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Abstract

This study is an investigation on how refugee children living in America define “flourishing” in their futures. This is a qualitative ethnography—with a phenomenological bent—containing a semi-structured interview protocol, where three children enrolled in the International Rescue Committee’s youth program were interviewed with open-ended questions about possible goals and values in their future world. The interview contained two halves: the first asked questions directed at building a future world, and the second portion posed a conflict in that future world that they must address. The world-building questions dealt with themes such as education level, relationship status, family size, number of children, geographical location, profession, religious practice, community involvement, income, hobbies, and more. The second portion included a hypothetical conflict within the future world, in which the interviewee defined and proposed a solution. After the interview, the data was transcribed and coded for overarching themes and implications for further research and resettlement strategies. The four overarching themes found were the centrality of family, helping professions, forgive-and-forget conflict resolution style, and unawareness of racial language in America. These themes can be used to understand the perspectives and experiences of refugee children; then, integration of these themes into refugee youth programming could bridge the gaps between the resettlement organization’s—and the community’s—prescribed needs and the felt realities of refugee children.
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This twelve year-old girl was determined to have a pair of heels. If I shook my head to show disapproval, she would return a minute later with another pair of high heels in a different color. I tried to explain that she was going to be wearing this pair of shoes everyday to school, and that choosing heels would guarantee endless foot cramping for the hard months to come. However, it was difficult for me to explain this because she didn’t speak any English; in fact, she had only been in the United States for a couple of days.

The girl and her family were Congolese refugees, fleeing chaos in the Democratic Republic of Congo. The Abilene International Rescue Committee (IRC)—where I am an intern—was taking this family to the Christian Service Center, an organization that allows families in need to take an allotted number of shirts, shoes, bras, pants, and so on. This family had barely arrived; they still had fear written on their faces. Who was I to refuse this little girl the dignity of high heels; after all, don’t we all sometimes want to feel taller during tough times? Heels would mean pain—especially from my perspective. Certainly this girl would have enough struggles ahead—cultural integration, language acquisition, starting at a new school, and more. The last thing she should worry about were her feet. Still, I could not forget her persistence and pursual of those high heels, and I wondered if I truly understood what was best after all.

Scenarios like this raise the question: How do refugee youth perceive flourishing in America? The concept of flourishing encompasses many aspects of life, not limited to success and gain as most Americans define it. Consequently, if thriving and flourishing are the goals of adult life, how would refugee children living in America imagine such a future? As with the little
girl, there are gaps that exist between the goals of resettlement agencies and the felt realities of refugee children, with assumptions made on both sides concerning culture, prosperity, and essential values. Refugee youth programs are typically focused on successful academic performance and cultural integration, but what if these programs do not provide appropriate help for these children to meet their own goals?

I have worked and formed relationships with many refugee kids and teenagers throughout my time as a volunteer and intern for the Abilene International Rescue Committee. I have listened to their stories, helped them write college essays, and discovered their remarkable resiliency and compassion for their communities. It is these experiences that have also exposed research and program holes in refugee youth development; my undergraduate project is a small attempt to bring these special issues to light. My hope is that these interviews and their subsequent analysis provide new ways to bridge the gaps between refugee youth and multiple conceptions of flourishing in American society, with practical and theoretical suggestions for further research.

**Literature Review**

A plethora of information is available about refugee resettlement strategies in the United States, including data about various psychological, social, financial, cultural, and political issues that face these vulnerable populations. Segal and Mayadas (2005) found that resettlement organizations must assist their clients with a variety of integration tasks, such as “economic self-sufficiency and asset building, equitable functioning in society, civic and political participation, empowerment, discussion and support groups, community organization, educational programs, and individual counseling around tangible issues” (p. 579). Even with refugee adults, the amount
of time and effort invested into meeting their basic needs leaves resettlement organizations financially dry and exhausted—while flourishing feels like a distant dream.

This is why curriculum for refugee youth seems to take a backseat to adult programs, especially since children are believed to be taught primarily by their new American schools on topics such as cultural mores, language arts, English skills, science, and more. Yet refugee youth are also in desperate need of extensive cultural programming designed to help them adapt to the American education system; they are almost immediately enrolled in school and expected to perform adequately for a completely foreign institution, with almost no introduction.

