1 being most important and 8 being least important.

<input type="text"/>	Education
<input type="text"/>	Becoming a part of my new community
<input type="text"/>	Finding a Job
<input type="text"/>	Learning English
<input type="text"/>	Meeting new friends
<input type="text"/>	Keeping a Good Job
<input type="text"/>	Feeling safe
<input type="text"/>	Citizenship

Demographic Questions

Please Fill in the Blanks:

18. How long have you lived in the United States?

19. Where were you first resettled in the United States?

20. When did you move to Fort Morgan?

21. What is your country of origin?

22. Did you speak English before you came to the United States?

23. What is your native language?

24. What year were you born?

25. What is your gender?

- Male
 Female

26. Do you have children at home?

- Yes
 No

27. If yes, what ages are your children?

Appendix B

Interview Questions: Somali Refugees

Family Questions:

1. Tell me about your family.
2. Who lives in your household? Who in your family has the most connection to the community? Who accesses social services? If a child is sick, for example, who brings her/him to the doctor? What does your family do on the weekends?

Integration Questions:

3. What are the places where you feel most connected/accepted in Fort Morgan?
4. Tell me about Somali culture. What are important foods, rituals, events?
5. In what ways do you practice your culture here in Fort Morgan? Do you feel supported in this? For example, if you wear traditional clothing, do you feel like people in Fort Morgan are accepting?
6. How are your cultural practices different than US cultural practices?
7. Do you talk with Americans in Fort Morgan? How often? In what circumstances? What do you talk about? Do you feel like they listen to you? Do you feel like they understand you and your culture?
8. In your opinion, are Somalis in Fort Morgan integrated into the community? Why or why not? (Meaning, do you feel like you are a part of their broader community – within the town of Fort Morgan - not just with other Somalis?) Overall, do you think Fort Morgan is a good place for Somalis to live?

Services Questions:

9. What social services exist for refugees in your community?
10. What services do you use? What do you think of those services? Are there any services you need but do not have?
11. What kind of educational opportunities have you had in Fort Morgan? What kinds would you like to have?
12. What are the healthcare services available for you and your family? What have your experiences been like in obtaining health care?
13. Do you feel physically safe in Fort Morgan? Have you ever felt physically unsafe, and if yes, what was the situation? What would make you feel safer?

Network and Community Questions

14. Who do you spend your free time with? If you need help with something (like childcare or education or healthcare), who do you call? What languages do you speak most often?

15. What does your community network and support look like in Fort Morgan? How is this different than when you were in Somalia? Do you have someone you could call in the case of an emergency?

16. Are you involved in any community organizations such as your children's school or the library? What do you do with these organizations?

17. How do you learn about what is happening (current events) in Fort Morgan? Do you ever attend these events? Why or why not?

Civic Attachment Questions

18. What is it about Fort Morgan that you like? Dislike?

19. If you had to leave this community, what would you miss? What would you be glad to leave behind?

20. Have you ever worked with a group on solving a problem in your community? If so, describe the issue and what you did...If you had the chance to do so, would you want to participate?

Feelings Questions

21. To you, what does it mean to be happy?

22. In order for you to be have joy and feel happy living in Fort Morgan, what do you need?

23. In the fall, I completed some surveys with refugees in Fort Morgan. Most of the refugees said they feel happy here. Do you think that is true? Why or why not?

24. What are your goals and aspirations for the future? What would you like for you and your family?

Demographic Questions:

Date of Birth:

Gender:

Languages:

Married/partnered:

Years of Formal

Education:

Do you have official refugee status or were you an immigrant?

Children at home? If yes, ages.

How many people living in household:

How many years in US?

Where were you first resettled?

How many years have you lived in Fort

Morgan?

Appendix C

Interview Questions: Public Administrators

1. Tell me about your background and work with refugees in Fort Morgan.
2. Can you describe the services available to refugees in Fort Morgan?
3. What has the reception been to the Somali refugees in Fort Morgan. How has it changed over time?
4. Today, do you think refugees are valued community members? Why or why not?
5. How has the town changed since the arrival of refugees?
6. What do you think are some specific challenges refugees face being in a small community? What challenges do the town face because of the size?
7. Do you think refugees are integrated in Fort Morgan?

Most of the refugees I talked with said they don't really know any Americans, but that they are friendly. Has that been your experience?

8. What do refugees need in order to be integrated or to have successful resettlement experiences?

The few community members I spoke with said they think the refugees sort of are co-habitating, not necessarily integrating into the community. What are your thoughts on that?

9. Do you think the Somalis you work with are happy? Why or why not? (Pause) Nearly every Somali I spoke with told me they were happy here. What do you think about that?

10. Have you seen any gender differences for refugee integration? Can you tell me about what you see as the different needs for male and female refugees in Fort Morgan?

11. Do you feel like Fort Morgan is a safe place for refugees?

12. I have read there were some challenges between Latino and Somali families? How has this dynamic evolved?

13. If Somali's in Fort Morgan have an opinion or want something changed, how does the town respond?

14. Do you think people in Fort Morgan understand Somali culture? Why or Why not?

15. Do you have any recommendations for other small towns in the West who may have refugees move to their communities in the next ten years?

16. Most refugees came to Fort Morgan because of work. Do you think Fort Morgan is now their home?

Appendix D
Fort Morgan Citizen Interview Questions

1. How long have you lived in Fort Morgan?
2. Thinking about the refugee influx since 2007, what are the major changes you have seen in the community?
3. Based on you reporting, what do you think have been the major challenges for the community as result of the new Somali population?
4. How do you view your role in this process?
5. What do you think are some specific challenges refugees face being in a small community? What challenges do the town face because of the size?
6. Do you think refugees are integrated in Fort Morgan? Why or why not?
7. What do you think (events, activities, interactions, etc) has made the most difference in helping Somalis integrate in the community?
8. Have you seen any gender differences in issues refugees face?
9. How involved are Somalis in making decisions in the community?
10. Do you have any recommendations for other small towns in the West who may have refugees move to their communities in the next ten years?