

Evaluating the Efficiency of Community-Based Assistance for
Successful Refugee Resettlement and Integration

Sarah Lords

Arizona State University

Prepared for the stakeholders of refugee resettlement in Arizona
Spring 2019

PAF 509: Public Affairs Capstone

*Dr. Malcolm Goggin, Professor of Practice School of Public Affairs
Arizona State University*

Abstract:

The global refugee crisis is unprecedented: there are more displaced people in the world now than ever before. This trend is predicted to continue, if not intensify, necessitating that the international community respond. While the U.S. has traditionally maintained an integral role in addressing this issue—facilitating the world’s largest vetted refugee program—it has recently decreased the allotment of resources for this initiative, creating substantial disparities in essential resettlement services. In these gaps, the role of community-based organizations gains new salience, taking on the role of addressing gaps and refugee needs.

This qualitative, exploratory study surveys the strengths and limitations of faith-based community organizations (FBCOs) and ethnic-based community organizations (EBCOs) as they assist with refugee resettlement and integration in Arizona. Data is comprised on [22] semi-structured interviews with stakeholders who participate in this work: the State’s Refugee Resettlement Program (RRP), the four volunteer refugee resettlement agencies (VOLAGs), and a group of FBCOs and EBCOs. Emergent study findings illustrate differences between the two CBOs, stratified by timeline of services provided, resources available, knowledge, networks, motivations, scope and the like. Policy recommends call for the State to facilitate more efforts towards stakeholder collaboration.

Keywords: community-based organization, faith-based community organizations, ethnic-based community organization, refugee integration

Acknowledgements

In grateful recognition of those who readily exhibit selflessness in their support: all study participants who facilitate the imperative, intensive work of refugee resettlement, along with faculty who provided integral guidance insight to the creation of this study, Dr. Malcolm Goggin, Ms. LaDawn Lingard, Dr. Jeong Joo Ahn, and Dr. David Androff.

A supplemental note of personal gratitude to the vibrant tapestry of people who persisted in their kind care and affirmation of my capabilities, keeping me both grounded and at force: EL, AL, AL, MW, RD, ML EB, CR, KT, EF, TN, KS, AB, SM, NZ, CF, DB, BB, SR, DF, BW, NR, CM, PM, AF, BV, JC, AL, MS, DP, RS, CF, JC, LC, MC, LP, and GH. Further appreciation extended to the compassionate humans who allowed me to sit for hours on end in public spaces as I finalized this project: to the personnel at Lux, Cartel, The Dressing Room, Be Coffee, Welcome Diner, and a handful of other charmed spaces, your vibrant vignettes of encouragement, patience, and kindness carried me into the small hours of the AM and were never lost on me.

Finally, I would like to humbly dedicate this paper to the refugee community—to those who embody the unfathomable capacities of the human spirit. Your resilience compels inspiration; your gratitude provokes humility; your joy provides reminders of what truly matters. Should my small life contribute to your betterment, I have found my meaning.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
Acknowledgements	2
Introduction	4
Problem	
Research Questions	
Purpose	
Background and Literature Review	8
Refugee Policy History: International Scope	
Refugee Policy History: United States	
Resettlement Process in the U.S.	
Reception & Placement (R&P) Program and Private/Public Partnerships	
Private/Public Partnerships in Resettlement	
Literature on Faith-Based Community Organizations & Ethnic-Based Community Organizations	
Macro-level Analysis	
Micro-level Analysis	
Evaluating Community-based Organizations	
Methods	18
Limitations	22
Findings	
Faith-based Community Organizations	23
Program Evaluations: Strengths and Limitations	
Ethnic based Community Organizations	28
Program Evaluations: Strengths and Limitations	
Structural evaluations:	32
Faith-based Community Organizations	
Ethnic-based Community Organizations	
Recommendations	34
Conclusion	37
References	
Appendix	38
A. Key Informants	41
B. Interview Structure	42

Evaluating the Efficiency of Community-Based Assistance for Successful Refugee Resettlement and Integration

The world is aflame. Increased globalization has pushed together clashing ideologies, catalyzing conflict and violence within and across borders (Lubbers, 2002). Record-breaking population growth has intensified the competition for resources, while environmental degradation and climate change, combined with natural hazards, exacerbates the devastation that natural disasters inflict—drought, famine, floods, and calamitous storms have left entire communities devastated in their aftermath with increasing severity (United Nations Development of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division, 2017; Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre, 2017). The stratification of disparity continues to grow, worsening the plight of the world's most vulnerable (Clemens, 2016).

These combined frictions have sparked an unprecedented humanitarian crisis: the largest population of displaced peoples the world has ever seen with a magnitude of human vulnerability has reached critical mass. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) reports that in 2017, the forcibly displaced population increased by 2.9 million, leaving 68.5 million individuals displaced as a result of persecution, conflict, and violence (UNHCR Global Trends 2017). Of this population, 25.4 million are refugees, 3.1 million are asylum-seekers, and 40 million are internally displaced. In the face of unparalleled urgency and vulnerability, it is imperative that the international community respond.

Problem

Historically, the United States has maintained an integral role in providing safety for refugees, reflecting its professed ideological value of being a safe haven for the oppressed. The U.S. has welcomed more than 3.3 million refugees for permanent resettlement since 1975—more

than any other country in the world—offering the opportunity to rebuild in the “land of opportunity” (U.S. Department of State, n.d.). The U.S.’s continued participation in refugee resettlement is rooted in diplomatic and humanitarian motivations, reflected in the initiative being housed within the U.S. Department of State, the federal executive department that conducts international relations and promotes diplomatic missions abroad. Beneath the umbrella of the U.S. Department of State is the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM), the office that oversees the resettlement program specifically. PRM’s mission statement captures the ethos of the American commitment to resettle refugees, saying that it seeks to:

...provide protection, ease suffering, and resolve the plight of persecuted and uprooted people around the world on behalf of the American people by providing life-sustaining assistance, working through multilateral systems to build global partnerships, promoting best practices in humanitarian response, and ensuring that humanitarian principles are thoroughly integrated into U.S. foreign and national security policy (About PRM, n.d.).

This commitment, however, has been waning: federal funding has continued to be depleted over the years, going from 36 months of federal assistance offered to new arrivals in 1980, down to eight months of contributed assistance under the current policy (Brown & Scribner, 2014). Additionally, this issue took on a new dimension in January 2017 when the newly-inaugurated president, Donald Trump, instituted a controversial ban on refugee resettlement. The “Executive Order Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States” initiated the following policy measures: it 1) prohibited the entry of refugees and immigrants from Iraq, Iran, Libya, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, and Yemen for 90 days; 2) suspended the entry of Syrian refugees indefinitely; 3) suspended the United States Refugee Admissions Program (USRAP) for 120

days; and 4) lowered the refugee admissions cap to 50,000 (Trump, 2017). Indeed, despite the U.S.'s longstanding history of resettling refugees (which will be detailed later in this study), public opinion has become increasingly polarized on the issue and governmental support has dwindled, leaving troubling gaps in refugee resettlement and integration services.

Due to these gaps, support from community-based organizations (CBOs) becomes increasingly salient, if not essential. While refugee resettlement agencies are limited in the scope of services they can deliver, community members—by volunteering time and contributing both in-kind and monetary support—have the opportunity to provide aid for needs that accompany integration.