Existing literature suggests a gap in this area; Nakeyar et. al (2018) introduced some of the unique challenges that refugee children face upon resettlement: “Refugee children and youth may experience decreased family support once they have been resettled…. Realistically, children and youth often adapt to the host culture, and learn the host language more rapidly than their parents” (p. 201). Decreased family support means a tougher transition for children, and their ability to learn languages more quickly than adults creates intergenerational divides between refugee families, with no clear way to navigate them.

Children also “begin establishing new friendships at school and in the community. However, their sense of security may be disturbed because of peer-victimization” (p. 202). Even though refugee children may adapt to their new surroundings quicker than adults, that does not mean a shortage of problems—it is merely swapping one set of complications for another. This translates into the school environment as well, where “refugees indicated that they often lost interest or were unmotivated to do their school work when their teachers assumed they did not
understand the material” (p. 202). Clearly, gaps still exist between the flourishing of refugee children and the realities and struggles of integration, especially in an educational context.

Refugee youth programs do exist, and in organizations such as the IRC, those programs are given much thought and planning. Though the research base is lacking, there are people on the ground helping these vulnerable populations. Some key findings by the IRC (2007) showed that there are common components of successful refugee youth programs:

- Physical and psychological safety, appropriate structure, supportive relationships,
- opportunities to belong, positive social norms, support for efficacy and mattering,
- opportunities for skill-building, and integration of family, school and family, and school and community efforts. (p. 13)

Youth programs with these markers of success are thriving across the United States and abroad, and those programs with their leaders should be applauded for their continual efforts to promote healthy youth development. Since this is an emerging field, these working professionals are the first to call for more research in this area. They are beginning to realize that it is time to stop taking shots in the dark.

**Literature and the Refugee Experience**

Truly, some of the most extensive portrayals we have of refugee resettlement are given in books; bestselling authors Viet Thanh Nguyen and Dave Eggers both created novels out of the refugee experience, and many other stories give thorough and emotional accounts of the hardships faced by refugee families both before and after flight from their home countries.

In fact, it is these works of literature that formed the inspiration for my research, based heavily in my love for narrative and my experiences of working with African refugees. The field
of literary theory aims to analyze the ways in which literature is applicable to reality, and seeks to understand the influences from which we write and read stories. Their main idea is that novels—fiction and nonfiction—hold truths that shape our understanding of the world around us. Books inspire their readers to look at life through a different lens and experience another person’s story. This is why books are generally believed to encourage empathy, because of their capacity to awaken readers to multiple world-views. Even if they don’t explicitly encourage empathy, they are certainly the most powerful force against ignorance.

Some of the most influential books in the production of my research have been: Viet Thanh Nguyen’s anthology of refugee writers, *The Displaced*, Jenny Erpenbeck’s novel, *Go, Went, Gone*, and Philip Gourevitch’s collection of nonfiction stories, *We wish to inform you that tomorrow we will be killed with our families: Stories from Rwanda*. Not only do these texts provide striking and emotionally-wrenching accounts of the refugee experience, but they are also very informative of the stories specific to central African refugees—from countries such as Congo, the DRC, Rwanda, Malawi, and Tanzania. These stories have given me narrative backgrounds from which to make sense of my own experiences of working with central African refugees, along with the many nuances of their pasts and goals for the future. Throughout my coding process, I also used these novels and short stories to find connections between the experiences of my research participants and other refugees—whether they are from Vietnam, Syria, or Nazi Germany.

The interviews are also designed to gather story grammars from the participants; fiction and nonfiction texts both contain setting, climax, and conclusion. By having the participants answer questions to build their future world, they are establishing setting. When the participants
walk through a conflict scenario and resolution, they are establishing a climax and conclusion.

The narrative framework for these interviews lends itself to making connections with the literature I have already mentioned as a foundation for my research and interest in refugee issues.

**Post-Development Theory and the Foundations for This Research**

When looking at the refugee story in particular, it is important to recognize ways that Western ideologies may inhibit our understanding of their experiences. This is an issue that post-development theory aims to examine; Sahle (2012) describes the main tenants of post-development theory as language being central to the understanding of social reality, knowledge as being socially constructed and not neutral, and power dynamics underpinning knowledge production and dissemination (p. 71). Within the lens of post-development theory, it becomes imperative that researchers and those working in international development take a critical look at their methods and analysis. A lot of the problems identified by post-development theorists can be prevented if researchers and development workers avoid presenting hegemonic solutions to problems in the “Global South”, instead focusing on “environmental concerns, local cultural practices, deeper forms of democratic participation in the development process, and self reliance” (Sahle, 2012, p. 82).