CBOs have been a part of the refugee involved in refugee resettlement from the beginning, with faith-based CBOs facilitating the bulk of refugee integration prior to the formal establishment of government-funded refugee resettlement agencies (Eby et al., 2011). Similarly, ethnic-based CBOs have contributed equivalent impacts, applying their linguistic and cultural expertise to assist with integration (Nawyn, 2016). However, as integration becomes more complex and fewer resources are afforded to resettlement programs, these partnerships may become strained or inefficient, begging the question: are partnerships with faith-based CBOs and ethnic-based CBOs still an effective form of assisting in refugee resettlement? If so, which group has achieved greater efficiency and, similarly, what are the features that contribute to their successes and failures? This study seeks to address such concerns, beginning with an overview of research inquiries and purpose, before proceeded to offer a review of the resettlement's historical background and analysis of available scholarly research regarding CBO engagement.

Research Questions

As previously noted, community-based participation in refugee resettlement continues to be an integral facet of its long-term success. However, what characteristics of CBOs are most helpful in promoting refugee integration? Considering these questions, this study will explore the following research questions:

- How effective are partnerships with faith-based CBOs? What features contribute to their successes? What features hinder them, or contribute to their failures or limitations?
- How effective are partnerships with ethnic-based CBOs? What features contribute to their successes? What features hinder them, or contribute to their failures or limitations?

Purpose

This study will seek to illuminate what combined factors contribute to the effective resettlement and integration of incoming refugees in Arizona, as it is promoted by partnerships between Arizona's refugee resettlement agencies and two types of CBOs: faith-based CBOs and ethnic-based CBOs. Such insights will inform policy makers and administrators on best practices by elucidating what advantages faith-based CBOs and ethnic-based CBOs offer and how these differentiated service attributes contribute to more seamless, efficient integration. These findings will also be helpful for guiding future funding opportunities by highlighting successful methodologies and priorities for provided assistance.

Additionally, gathered insights will provide Arizona resettlement agencies with a detailed review of the strengths and limitations exhibited by each type of CBO, a knowledge that will equip them with the tools necessary to best leverage each network and plot out more forward-thinking engagement strategies. Similarly, study results will be distributed to participating CBOs, providing them with the opportunity to reflect on their own strategic approaches, reframe their

programmatic design (as needed), and, by synthesizing the methodologies of parallel organizations, opens opportunity to solicit the expertise of parallel organizations in the field.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, this study will positively impact future incoming refugees by increasing the efficiency of stakeholders who administer resettlement and integration services, offering the opportunity for a more seamless, ordered experience for new arrivals as they transition into rebuild new lives in the U.S.

Background and Literature Review

This section will provide an intellectual foundation for this study by offering a comprehensive overview of the policy background of refugee resettlement, how it is facilitated today, the role of public/private partnerships, and an overview of academic research that has been developed on the topic.

Little scholarly research engages the questions and themes raised in this study. Thus, this study will be grounded in the history of refugee resettlement in the United States, followed by an overview of available, relevant research, including commentary on the limitations of this scholarship.

Refugee Policy History: International Scope

While the current refugee crisis has achieved unprecedented levels of urgency, the consideration and discussion of refugee resettlement is not new. Beginning decades ago and finding refreshed relevance, refugee resettlement policy has engaged a myriad of global actors and remains a pressing concern for the international community.

The vulnerability and plight of forced migration first caught international attention in the late 1940s, as the violence and conflict of World War II prompted over 60 million people to flee persecution, catalyzing a population shift with repercussions significant enough to illustrate the

need to establish a formalized, policy-oriented solution. Responding to this demand, in 1948, the United Nations drafted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, a document containing 30 articles that articulated and affirmed the inherent value of the human person. While not legally binding on its own, the Declaration served as a foundation for future legislation regarding human dignity, along with the collective responsibility of the international community to bolster these fundamental rights. Included in the Declaration was Article 14, a passage that recognized the dignity and rights of people forced to flee for fear of persecution and seek asylum in other countries, saying: “Everyone has the right to seek and enjoy in other countries of asylum from persecution. This right may not be invoked in the case of prosecutions genuinely arising from non-political crimes or from acts contrary to the purposes or principles of the United Nations” (United Nations General Assembly, 1949).

Not only was this charter ground-breaking in its suggestion of the humanity embedded in immigration, it also set the foundation for the United Nation’s 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees. From the assemble, a key outcome was produced: a legal document that serve as the foundation for refugee policy, as it defined the legal term “refugee,” detailing the associated rights of the population, as well as the legal obligations of the international community to uphold such rights. As established by the 1951 Convention, a refugee is a person who maintains a “well-founded fear of being persecuted for reasons of race, religion, nationality, membership of a particular social group or political opinion, is outside the country of his[/her] nationality and is unable or, owing to such fear, is unwilling to avail himself[herself] of the protection of that country” and “owing to such fear, is unable or is unwilling to return to it” (Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951). The 1951 Convention also instituted the creation of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), an agency tasked

with the objective of assisting the millions of refugees who were dispersed across Europe. Accordingly, the UNHRC developed a framework to facilitate future issues of resettlement, coining the term “durable solutions.” As prescribed by the recommendations of the UNHCR, refugees have three options following forced-flight: 1) voluntary repatriation to their country of origin, 2) local integration in their country of first asylum, or the country that they have fled to immediately, often a nation that provides temporary safety, and 3) resettlement into a third country of asylum (UNHRC Solutions, n.d.). This framework later served as the foundation for the U.S.’s own policy development.

Refugee Policy History: United States

Historically, the U.S. has maintained an integral and active role in providing refuge for the displaced, offering safety to the vulnerable by facilitating the largest third-country resettlement program in the world, one that has welcomed more refugees for resettlement than all other nations combined (Conner, 2017).

The involvement of the United States in refugee resettlement also began in the late 1940s. Joining the international effort to aid those displaced by World War II, the U.S. began resettling European refugees, with Congress instituting the first piece of refugee-oriented legislation, the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, which allowed entry for 650,000 people. In the years that followed, the U.S. continued to institute legislation that admitted displaced peoples as a real-time response to international humanitarian concerns, including refugees fleeing Communist regimes in the Cold War era and Cubans fleeing the oppressive administration of Fidel Castro in the 1960s.

However, in the mid-1970s, the U.S. was presented with a challenge unprecedented in its scope: resettling the hundreds of thousands of southeast Asian refugees who were uprooted by

the Vietnam War. Faced with this unique assignment, Congress quickly realized the need to establish an overarching set of policies and procedures to effectively manage the ongoing operation of resettling refugees. Thus, the commitment of the U.S. to resettle refugees was formalized with the passing of The Refugee Act of 1980, which: adopted the United Nations definition of a “refugee,” standardized the services that would be provided to those admitted and the procedures that would be employed to manage refugee admissions, authorized the provision of federal funding to assist in resettlement, and established the Office of Refugee Resettlement within the Department of Health and Human Services, along with the Bureau for Population, Refugee, and Migration (PRM) within the State Department (History of Refugee Resettlement in America, p. 3).

Resettlement Processes in the United States

Refugee admissions and resettlement in the United States is an extensive process and engages a myriad of governmental agencies before shifting to the oversight of private entities. The process begins with the UNHRC referring refugees for third-country resettlement if this option is considered as the most durable solution for the case at hand. For U.S. admissions, the case—whether an individual or family—is reviewed by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) in partnership with the International Organization for Migration (IOM). If the case advances, the DHS administers an extensive set of background checks and interviews with participants, a process that take at least two years on average (U.S. Department of Homeland Security, 2018).