While I do not intend to make any conclusive judgements about the results of my interviews, post-development theory provides a foundation of intellectual humility toward this work. The framework for my research is not centered on Western ideology but focused rather on the answers and stories of my research participants. Instead of going into the interviews with a rigid set of questions and expectations, I designed my study to allow the participants to ultimately guide the conversation. Some of my questions were built on Western ideas of being an
adult, but the participants were not confined by those ideas—the participants forged their own cross-cultural dreams and goals, without my aid. Though there are limitations to my study—some of which I am probably not aware—this study is certainly built from the ideas and answers of the participants. From this, rudimentary suggestions will be extrapolated, only after my own meticulous research and thoughtful consideration of the facts.

**Research Design and Methodology**

My research takes the form of a qualitative ethnography, with a semi-structured interview protocol. My research is focused on a specific demographic: female, central African, and adolescent refugees living in Abilene, Texas. I chose three female participants in the IRC’s youth program chapter ranging from ages 13 to 18—middle school and high school age. Each participant has lived in America for at least two years, and were enrolled full-time in school.

Rather than look for numbers and data that could be measured, I was more interested in diving deeply into the emotions, stories, and future goals of this population. When planning my interview protocol, I knew the topics I wanted to cover, but I ultimately wanted the research participants to steer the conversation. Over a span of approximately forty minutes, I had a list of topic questions for the participants to shape out on their own. Since the questions were meant to build a future world, I asked questions relating to family, school, career, finances, community, and religion. During the conflict scenario portion, I asked more questions pertaining to common sources of tension in adult life: family, community, work, society, and racism. I left room in the interviews for myself to ask more questions if I wanted to probe more into surprising answers.

My volunteer and intern experience with the IRC formed the initial base of my interest in this research question, and during the summer of 2017 I drafted an expedited review request for
the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Once my study had been approved by the IRB, ACU’s Honors College, and my supervisors at the IRC, I began the process of getting consent and assent from my research participants and their parents. I was able to find a fellow student at ACU who could translate for the children’s parents who were less fluent in English, and so I obtained all the permissions to proceed with the interviews.

The interviews took place either at school or during the IRC’s weekly youth program—with one exception, because due to the participant’s family situation, she could not meet during the requested times. I would reserve a room where the participant and I could speak privately with little chance for interruption. I would introduce the participant into a voice recording under a pseudonym—created by the participant for the sake of confidentiality—and explain the two main portions of the interview. From then, the participants would answer questions and speak freely. Each interview lasted approximately forty minutes, and I later transcribed the interviews and removed any identifying information from the transcripts.

**Coding and Analysis Methods**

With a qualitative research study, any analysis is going to scrutinize the words of the participants. I looked specifically for patterns in their words and common themes between the three participants; I inputed their answers electronically into a table alongside the topic questions, and compared their answers to one another. Then began the process of in-vivo coding, emergent thematic coding, and axial coding. All of these coding passes analyze the exact words used by the participants, the themes detected throughout the interviews, and the connections between those themes. This entailed having intimate familiarity with the transcripts and being
able to recount specific details and overarching observations from the interviews—such as body language, contextual factors, location, and more.

I also incorporated fiction and nonfiction narratives—particularly those by Erpenbeck, Nguyen, and Gourevitch—into my analysis. When I noted a significant theme in my participants’ responses, I searched for connections with the larger scope of refugee literature, with authors and characters from all around the world. Since my sample size was small and incredibly specific, I used literature to demonstrate the relevance of my findings. I can further establish credibility in my participants’ responses by showing their feelings being experienced by other refugees. I did not use literature to homogenize the refugee experience to four themes; I showed the various ways refugees from other parts of the world handle these themes in their own stories, and how these connections contribute to a greater understanding of refugee issues.

I stated earlier that the ultimate direction of this research would be decided by the answers of the participants, and not by my own interests. This is based on a phenomenological impulse, which places heavy importance on the participant’s subjective perspective. When evaluating a phenomenon such as the refugee experience, it is best to heed most the stories of those who have had the experiences. Any solution to issues created by refugee resettlement requires a close look at the perceptions and perceived needs of refugees. Even though teenagers are apt to changing opinions and development, their insights—even if temporary—provide a necessary glimpse into their world. Their answers reflect the struggles of a young refugee in the American education system and the future dreams of those students; their answers thus inform us about both educational systems and refugee issues.
My interview protocol is based off this idea, which allows my research participants to define their own goals and desires for the future. Not only do their answers shape the interviews, but their answers also dictate the data. The participants give their ideas, and then I look for patterns; through this process I become the messenger, presenting their answers through my research to ACU and the IRC. The goal of this approach is to localize the results as much as possible and empower the participants through the appreciation and prioritization of their voice.