If the case is accepted for resettlement, it is then passed along to the U.S. State Department, specifically the Bureau for Population, Refugee, and Migration (PRM). These agencies are tasked with ensuring that approved refugees are provided necessary resettlement

services, such appropriate cultural orientation, housing, access to education, employment assistance, and medical examinations under strict direction supplied by the Reception & Placement (R&P) program guidelines. At this point in the resettlement process, the operational responsibility is passed off to non-governmental agencies through a contracting process. These agencies are commissioned to ensure that the aforementioned services are provided, making them the “boots on the ground” mechanisms that advance refugee resettlement and integration. While PRM maintains the responsibility of oversight and evaluation, the provision of services is administered by non-governmental actors: refugee resettlement agencies.

Reception & Placement (R&P) Program and Private/Public Partnerships

The resettlement agencies tasked with the administration of the R&P program are non-profit organizations that manage federal funding to execute the provision of services to new arrivals. In the United States, there are nine non-governmental organizations that are contracted through the State Department to resettle refugees. These volunteer agencies (VOLAGs) include religiously-motivated organizations, as well as secular organizations: Church World Services (religious), Episcopal Migration Ministries (religious), Ethiopian Community Development Council (secular), Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society (religious), the International Rescue Committee (secular), Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services (religious), U.S. Committee for Refugees and Immigrants (secular), United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (religious), World Relief Corporation (religious) (Office of Refugee Resettlement Voluntary Agencies, n.d.). It is important to note that while an organization may be religious in their mission, they are strictly prohibited from any activities that proselytize or promote religious doctrine.

Private/Public Partnerships in Resettlement

At a cursory glance, the long thread of government actors involved in the process of refugee resettlement seems to suggest that the governmental support offered to resettled refugees is extensive. In actuality, however, resources afforded to new arrivals remains limited. Refugees receive approximately \$1,100 of funding to facilitate all living expenses—housing, food, clothing, transportation, and the like—associated with integration and, on average, receive three months of formal assistance under the expectation that they become “economically self-sufficient” three months after of their date of arrival. Incoming arrival cases that may be classified as “high needs” are considered for an extension of services, affording them marginally elongated timelines for integration. Needless to say, in having to operate with limited government-issued resources and on such an abbreviated timeline, VOLAG participation in refugee resettlement often remains insufficient, leaving gaps in the integration process. Within these gaps, the altruistic efforts of faith-based and ethnic-based community groups becomes imperative, as they work eagerly to help close them by providing auxiliary support.

Again, it is important to note that public/private partnerships are not a new phenomenon to refugee resettlement in the U.S. From the earliest iterations of resettlement programs, public/private partnerships have been an integral facet towards refugee integration in the U.S. In fact, prior to the Refugee Act of 1980, almost all refugee resettlement was facilitated by private ethnic and religious organizations. However, despite its longstanding history, limited scholarly research is produced on the scope and methodology of these groups as they contribute to refugee integration in the United States.

Literature on Faith-Based Community Organizations & Ethnic-Based Community Organizations

Reviewing the literature, there are few studies that address the scope of faith-based and ethnic-based community organizational support, let alone best practices for efficient refugee integration. Instead, scholarly research can be bifurcated into two levels of analysis: first, macro-level analysis that address faith-based involvement in humanitarian initiatives (i.e. not refugee resettlement specific) and second, micro-level analysis that hones in on specific agencies, detailing how a single faith-based organization facilitates refugee resettlement in the form of a case study. Additionally, it is important to note that there are virtually no studies that focus on ethnic-based community organizations, as they are often difficult to identify and generalize due to the lack of a centralized network of association and a deeply-embedded localization that limits awareness of their reputation to the geographical areas surrounding resettlement offices.

Furthermore, the research that has been produced on community involvement in refugee resettlement—be it faith-based or ethnic-based—is not specific to the U.S. due to the lack of a centralized structure for managing community members as they participate in refugee resettlement. Instead, studies that are focused on analyzing the effectiveness of community engagement focus primarily on Canada and Europe, as their primary method for facilitate resettlement is via case-specific sponsorship. While robust studies are available on sponsorship methods, they offer limited insight into the research questions this study seeks to address due to the fact that the structures and contexts of this research remain too divergent from the model of resettlement administered within the United States. Both Canada and Europe maintain extensive, accommodating social welfare programs, along with political climates that generate more sympathetic public attitudes towards incoming refugees.

Macro-level Analysis

Bearing all this in mind, there are a few scholarly contributions worth consideration, that frame and ground the issue. First, is the work of author Elizabeth Ferris (2011), whose research offers compelling insight into the work of faith-based groups regarding their involvement in humanitarian interventions. While broad in its themes, Ferris's work does address the role that faith maintains in stimulating motivation for altruistic pursuits across a variety of religious traditions. Her research coalesces the utilitarian outputs of faith-based groups and then compares these outcomes with those generated by their secular counterparts, before moving to offer a brief commentary on the potential to partner for future humanitarian work. The findings of her work suggest that the differences between faith-based actors are often greater than those between secular and faith-based organizations, but concludes with the remark that serious research on faith-based humanitarian organizations is still needed (Ferris, 2011). While it is helpful to assess the ways that faith-based groups participate in humanitarian aid, again, it does not fixate on refugee-specific engagement and thus, offers limited insight into the questions of this study.

Similarly, the research of Clarke and Jennings (2008) offers a comprehensive overview of how faith-based groups participate in humanitarian aid. One helpful facet of their research is that they offer a clear definition of faith-based engagement, noting that it is participation from "any organization that derives inspiration and guidance for its activities from the teachings and principles of the faith or from a particular interpretation or school of thought within that faith" (Clarke & Jennings, 2008, p. 6).

Micro-level Analysis

Although the macro-level analysis is helpful for understanding the broad scope of faith-based engagement, the micro-level perspectives are more helpful as they specifically engage

refugee resettlement. To that end, the work of author Jessica Eby (2011) is extremely helpful in setting a scholarly foundation of how faith-based groups have participated in resettlement. Eby's research begins by providing a detailed summary of the "strong legacy of providing support for refugee assistance" that faith-based organizations have historically maintained (p. 586). While her research focuses on one faith-based community organization, Church World Services, the statistical analysis she produces offers insight into the scope of faith-based involvement. Per her analysis, in 2010, 6 percent of the U.S. refugee caseload was resettled by ethnic agencies, 24 percent by secular agencies, and 70 percent by faith-based agencies (p. 591). The fact that such a significant majority of arrivals are resettled by faith-based and ethnic-based agencies proves that both faith-based and ethnic-based community organizations are pivotal actors in resettlement and thus, suggests that there is a tremendous urgency to further understand their structure, motivations, and methodologies as they participation in refugee resettlement.

Similarly, research conducted by author Stephan Nawyn (2006) is relevant to considerations of this study, as her findings detail the role that inter-religious stakeholders maintain as they facilitating refugee integration. Nawyn's work compares the services provided by secular and faith-based groups to gauge whether one is better than another. The data from her study indicate that, in the consideration of practical services provided, "faith-based and secular NGOs are more similar than different in how they resettle refugees" (Nawyn, 2006, p. 1516). While this may be true between the agencies researched in Nawyn's study, her findings do not include comparisons of ethnic-based participation, further demonstrating the gap that this study seeks to address.

Evaluating Community-based Organizations

Considering interview framing and applied methodology, questions were structured around program theory assessment, processes evaluation, and impact evaluation, as presented by the American University in Washington, DC. Drawing from these considerations, interview questions posed to respondents sought to detail how their facilitated initiative is working, what can be learned, and whether or not the initiative is most effectively achieving its goals.

Similarly, drawing from articles presented via the Community Tool Box, a resource for community-based initiatives provided by the Center for Community Health and Development at the University of Kansas, interview questions took on a tri-fold purpose as they sought to evaluate organizational efficiency: 1) to gain an understanding of what works (thus presenting questions after organization strengths and helpful resources), 2) to improve how things get done (thus presenting questions after organization limitations and barriers), and 3) to determine the effects of the program on individuals who participate and on the community (thus presenting overlapped perspectives from stakeholders, both self-reflective and commentary on their peers).

Summary

In sum, while little scholarly research exists specifically regarding the topics this study seeks to address, we see the following themes emerge that are relevant to this project. First, collaboration between private, community-based organizations has been, and will remain, imperative for the future of refugee resettlement. Second, faith-based actors have consistently contributed to humanitarian initiatives, including refugee resettlement, further demonstrating the need for their involvement within refugee resettlement to be further explored in a more holistic capacity. Third, because there is no scholarly research that details the role of ethnic-based actors as they contribute to refugee resettlement work, there remains a need to for research to fill this

gap. Finally, when evaluating community-based organizations, programmatic theory and process evaluation are helpful methodologies for framing such an analysis. This in mind, the next section will detail the methods of this study, including its limitations, in an effort to candidly frame research findings and outcomes.

Methods

As previously noted, this study seeks to determine what characteristics of faith-based and ethnic-based CBOs are most helpful in contributing to efficient, effective refugee resettlement and integration in Arizona. Because these considerations are relatively unstudied, with little scholarly research available on the issue—and because the topic is newly reconfigured and intensified under the charged political climate of the Trump administration—this study has taken on a qualitative approach with an exploratory nature.

The population of potential participants in this study remains broad due to the wide breadth of stakeholders who participate in refugee resettlement. Additionally, it remains beneficial to coalesce a variety of perspectives in order to construct a comprehensive understanding of the issue. Qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted with study participants across four key stakeholder groups: 1) volunteers/community members from faith-based CBOs, 2) volunteers/community members from ethnic-based CBOs, 3) employees from each of the four refugee resettlement agencies/VOLAGs in Arizona, and 4) employees from the State of Arizona's Refugee Resettlement Program.

Interviews were semi-structured across stakeholder groups due to the unique roles and perspectives each had to offer in detailing their experience with CBOs. Interview questions were framed in a way that explored similar themes, but did not pose exactly the same question to each participant. For example, when asked to evaluate the strengths of a faith-based organization, an

employee at a resettlement agency may present a more overarching review of working with a variety of churches, while a volunteer connected with a faith-based organization may only have commentary on working with one resettlement agency. Because variables of insight are diverse in the scope of stakeholder perspectives, tailoring interview questions for specific participants will gather the insights necessary to construct an overview of the characteristics of CBOs that contribute to effective resettlement.

Interviews were conducted from January 2019 to March 2019—facilitate in-person, over the phone, and/or via email—recorded, and then tagged with stakeholder descriptors. Throughout the interview process, data was assessed by identifying areas where participants express similar or contrasting perspectives and/or experiences. Results were then stratified by stakeholder group and sub-organized by the strengths and limitations detailed by each group. Participant responses and findings are presented anonymously in order to protect the reputation and trust of organizations working within the same sector. The study summary provides a comprehensive overview of participant information and subsequent findings, followed by the study conclusion which offers recommendations for future policy implementation and the development of sector-wide infrastructure to increase effective collaboration between CBOs. The study closes with a call for further research to advance future understanding on the issue.

Limitations: Methodological

This section will review the limitations embedded within the study's design, beginning with the study's methodological limitations, and then continuing on to include researcher limitations.

Sample size. One potential limitation of this study is the sample size and scope of study participants. Potential respondents initially solicited for participation were identified on the basis

of their formal association with the State of Arizona's Refugee Resettlement Program (RRP) facilitated by the Department of Economic Security. The RRP page lists all local resettlement providers—or the four Arizona-based volunteer refugee resettlement agencies (VOLAGs) that are contracted by the Office of Refugee Resettlement—along with affiliated ethnic-based community organizations (EBCOs) that bear a formal association. All agencies listed were contacted for participation. Each of the four VOLAGs participated. A handful of EBCOs consented to participate and upon doing so, were asked to provide referrals for other EBCO candidates for participation. While it is both uncertain and unlikely that all EBCOs were solicited for participation, contact referrals did broach data saturation, as recommendations began to be often repeated. See Appendix A for a full list of study participants, sorted by stakeholder affiliation.

Similarly, participant faith-based organizations were identified via referral, as recommended by the VOLAGs, ethnic-based community organizations, and other faith-based organizations. While this methodology of soliciting participants presents the limitation of snowball sampling methods—including the introduction and intensification of participant biases—random sampling methods for faith-based and ethnic-based organizations was prohibited due to the resource limitations of time, cost, and the broad scope of sample size. Methods taken to mitigate this limitation include intentionally seeking out diverse community organizations, stratifying solicitations across different religious and ethnic affiliations and organization size.

Generalizability. A second limitation of this study is the generalizability of its findings. Since respondents were only able to offer insights framed and confounded by their own context, findings may not reflect the ubiquitous experience of parallel institutions or populations. However, given the lack of preexisting literature and the exploratory nature of this study,

findings remain salient as they catalyze initial guidance on potential themes regarding the research inquiry, presenting the foundation of a conceptional framework to be further examined and explored with recommended future studies. Additionally, while findings of this study may not be unanimously representative of refugee resettlement stakeholders in a broad sense, they are valued by participant stakeholders—Arizona’s government, public programs, resettlement agencies, EBCOs, FBCOs, and future refugees to be resettled—which serves as supplemental justification for the significance of study findings.

Data collection. A third limitation of this study is the nature of its data collection, as the method of collection was conducted via semi-structured interviews, thus making all composed data self-reported. Insights gathered via semi-structured interviews run the risk of being highly subjective, threatening the relativity of findings, and warrant an extensive verification process to extract comparative information. Additionally, all data gathered in this study was self-reported, which runs the risk of participant attribution and exaggeration. While participant responses may capture embedded biases, this limitation was mitigated by presenting an overlapped, wide scope of stakeholder perspectives, minimizing the opportunity for isolated, unsubstantiated claims.

Limitations: Researcher

Access. In addition to methodological limitations, a supplemental dimension of limitations remains embedded within the capacity of the researcher. Researcher limitations for this study being with the level of access available to the researcher, as this study remained wholly dependent on respondent participation. A second limitation of this study concerns its longitudinal effects. Not only is the topic of inquiry a relatively new phenomenon that lacks robust, preexisting research, it is also contextualized by an unprecedentedly polarized political climate, one that serves to intensify both support and opposition for refugee resettlement. Framed

by these considerations, the stability and reliability of its findings may be constrained to a current context. This in mind, however, it remains important to note that these aforementioned themes are expected to continue, if not intensify, offering the opportunity for the study to maintain salience.