Findings

Four main themes connected my participants’ answers: the centrality of family, the goal of entering “helping” professions, a forgive-and-forget conflict resolution style, and unawareness of racial language. Each of the interviews produced an array of different answers, but for the sake of clarity, I will only elaborate on the significant answers they all shared in common.

The Centrality of Family

When asked to explain their decision-making process for future world-building, the participants cited their families as a major factor. It would be difficult to summarize the impact of families on these participants because of how imbedded their answers were in familial ties or culture. When asked who they intended to live with—ten years from now in their future world—they all wanted to live with family members. The older participants planned to live with their husbands and children while the youngest participant intended to live with her older sisters and their families. The two older participants both thought they would be married with multiple children by age 27 or 28—the oldest participant said she thought her elderly mother might be living with either her family or her older brother’s family.
The centrality of family also demonstrates itself in the geographic location of the participants’ future worlds. All the participants planned to continue living in the United States, even when explicitly stated they could live anywhere. Two of the participants wanted to live in Abilene, while the other wanted to live in Arizona. When asked why they wanted to live in Abilene, the youngest participant said she wanted to stay with her community, while the other said Abilene was a child-friendly environment and not too loud. The last participant wanted to live in Arizona because of a church she likes and a community of friends. It should be noted that the participants wanted to remain close to their families who live in the United States—even more specifically, in the South.

**Helping Professions**

While each of the participants had their own career goals—a doctor, missionary, and a social worker—they all stated they wanted to help people as the reason for their chosen profession. The youngest participant, who wants to be a doctor, also wants to use medicine to help people in her home country. She said she would want to go and visit on a medical mission trip—not staying permanently, but eventually returning to the United States. She is motivated by past experiences of being sick all the time and needing care from her older sisters.

The oldest participant, who wants to be a social worker, also proposed getting her cosmetology license and opening an African restaurant in Abilene. She currently braids hair and sees it as a way to preserve her cultural roots and keep friends in her community. She wants to open an African restaurant—with food from all regions—so that Americans can enjoy new food and other Africans can learn new recipes. She says food is a cultural interaction; she stated that though she has never been to China, she can appreciate Chinese food. By opening an African
restaurant, she can preserve African food traditions and create a place for both Americans and Africans to encounter culture.

Another participant wants to be a missionary because she believes it is her calling. She is a devout Christian and bases her convictions on past experiences. When asked what her future faith goals were, she told a story about her interactions with a Muslim friend via social media. She regularly posts Bible verses on her social media accounts, and the Muslim friend reached out to her because of these posts. She talked with him about faith, and the boy eventually told her about wanting to become a Christian. She cited this story as a motivation for sharing faith with others and hopes she can share faith through discipleship in the future.

**Forgive-and-Forget Conflict Resolution Style**

A surprising theme found in the participants’ answers were a forgive-and-forget conflict resolution style. A portion of the interview was dedicated to confronting and solving a possible conflict scenario, where the participants chose a conflict they would be likely to encounter in their future worlds. The participants would then walk through the conflict scenario, describing parties involved, what was entailed in the conflict, and how the conflict could be solved. Two participants chose a work conflict, while the other chose a family conflict. When asked how they would move on from the conflict after its resolution, they all stated they would not like to remember the conflict in the future—forgive and forget. Resolution and peace between the opposing members was paramount, but moving forward from the conflict meant forgetting it.

When seeking forgiveness and peace for both parties, all participants offered an honest and confident way of dealing with the problem. They would all confront the tension head-on and
seek to understand the other’s perspective. They would expose any miscommunication that would have occurred and defend their own stances.

They would like to forget about the conflict so that everyone could keep the peace. For the participants, forgetting about the conflict helps each party not obsess over past wrongs. The youngest participant thought that remembering conflict or continuing to talk about it would only make the conflict worse. Another participant, whose hypothetical conflict was with her children, said she would not like her children to remember they had hurt or disobeyed her because forgiveness means that you let it all go.