Strengths. Limitations disclosed and considered, this study does present unique strengths that make it justifiable and valid as a form of formal inquiry. First, authors Roshan & Deeptee (2009) advocated for qualitative research, especially that of an exploratory nature, as it provides opportunity to study complex human behaviors that are not easily able to be quantified, while Jamshed (2014) notes that conducting interviews as a valuable method of gathering data, as it contributes depth and extensive understanding to a complex reality. Similarly, Crescentit & Mainardi (2009) note that the limitations of qualitative research can be effectively mitigated if the study is 1) well-structured, 2) transparent in detailing the procedures of the research process and, 3) able to be easily understood by readers. Regarding these considerations, the methodologies employed in this study make it a valid and justified research inquiry.

Findings

This section will detail emergent themes that arose from participant interviews, primarily organized by type of community-based organization, beginning with faith-based community organizations and then moving to ethnic-based community organizations. Themes will be framed by the evaluative measure employed—first, programmatic evaluations that detail the community-based organization's strengths and limitations; and second, structural evaluations that detail the resources that contributed to the community-based organization's success, barriers that were encountered, and how each organization works with other refugee resettlement stakeholders.

Within the two types of community organization, findings are then sub-stratified between participant stakeholders and their contributed perspectives, as each offers overlapped insight on the role and outputs of their counterparts within the field. Stakeholders are listed in the following order: 1) Government—namely, the State of Arizona’s Refugee Resettlement Program—that operates on high levels of coordination, as they are tasked with overseeing all public and private actors within resettlement, 2) voluntary refugee resettlement agencies (VOLAGs)—public/private organizations who work under government contracts, both federal and state, 3) private, faith-based community organizations (FBCOs), and 4) private, ethnic-based community organizations (EBCOs). See Table 1 (right) for findings outline.

Faith-based community organizations

Programmatic Evaluations

Strengths and limitations, as identified by

- 1) State Refugee Resettlement Program
- 2) Resettlement agencies (VOLAGs)
- 3) Ethnic-based community organizations (EBCOs)
- 4) Self (FBCOs)

Structural Evaluations: (Self/FBCO identified)

Resources for success, barriers, interfacing with other resettlement stakeholders

Ethnic-based community organizations

Programmatic Evaluations

Strengths: As identified by

- 1) State Refugee Resettlement Program
- 2) Refugee resettlement agencies (VOLAGs)
- 3) Faith-based community organizations (FBCOs)
- 4) Self (EBCOs)

Structural Evaluations (Self/EBCO identified)

Resources for success, barriers, interfacing with other resettlement stakeholders

Faith-based community organizations (FBCOs)

Program Evaluations: Strengths and limitations:

As identified by the State: From the perspective of the State, faith-based community organizations contribute the strengths of resource availability, institutional embeddedness, and preexisting networks in their participation of facilitating efficient refugee integration. Able to leverage their communities, FBCOs readily contribute both financial and human capital towards meeting the needs of refugees and demonstrate a deep desire to be involved. While the services

they provide are undoubtedly an asset of their participation, one unique characteristic they maintain is in the ethos they contribute to resettlement—namely, the sentiment of “welcome” and hospitality they engender. The refugees they engage are able to see examples of Americans who are deeply vested in their integration, contributing to the understanding that individuals in their newfound communities are, indeed, devoted to their success. Additionally, FBCOs are able to serve as advocates for resettlement, capitalizing on their knowledge of American political systems to campaign for refugee populations, as well as facilitate trainings and orientations for others within their community.

However, if overemphasized, the enthusiasm and internal networks of FBCO can contribute to their limitations. As noted by State participants, FBCOs may become apathetic to collaboration between other stakeholders once they’ve become engaged with a refugee population. This risk of being siloed is further intensified as different FBCOs may maintain different missions in their engagement, leading to the creation of different niches of support. For example, one FBCO may be skilled at providing English-language resources, while another may prefer to provide emotional support to incoming mothers. While both are virtuous, there is a discrepancy in the provision of services which may contribute to disproportionate or skewed outcomes for integration.

As identified by refugee resettlement agencies: Building off of the perspectives of the State, participants from the four refugee resettlement agencies contributed similar insights, but with a more “boots on the ground” perspective, as they each work with both EBCOs and FBCOs. From the perspective of refugee resettlement agencies, one key emergent strength promoted by faith-based community organizations is the vast well of knowledge and resources that is available. Rooted in a natural-born American cultural literacy, FBCOs maintain far-reaching

expertise on a wide range of American institutions and are familiar with how to both navigate and leverage these institutions for the benefit of incoming refugees.

Additionally, FBCOs are often embedded within their communities and have cultivated trust with their constituents/congregants. This allows them to draw from a broad and diverse network of volunteers, giving FBCOs the opportunity to match refugee needs with specific individuals or institutions that are able to address them. As one FBCO participant noted, their volunteer team includes an accountant, physical therapist, and immigration lawyer, all of whom work to supply the refugees they assist with unparalleled, immediate expertise. Furthermore, FBCOs are used to developing and maintaining partnerships not only with resource providers, but with resettlement agencies, a characteristic that proves useful for streamline, efficient communication and collaboration. Finally, as was similarly noted by the State, FBCOs are able to mobilize their congregant networks to provide much-needed donations, both in-kind and monetary, as well as human capital in the form of volunteers.

Considering long-term impacts, faith-based organizations are prone to becoming political advocates for refugee issues, as they, once again, maintain familiarity with American systems and develop deepening empathy as they become increasingly involved in the work of resettlement, catalyzing further future engagement. FBCOs maintain a deep ideological commitment to humanitarian causes, a passion that is noted to be grounded in their faith-based motivations.

This in mind, however, faith-based community organizations are not without their faults. From the perspective of refugee resettlement agencies, emergent limitations for faith-based organizations occur largely at the onset of their involvement. FBCOs are slow to mobilize, requiring a lot of support from parallel stakeholders as they attempt to navigate unknowns. Many

lack critical understandings regarding resettlement work and require extensive, in-depth training on complex issues including: the refugee resettlement process; the cultural, linguistic, and religious traditions of incoming refugees, as well as their likeliness of trauma; and how to appropriately work with them, including trainings on appropriate behaviors, how to effectively work with other resettlement stakeholders, and setting boundaries with regard to promoting refugee self-sufficiency. From this lack of familiarity, FBCOs may develop unrealistic visions of what success looks like in the life of a refugee, as well as contribute to a lack of understanding for the limitations of services that government actors are able to provide. Such misconceptions may promote a dangerous autonomy within FBCOs, demonstrated in a resistance to working with resettlement agencies or other stakeholders, including the refusal to adhere to agency requirements, such as background checks or time monitoring. Worse still, frictions with resettlement agencies may compel FBCOs to teach the opposite of what resettlement agencies recommend, as one respondent noted. Results of this unmonitored participation—FBCO engagement without consulting the knowledge of professionals in the sector—can promote compassion fatigue within volunteers, as some may lack healthy boundaries, or even more concerning, may bring harm, intentionally or unintentionally, to the refugees themselves.