**Unawareness of Racial Language**

The most striking finding was the unawareness of racial language in the participants’ answers. The youngest participant did not mention any racial tension in her answers, while the other older participants, when asked what they anticipated the role of racism to be in their future worlds, both asked me to define racism. They specifically asked, “what is that?”. When given a broad definition, they understood the concept and were able to give answers.

Neither of the older participants were concerned about the role of racism in their future worlds. For different reasons, they stated that the issue wasn’t of much importance to their lives. One participant stated that death will be the ultimate equalizer, and that it won’t matter who is Jew or Gentile, rich or poor, because we will all be buried someday. The oldest participant stated that she doesn’t put racism in her mind, she prays God will protect her, and that her community will be an invincible source of happiness and security in her life.
Discussion and Questions for Further Research

What is most striking about the centrality of family is its stark contrast to Western society. This has deeper societal implications than we might initially think. When asked about his family by an African refugee, Jenny Erpenbeck’s (2017) protagonist recounts the divide between cultural values: “He’s operating on the assumption that only a terrible misfortune could lead to a man Richard’s age not having offspring” (164). While family may be a factor in decision-making for Americans, it was the central factor for my participants—and in the case of Erpenbeck’s African refugee, the highest good in life. This clearly demonstrated itself in the geographic location chosen by all participants; they all wanted to live close in proximity to their families and communities. While one planned to live in another state, the distance was not significant. All the participants said they would bring their families on vacation, and they anticipated continuing strong relationships with their siblings. All these findings suggest a high priority on family, even being a main reason for contentedness and flourishing in their future narratives.

This centrality of family is a theme in almost all African cultures where the participants are from. It isn’t far-fetched that a family focus would remain—even intensify—after undergoing a crisis such as flight from their home country. In Philip Gourevitch’s (1998) book of stories about the Rwandan genocide, he recounts the narrative of one particular Tutsi survivor: “Bonaventure Nyibizi told me that he often wondered why he hadn’t left Rwanda in those days. ‘Probably the main reason was my mother… She was getting old and I probably felt it would be difficult to move her without knowing where to go’” (108). Even in situations of life or death—at the risk of your own life—family is still the highest priority. Like my participants, Nyibizi
made a tough decision about geographic location based on his family’s needs. This pattern holds across age, gender, refugee status, and location for this culture.

The desire for refugee children—especially females—to enter helping professions is not surprising. What’s notable is that each participant stated a different career preference; children tend to act as echo-chambers of their communities and do not want to stray from the consensus of their friends and family. This difference could be attributed to the ages of the participants; two of the participants were upperclassmen in high school, perhaps signaling a greater capacity to make individualized decisions about identity and future goals.

The most perplexing themes of this research were the last two because they have the most context in cultural history. The conflict resolution scenario produced a forgive-and-forget theme throughout all three interviews; conflict resolution is engrained in cultural memory. My participants are all from central Africa, where the cultural memory is influenced heavily by the Rwandan genocide. This could be a viable explanation for my participants’ responses because they have heard an intergenerational narrative that is greatly shaped by the genocide and how Rwandans coped with the aftermath. When I talked casually with older African friends about this research, they confirmed this perspective and added that frequently remembering conflict can make the conflict itself more confusing and frustrating. Specifically, remembering the Rwandan genocide may not be a road to reconciliation because of the hurt many people still feel; forgetting could be the only way to cope with the gravity of conflict.

The last theme of racial discrimination is the most thought-provoking. I asked the participants to contemplate what the role of racism might be in their future lives; though the participants did not understand the initial phrasing of “racism” and “racial discrimination”, when
given a brief definition they were able to respond. This led me to believe that the language of race was the key; racial language predominates in the West, while language of ethnicity is more culturally relevant to central Africans (Lentz, 1995, p. 303). The participants understand what racial tension was conceptually, but they would understand it as ethnic tension rather than racial. Though the participants have all lived in the United States for multiple years, this language of race appears to be on a level of cultural context that they have not understood yet—though they most certainly have experienced racism as Westerners would define it.

Another facet to this question is how African refugees experience and perceive of racism differently than other minority groups in America. The participants did not seem concerned about the role of racism in their future lives, and this answer may not reflect a mere dismissal of racism. Groups that have lived for many generations in America—such as African-Americans, Hispanics, and Chinese-Americans—experience an intergenerational narrative of racism in America, while this narrative does not fully exist for newly arrived African refugee families. In terms of culture, concepts and individual experiences of racism are “below the iceberg” of our society. If they do not already arrive knowing America’s language of race, it will take a long time to recognize the layers of context that permeate racial tension in America and how they fit into it. The language of race is not inherent to all cultures, and it is something a refugee family will learn with time—willingly or unwillingly.

In Africa, language of race does not completely apply to the tensions between countries—in fact, Gourevitch argues that European colonizers are the reason for any racial language to exist in Africa. He asks, “what did being black have to do with anything in Rwanda?” (Gourevitch, 1998, p. 178). African history is instead populated by ethnic tensions; Rwandan history is
specifically dominated by the conflict between Hutus and Tutsis, which spanned ethnic, socioeconomic, and cultural conflicts across decades. While central African refugees may be familiar with the concepts of racial or ethnic tension, they may not have learned yet the nuances of race relations in America and the labels created to describe them.

**Implications for Further Research**

Good research leads to more questions. The questions for further research are hopefully indicative of the utility and benefit of understanding the refugee perspective from such a sample. Most questions for further research are either aimed at program creation for refugee youth or further evaluation of the participants’ responses. If this research sets up a foundation to better understand the perceived needs of refugee children, further research is needed to explain those perceptions and how to move forward with them in mind.

There are many layers to the responses of my participants, especially in the questions of overarching societal concepts like race and cultural memory. In the four dominant findings of my research, more investigation would be helpful in developing insights for the refugee perspective. If my participants did not anticipate racism to be an important influence in their lives, why would that be so? What do they predict to be the main sources of tension in their lives? What coping mechanisms would be effective or ineffective when dealing with experiencing racism as a central African refugee? Do they perceive racism to be a bigger threat to other minority groups in America than themselves, or do they see it as a dramatized issue? Where were the participants’ first introductions to “racial” language, and how does that influence their perspective of race in America? These questions would dig deeper into the cultural and psychological aspects of how refugee children—especially from Africa—perceive race language and racism in America.
When it comes to curriculum development, there are many opportunities to use this research in resettlement youth programs. Curriculum development may need to recognize the felt realities of refugee children to become more effective and relevant to the refugees they serve. Research in this area could include ideas of integrating the refugees’ own perceptions into the curriculum; for example, I am most interested in how resettlement programs could incorporate African-American history into the youth curriculum while using concepts that are comprehensible to African refugee children. There is a clear indication that these children should be aware of the way race language is used in America and why; the goal of this history lesson not being indoctrination of a Western philosophy, but to give informative and useful concepts relevant to the cultures that refugees are being resettled in.

I have also been introduced to the field of peace education as a possible realm for further research. I am particularly interested in how the concepts of peace education—positive peace and negative peace—can be introduced to refugee youth curriculum, especially in the topic of conflict resolution. This collaboration between peace education and refugee resettlement could prove to be relevant and even helpful to newly arrived refugee families as they struggle to reconcile their pasts with the new task of cultural integration. As an idea for further research, I would love to see the impact of peace education on refugee youth, and whether or not this pedagogy makes them better equipped to handle conflict in their lives.

**Limitations of This Study**

In an ideal world, the sample size would have been much larger to provide the most accurate representation. However, my sample composition was representative of the small group of central African refugees that make up my local chapter of the IRC youth program. While we
do have male refugees enrolled in our program, they have jobs and are usually not available for after-school youth program meetings.

Another limitation is my own lack of education in these racial issues. Since I structured my research to be ultimately shaped by the participants’ responses, there would not have been room to adequately prepare an encounter with this material. My educational background equips me with limited tools to discuss race relations across the world, and while I attempted to alleviate this through conversation with many qualified people, my perspective is still limited. However, this study is not meant to explain the data, only to report it. While a thorough knowledge of race theory and African history would be beneficial to a discussion of this research, it is not essential for giving the raw data as it is stated by my participants.

**Conclusion**

This research has been an attempt to cross the bridge between resettlement perspectives and the individual experiences of refugee children living in the United States. Through theoretical foundations that aim to give refugee children a voice—particularly females—my research has illuminated themes that unite refugee children in their future goals. Through literature and the stories of other refugees, I have found relevant connections with refugees from around the world to prove that these experiences are not isolated events. Through a loosely-structured interview protocol, I gave myself and my participants the freedom to explore different facets of their future goals. Through my analysis, I have learned more about the refugee children I work with and the cultural blinders I initially started this project with.