As identified by ethnic-based organizations: From the perspective of ethnic-based community organizations, parallel actors in the field of resettlement, FBCOs offer the strength within their altruistic motivations to assist in the work of resettlement and their contribution of short-term volunteer personnel and infrastructural resources, including curriculum, donated space for programming, and access to their preexisting network of individuals who may offer their expertise to address a high-needs refugee case. However, respondents did note that FBCOs are often more interested in providing financial, in-kind, or short-term support, rather than

committing to the long-term case assistance required for successful integration. EBCOs primarily contribute to refugee integration by working with refugees one-on-one and within a long-term capacity, a norm that may present a friction regarding expectations of impact between the two types of community organizations.

As identified by faith-based community organizations themselves: Faith-based community organizations are not ignorant of their own strengths and limitations and, when offered the opportunity for self-reflection, provided several emergent themes regarding their role in facilitating successful refugee integration. FBCOs are aware of their network impacts and seek to leverage them for the benefit of resettlement work. While they may initially require extensive training, FBCOs are quick to reinvest their imparted knowledge, facilitating trainings with other FBCOs and members of the general public. Similarly, FBCOs note that their extensive network allows incoming refugees to be uniquely surrounded by community: a group of individuals who are able to enter all facets of resettlement to meet needs and assist in integration.

Strengths accounted for, FBCOs are also aware of their own limitations, including the faith-based foundations they maintain as they enter resettlement work. Several FBCO participants noted that correcting misguided motivations or assumptions regarding resettlement outcomes—including efforts towards proselytization—remains a notable limitation, although not one unaccounted for in their internal trainings. Additionally, FBCO participants noted that their lack of experience and education in resettlement may be deeply problematic despite their embedded intentionality to be helpful. A blindness to potential paternalism, as well as issues of historical abuses in power by faith-based groups, coupled with a hesitation to include other actors in resettlement work—regardless of faith (or lack thereof) motivations—complicate FBCO engagement.

This in mind, however, the work contributed by faith-based community organizations remains imperative, as it does work to alleviate disparities in government-provided services. Joining FBCOs are parallel community-based organizations are ethnic-based community organizations. The following subsection will detail study findings within this type of organization.

Ethnic-based Community Organizations (EBCOs)

Program Evaluations: Strengths and limitations:

As identified by the State: From the perspective of the State, ethnic-based community organizations contribute the strength of an intrinsic bond with incoming refugees through shared experiential, linguistic, cultural, and often religious ideologies. Being that EBCOs are primarily comprised of former refugees themselves, many have experienced the resettlement process first-hand and thus, are afforded a highly empathetic understanding of the journey. By this, EBCOs are able to offer incoming refugees the opportunity to establish new roots in the U.S. within a familiar community, functioning as critical cultural navigators who assist in acculturation and adjustment through a more “alongside” approach. EBCOs are often able to “speak the language,” both in a literal and figurative sense, granting them the unique strength of being able to explain complex American institutions from a culturally-matched foundation. Understanding both culture and the resettlement process empowers EBCOs to specifically tailor their approach as they engage with new arrivals, allowing them to provide efficient assistance.

However, EBCOs also face limitations in their provision of services. As identified by the State, there are often several EBCOs associated with one country or ethnic population, which then creates confusion regarding which organizations represent and effectively works alongside the corresponding people group. Similarly, it makes the process of identifying who the

community leaders are more complex, as several individuals may claim the title while the verification of such a claim is near impossible. Furthermore, if there are several organizations that maintain a similar mission, it runs the risk of heightening the competition for resources while also discouraging opportunities for collaboration.

As identified by refugee resettlement agencies: From the perspective of refugee resettlement agencies, one critical, emergent strength promoted by ethnic-based community organizations is their deep-rooted familiarity with refugee needs and their long-term commitment to successful integration. EBCOs maintain a realistic vision of what refugee success looks like and are able to develop trusting relationship with newly arrived refugees quickly. Similarly, EBCOs are able to identify gaps in service provision before resettlement agencies are able to and serve as a valuable support for resettlement staff by making pointed case referrals.

Additionally, due to shared culture, EBCOs are able to present critical knowledge with communicative competence. This allows incoming refugees the opportunity to more readily take-hold of the information presented and efficiently make strides towards their own self-sufficiency. EBCOs are also able to extend the reach of services into an ethnic community, a reach that is sometimes limited for “outsiders.” Given the vulnerability of the population and their social distinctiveness, gatekeepers are often required to adequately network within these culturally-analogous, ethnic groups. EBCOs are able to build and maintain a unique confidence with refugee populations, as they are, again, primarily comprised of former refugees themselves.

These strengths in mind, however, EBCOs are not without limitations. From the perspective of refugee resettlement agencies, emergent limitations for ethnic-based organizations are primarily found in the form of infrastructural inadequacy. As EBCOs are more informal associations than resettlement agencies, and even faith-based community organizations, they are

subjected to limited resources and available, although dedicated, staff. Similarly, EBCOs often lack funding to grow their infrastructure, as well as the institutional knowledge on how to leverage complicated American institutions, such as Federal and State programs, or even the services provided by resettlement agencies themselves.

Additionally, rooted in their lack of formal, organizational structure, EBCOs are difficult to communicate with an authenticate. EBCO services are often made known through word-of-mouth between refugee communities, meaning that many are not publically listed making them difficult for community members and parallel stakeholders to find. With limited oversight, ensuring the EBCOs have the refugee's best interest in mind becomes complicated, and occasionally, instances of exploitation occur within these networks. One example, as a participant noted, is EBCO-promoted referrals to unethical tax preparers. Along similar lines, relying too heavily on EBCO-exclusive communication presents the complexity of limited community integration within the U.S., which may contribute to issues like domestic violence or substance abuse being underreported, as they are culturally dismissed.

A supplemental limitation of EBCOs as identified by resettlement agencies is their timetable for self-sufficiency. With government support limited to 30-90 days, EBCOs may be quick to dismiss recommended timelines and their corresponding urgency for achieving self-sufficiency and thus, may offer too wide of a window in providing services.

As identified by faith-based organizations: From the perspective of faith-based community organizations, parallel actors in the field of resettlement, EBCOs offer the strength in their vast, often-lived expertise regarding refugee needs and the experience of being a refugee. Several participants from faith-based community organizations noted that they often look towards EBCOs in the pursuit of knowledge and advice on best-practices for integration, seeking

ways to collaborate and genera mutual knowledge-sharing opportunities. With regard to insights from faith-based community organizations on the limitations that face EBCOs, participants offered no substantive observations. This fact may indeed signal a key issue between collaborative efforts: faith-based community organizations remain disproportionately unaware of the role EBCOs play in facilitating refugee integration.

As identified by ethnic-based community organizations themselves: Similar to their faith-based community organization counterparts, EBCOs are not ignorant of their own strengths and limitations and offered several helpful, emergent themes regarding their role in resettlement. EBCOs cite a key strength in their understanding of refugee issues, along with their ability to readily identify the root cause and provide prompt solutions. In issues of housing, community policing, or educating stakeholders, EBCOs are aware of the strength they maintain in their platform. One respondent, a former refugee and EBCO employee, noted that as a newly arrived refugee, “Everyday you receive something new” and the knowledge that EBCOs possess to ask the question, “what step are you at?” gives them a keen advantage in 1) addressing the issue at hand and 2) building out more robust, future-oriented solutions. Indeed, the holistic knowledge EBCOs carry with regard to the process of integration allows them to take on a more long-term approach to integration. Free from timelines, EBCOs provide in-depth training for newly arrived refugees on topics that range from leadership development to mental health, from conflict resolution to mental health and empowerment. As one respondent noted, EBCOs have “human needs to meet,” whereas resettlement agencies may have “boxes in a file to check off.”