When I started college, one of my future goals was to create something that helped others. Throughout my years at ACU, I have been prepared by my Child & Family Services
major, along with my English major, to take on this project and meet that goal. While I cannot foresee my project saving the world, I do hope it helps one refugee, one resettlement worker, or one community member to help understand the needs of refugees in our communities. Since they are a growing demographic in the West, it is vital that we begin to see life from their point of view. If we want to say “refugees welcome” on our social media accounts, we need to accept all the cultural beliefs, languages, trades, and values they come with. This project gave me a slice of their lives, which helps me become a better resettlement intern and community member. For now, this research is far from over; it is a new piece of the large puzzle that is understanding refugee resettlement in the United States.
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If any problems develop with the study, including any unanticipated events that may change the risk profile of your study or if there were any unapproved changes in your protocol, please inform the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs and the IRB promptly using the Unanticipated Events/Noncompliance Form.

I wish you well with your work. Sincerely,

Megan Roth, Ph.D.
Director of Research and Sponsored Programs
Additional Approvals/Instructions:

The following are all responsibilities of the Primary Investigator (PI). Violation of these responsibilities may result in suspension or termination of research by the Institutional Review Board. If the Primary Investigator is a student and fails to fulfil any of these responsibilities, the Faculty Advisor then becomes responsible for completing or upholding any and all of the following:

- If there are any changes in the research (including but not limited to change in location, members of the research team, research procedures, number of participants, target population of participants, compensation, or risk), these changes must be approved by the IRB prior to implementation.

- Report any protocol deviations or unanticipated problems to the IRB promptly according to IRB policy.

- Should the research continue past the expiration date, submit a Continuing Review Form, along with a copy of the current consent form and a new Signature Assurance Form approximately 30 days before the expiration date.

- When the research is completed, inform the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs. If your study is Expedited or Full Board, submit an Inactivation Request Form and a new Signature Assurance Form. If your study is Exempt, Non-Research, or Non-Human Research, email orsp@acu.edu to indicate that the research has finished.

- According to ACU policy, research data must be stored on ACU campus (or electronically) for 3 years from inactivation of the study, in a manner that is secure but accessible should the IRB request access.

- It is the Investigator’s responsibility to maintain a general environment of safety for all research participants and all members of the research team. All risks to physical, mental,
and emotional well-being as well as any risks to confidentiality should be minimized. For additional information on the policies and procedures above, please visit the IRB website http://www.acu.edu/community/offices/academic/orsp/human-research/overview.html or email orsp@acu.edu with your questions.
Appendix B

IRB Expedited Review Request

Abilene Christian University Institutional Review Board Committee

Expedited Review Request

Complete the Request and send as an e-mail attachment to orsp@acu.edu. Include any appendix materials, as applicable, including participant solicitation materials, consent forms, surveys, and the signed Investigator assurance/signature form.

Allow up to 8 weeks for the requests to be processed. Many members of the committee are unavailable to review proposals during the summer and holiday months. Submission during the fall or spring term is highly recommended.

Title of Proposed Project: Future Narratives and the Goals of Refugee Children

Date of Request: 9/21/2018

Principal Investigator: Tori Ford

Faculty Advisor (If PI is a student): Dr. Scott Self **Note: Faculty Advisor MUST read and sign the Investigator Assurances Form

Phone: (210) 394-8041 Email: vlf14a@acu.edu

Address: 526 E.N. 18th Street, Abilene, Texas (79601)

Point of Contact, if other than PI (Name, phone, email):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Investigators on Project (including PI)</th>
<th>Degree/Credentials</th>
<th>Departmen t / Affiliation</th>
<th>NIH Protecting Human Subject Research Participants Training+</th>
<th>EthicsCORE RCR Training++</th>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
<th>Certification Number</th>
<th>Date of Completion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tori Ford</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>English &amp; Child/Family Services</td>
<td>8/6/18</td>
<td>2869012</td>
<td>7/24/18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott Self</td>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>School of Education Leadersh ip</td>
<td>9/8/18</td>
<td>2916564</td>
<td>4/27/17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

++ NIH and EthicsCORE Responsible Conduct of Research Training are required of ALL research team members as of January 1, 2017.
Section I—Site & Funding