Finally, EBCOs cite their “back home” familiarity as a key strength, as it contributes to refugee comfort and the development of the refugee community. EBCOs note that they are able

to provide detailed explanations of nuanced topics in culturally-appropriate notes, allowing for more seamless understandings of these issues.

EBCOs, however, also remain aware of their limitations and, as the refugee resettlement agencies noted, cite limited resources and infrastructure as the primary source of these limitations. Without the capacities to secure full-time staff, available personnel remains at a deficit, curbing the services they can provide to primarily addressing emergency needs. Shortages of funding, transportation, teaching supplies, childcare, programming space, and accessible curriculum were also noted as contributing factors to EBCO limitations.

Structural evaluations: Resources for success, encountered barriers, and stakeholder interactions

With coalesced responses from resettlement stakeholders on their functional strengths and limitations in mind, this section will now detail the external, structural evaluations both faith-based community organizations and ethnic-based community organizations reported. While each type of community organization maintains unique, nuanced approaches in their methodology of assisting with refugee resettlement, there are overlapped themes that both experience in the resources they cite as contributive to their success, barriers encountered that bound their limitation, and how they, as stakeholders within refugee resettlement, work together. This section will detail these responses, beginning with faith-based community organizations and then moving to ethnic-based community organizations.

Faith-based community organizations: Embedded within their exemplified strength, FBCOs site their vast networks and knowledge of American institutions are sources that contribute to their successful and efficient role in furthering refugee integration.

Regarding structural barriers, FBCOs reported that working with other resettlement stakeholders, especially the resettlement agencies, remains precarious, as these agencies may often present a suspicion of their motivation. As one FBCO respondent noted, they are often “pigeonholded by people who do not know what they do” and thus, are compelled to dedicate time and resources to clarifying “intention versus perception” in order to work with other stakeholders. Supplementally, FBCOs reported that they are often compelled to navigate complex relationships within their own networks as, despite altruistic intentions, other FBCOs may feel their field of impact is being intruded upon. “‘You took my refugee!’ is something I often hear,” one respondent noted, “And it then becomes tricky to fulfill your mission without stepping on anyone else’s toes.” It should be noted that these tensions are present within shared-faith contexts and within inter-faith contexts. Finally, because FBCOs often engage large networks, the coordination of these networks is often overseen by a small group of people and by this, a substantial portion of institutional knowledge remains embedded in one individual or in a narrow collective of individuals. This structural facet presents a barrier, as it makes it difficult to gather diverse perspectives, institutes substantial pressure on a singular staff team, and, in the case of personnel turnover, runs the risk of losing critical information.

Nevertheless, FBCOs all reported a desire to work with other resettlement stakeholders. As one participant disclosed, FBCOs consider themselves as “next step” organizations ready to address refugee needs when resettlement agencies “run out of gas.” By this, FBCOs in this study reported an active desire to work more closely with resettlement agencies, ethnic-based community organizations, and other FBCOs in order to further promote their impact.

Ethnic-based community organizations: Similar to their faith-based counterparts, EBCOs reported that the resources that allow them to be successful are also tied to their

aforementioned strengths: namely, their commitment to long-term, one-on-one integration strategies and their ability to solicit support from their culturally-established ethnic community for support. By facilitating refugee integration of a smaller, more intimate scale, EBCOs reported that their detailed knowledge of refugee cases allows them to most efficiently address issues while building out connections with proximate institutions. This small-scale approach, however, presents a double-edged sword to their impact.

With regard to encountered structural barriers, EBCOs cited the lack of awareness that resettlement agencies and faith-based organizations maintain as a critical limitation. For EBCOs, government and private agencies lack basic knowledge about refugees in Arizona, let alone their needs. Because of this, EBCO caseworkers often extend substantial time and resources in educating people on *why* refugee integration is complicated and the services that they provide instead of having the opportunity to leverage those resources towards addressing refugee needs. As a contributive inverse, because EBCOs facilitate such extensive booth-on-the-ground services, they often lack the capacities to simultaneously solicit support from large-scale institutions, such as capitalizing on grant opportunities or contributing to lobbying efforts, which further limits future opportunities for increased impact.

Nevertheless, like corresponding faith-based community organizations, EBCOs also report a desire for increased collaboration with other resettlement stakeholders. While one respondent did note small improvements in their partnerships with government actors and resettlement agencies, there is still opportunities for improvement. These desires serve as the perfect segue into the following Recommendations section of this study, as it provides suggestions on helpful changes for the interaction between all resettlement actors.

Recommendations:

Results of this study suggest that partnerships with FBCOs and EBCOs remain imperative to the successful, efficient integration refugees in Arizona, with each type of community organization given opportunity to contribute strengths to resettlement, along with being faced with the challenges of how to mitigate their own limitations.

Considering the contributions that each offer, recommendations primarily focus on increasing communication between the two types of community based organizations, as well as other resettlement stakeholders. Guided by the State's Refugee Resettlement Program, emphasis on future collaboration is key. In framing recommendations, it is beneficial to draw upon vetted, preexisting models for evaluating and supporting community initiatives. Thus, proceeding recommendations are framed by the Community Tool Box logic model, which recommends the six following steps:

- 1) Supporting collaborate planning,
- 2) Documenting community action and change,
- 3) Assessing adjustments,
- 4) Evaluating distal outcomes,
- 5) Promoting dissemination,
- 6) Repeat and share findings with stakeholders (Community Tool Box:

Recommendations, n.d.).

Adapting this framing in application, the following recommendations are proposed.

Collaborative planning: As communication between the resettlement stakeholders seems to be a key contributor to limitations of efficiency, initial recommendations include a stakeholder-wide census to gather data on the organizations that participate in refugee resettlement. This census would require stakeholder buy-in, a complicated expression of participation, but as this

study has observed, stakeholders are more willing to collaborate than initially predicted. The State Refugee Resettlement Programs may consider allocating funding towards this objective, offering a small incentive for participation in the form of reciprocal information sharing or opportunity to apply for grant opportunities that promote collaboration. Upon gathering census participant data, a survey should be distributed that seek to detail local concerns and resources, similar to the findings presented in this study.

Documenting action: Resettlement stakeholders should be provided with resources to assess and share their mission is facilitated. Detailing how missions are effectively accomplished will serve to further refine the efficiency of resettlement, proving to benefit all stakeholders involved in achieving their mission.

Assessing adjustments: With information on interventions provided, participate stakeholders should continue to remain in communication, detailing that procedural alterations have contributed to their strengthened efficiency, and which have also contributed to limiting their efficiency.

Evaluating distal outcomes: As is needed, and under supervision, organizations should be encouraged to venture out of traditional resettlement processes in order to continue innovating best-practices for resettlement. It should be noted that this step should be applied with caution and oversight, ensuring that stakeholders and refugees remain ethical and efficient towards their missional outcomes.

Promoting dissemination: Again, constant communication and collaboration between refugee stakeholders remains imperative. Ensuring that resettlement stakeholders have a platform to share knowledge on what is effective in their approach is essential for continued development.

Repeat and share findings: As a final recommendation, it is important to note that such processes are cyclical and constant repetition is essential to strengthen ties and trust between stakeholders, as well as to refine best-practices for efficient integration. Organizational behavior is often a longstanding institution and when thread across a myriad of cultural nuances, becomes a difficult objective to adjust. Nevertheless, as this study illustrated, stakeholders seem willing to participate in these discussions, opening up hope for future collaboration.

Conclusion:

In sum, collaboration between refugee resettlement stakeholders—the State, volunteer resettlement agencies (VOLAGS), faith-based community organizations (FBCOs), and ethnic-based community organizations (EBCOs)—is critical for efficient, holistic refugee integration. While each resettlement stakeholder maintained different strengths and limitations, information sharing between each group can provide keen insights into best practices for development. As coordinator of Arizona’s Refugee Resettlement Program, the State’s Office of Refugee Resettlement should take on a lead role in increasing communication and interdisciplinary training between resettlement participants.

There are challenges to ensuring stakeholder buy-in, including divergent motivations, backgrounds, levels of organization and professionalism, accessibility to resources and more, but in such discrepancies, each actor is able to refine and promote their unique advantage. Being able to bring together stakeholders to learn from one another through increased communication and cooperation means that the population of primary concern—the refugee community—is benefited in the end. This study illuminated that this ambition remains at the core of each stakeholder’s mission, providing an optimistic platform for gather around in future iterations of successful, more efficient refugee resettlement.

References:

- About the Bureau of Population, Refugees, and Migration (PRM). (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/j/prm/about/index.htm>
- Brown, A., & Scribner, T. (2014). Unfulfilled promises, future possibilities: the refugee resettlement system in the United States. *J. on Migration & Hum. Sec.*, 2, 101.
- Center for Community Health and Development, University of Kansas. (n.d.). Evaluating the Initiative. Retrieved from <https://ctb.ku.edu/en/evaluating-initiative>
- Clemens, M. (2016, August 2). Why Today's Migration Crisis Is an Issue of Global Economic Inequality. Retrieved from <https://www.cgdev.org/blog/why-todays-migration-crisis-issue-global-economic-inequality>
- Crescentini, A. & Mainardi, G. (2009). Qualitative research articles: guidelines, suggestions and needs. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 21(5), 431-439.
- Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (189 U.N.T.S. 150, entered into force April 22, 1954). United Nations [Internet]. 1951.
- Eby, J., Iverson, E., Smyers, J., & Kekic, E. (2011). The Faith Community's Role in Refugee Resettlement in the United States. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24(3), 586-605.
- Ferris, E. (2011). Faith and Humanitarianism: It's Complicated. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, 24(3), 606-625.
- Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre. (2017, May). Global Report on Internal Displacement. Retrieved from <http://www.internal-displacement.org/global-report/grid2017/>
- Jamshed, S. (2014). Qualitative research method: Interviewing and observation. *Journal of Basic and Clinical Pharmacy*, 5(4), 87-88.
- Nawyn, S. J. (2006). Faith, ethnicity, and culture in refugee resettlement. *The American*

Behavioral Scientist, 49(11), 1509-1527

Office of Refugee Resettlement. (n.d.). Voluntary Agencies. Retrieved from

<https://www.acf.hhs.gov/orr/resource/voluntary-agencies>

Roshan, B. & Deeptee, P. (2009). Justifications for qualitative research in organizations: a step forward. *The Journal of Online Education*, 1, 1-7.

Trump, D. J. (2017, January 27). Executive order protecting the nation from foreign terrorist entry into the United States. (Executive order No. 13769). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

United Nations Development of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division.

(2017). *Migration and Population Change: Drivers and Impacts* (pp. 1-4, Rep. No. No. 2017/18). Retrieved from:

<http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/publications/populationfacts/docs/MigrationPopFacts20178.pdf>

United Nations. General Assembly. (1949). *Universal declaration of human rights* (Department of State publication; 3381). Washington, D.C.: Department of State, United States of America.

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (2002, July 5). "Refugees in a Globalized World" - Ditchley Foundation Annual Lecture, by Mr. Ruud Lubbers, United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Ditchley Park, United Kingdom, 5 July 2002. Retrieved from <https://www.unhcr.org/admin/hcspeeches/3d2ea6764/refugees-globalized-world-ditchley-foundation-annual-lecture-mr-ruud-lubbers.html>

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. (n.d.). *UNHCR Solutions*. Retried from <https://www.unhcr.org/solutions.html>

- United States, Department of Homeland Security. (2018, January 29). *DHS Announces Additional, Enhanced Security Procedures for Refugees Seeking Resettlement in the United States* [Press release]. Retrieved from <https://www.dhs.gov/news/2018/01/29/dhs-announces-additional-enhanced-security-procedures-refugees-seeking-resettlement>
- U.S. Department of State: Refugee Admissions. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.state.gov/j/prm/ra/index.htm>
- Vetthus, I., Norwegian Refugee Council. (2017, October 20). Disasters will displace 14 million people every year. Retrieved from <https://www.nrc.no/news/2017/october/disasters-will-displace-14-million-people-every-year/>

Appendix A: Study Participants

State Refugee Resettlement Program Coordinators	Refugee Resettlement Agencies (VOLAGs)	Ethnic-Based Community Organizations (EBCOs)	Faith-Based Community Organizations (FBCOs)
2	6	6	5
Total: 19			

Participant Organizations & Affiliations	
Affiliation	Organization & Key Informant Initials
State of Arizona	Refugee Resettlement Program Coordinators (LW & AW)
VOLAG	International Rescue Committee (NW, DK, & AB)
VOLAG	Lutheran Social Services of the Southwest (SE)
VOLAG	Catholic Charities (JM)
VOLAG	Arizona Immigrant & Refugee Services (CG)
EBCO	Asian Pacific Community in Action (LR)
EBCO	Refugees and Immigrants Community for Empowerment (RR)
EBCO	Somali American United Council (NC & IM)
EBCO	Somali Association of Arizona (MK)
FBCO	Central Christian Church (LM & RS)
FBCO	Scottsdale Bible Church (BM)
FBCO	Phoenix Refugee Connections (MC)
FBCO	Tucson Refugee Ministries (BO)

Appendix B: Semi-structured interview questions

MISSION & PURPOSE: Statement of the subject organization goals

Purpose: Help establish context & conditions

- Why was the organization started? What is its mission and target population?
- Walk me through the process of working with the target population from start to finish:
 - How are you connected to the target population?
 - What activities are conducted with the target population?
 - When do the services you provide end?
 - How does your organization interact with resettlement agencies, other FBCOs or EBCOs?

EVALUATION: Process Evaluation & Outcome Evaluation on Resources & Barriers

Purpose: Understand the efficiencies that subject organization offers to refugee resettlement

- (PE) Are the objectives of your mission often reached? If so, how? If not, why not?
- (PE) What resources or skills make you successful in fulfilling your mission?
- (IE) What are the limitations or challenges of services you can provide?
- (IE) What are the barriers that you encounter most often when providing services to the target population?

ORGANIZATIONAL EFFICIENCIES:

Purpose: Understand the individual efficiencies subject organization offers to refugee resettlement

- In what area of resettlement does your organization generate the most success? (i.e. Job training, cultural orientation, education, etc.)
- In what area of resettlement does your organization generate the most success? (i.e. Job training, cultural orientation, education, etc.)
- Is there a unique strength, knowledge, awareness, or skillset that your organization offers to refugee resettlement?
- Is there a unique challenge that your organization faces regarding refugee resettlement?