The project will be conducted: On Campus X Off Campus

If off-campus, please describe the site, whether you require and have permission to conduct the study at the site, and whether the site is accepting this IRB review or requires their own IRB approval: Site provided by the Abilene International Rescue Committee (IRC)

Will you be requesting records, documents, or other information or assistance from another office, department, institution, or agency? ☐ Yes X No

If "Yes," have you discussed this protocol with the appropriate authorized personnel and received approval? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A

Is this project being funded by an outside agency? Yes X No

If yes, please specify which agency:

Section II. Categories of Research That May Be Reviewed by the IRB through an Expedited Review Procedure

Select the Category Below that applies to this study. ALL human subjects research activities in the study must fall under one or more of these categories to be eligible for Expedited Review. If any part of the study does not qualify for Expedited (or Exempt) Review or a reviewer determines and justifies that an otherwise qualified category represents more than minimal risk, the study will be referred for Full Board Review:

☐ Category 1: Clinical studies of drugs and medical devices only when condition (a) or (b) is met.

  a. (a) Research on drugs for which an investigational new drug application (21 CFR Part 312) is not required. (Note: Research on marketed drugs that significantly increases the risks or decreases the acceptability of the risks associated with the use of the product is not eligible for expedited review.)

  b. Research on medical devices for which (i) an investigational device exemption application (21 CFR Part 812) is not required; or (ii) the medical device is cleared/approved for marketing and the medical device is being used in accordance with its cleared/approved labeling.

☐ Category 2: Collection of blood samples by finger stick, heel stick, ear stick, or venipuncture as follows:

  a. (a) from healthy, nonpregnant adults who weigh at least 110 pounds. For these subjects, the amounts drawn may not exceed 550 ml in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week; or

  b. from other adults and children [2], considering the age, weight, and health of the subjects, the collection procedure, the amount of blood to be collected, and the frequency with which it will be collected. For these subjects, the amount drawn may not exceed the lesser of 50 ml or 3 ml per kg in an 8 week period and collection may not occur more frequently than 2 times per week

☐ Category 3: Prospective collection of biological specimens for research purposes by noninvasive means. Examples: (a) hair and nail clippings in a nondisfiguring manner; (b) deciduous teeth at time of exfoliation or if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (c) permanent teeth if routine patient care indicates a need for extraction; (d) excreta and external secretions (including sweat); (e)
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Uncannulated saliva collected either in an unstimulated fashion or stimulated by chewing gumbase or wax or by applying a dilute citric solution to the tongue; (f) placenta removed at delivery; (g) amniotic fluid obtained at the time of rupture of the membrane prior to or during labor; (h) supra- and subgingival dental plaque and calculus, provided the collection procedure is not more invasive than routine prophylactic scaling of the teeth and the process is accomplished in accordance with accepted prophylactic techniques; (i) mucosal and skin cells collected by buccal scraping or swab, skin swab, or mouth washings; (j) sputum collected after saline mist nebulization

☐ Category 4: Collection of data through noninvasive procedures (not involving general anesthesia or sedation) routinely employed in clinical practice, excluding procedures involving x-rays or microwaves. Where medical devices are employed, they must be cleared/approved for marketing. (Studies intended to evaluate the safety and effectiveness of the medical device are not generally eligible for expedited review, including studies of cleared medical devices for new indications.) Examples: (a) physical sensors that are applied either to the surface of the body or at a distance and do not involve input of significant amounts of energy into the subject or an invasion of the subject’s privacy; (b) weighing or testing sensory acuity; (c) magnetic resonance imaging; (d) electrocardiography, electroencephalography, thermography, detection of naturally occurring radioactivity, electroretinography, ultrasound, diagnostic infrared imaging, doppler blood flow, and echocardiography; (e) moderate exercise, muscular strength testing, body composition assessment, and flexibility testing where appropriate given the age, weight, and health of the individual.

☐ Category 5: Research involving materials (data, documents, records, or specimens) that have been collected, or will be collected solely for nonresearch purposes (such as medical treatment or diagnosis). (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

☒ Category 6: Collection of data from voice, video, digital, or image recordings made for research purposes

☐ Category 7: Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies. (NOTE: Some research in this category may be exempt from the HHS regulations for the protection of human subjects. This listing refers only to research that is not exempt.)

Section III-- Plan

1. Purpose of the study: To gather the goals and perspectives of refugee children about what flourishing in America looks like.

Background: Volunteering with refugee youth has opened my eyes to the value of their perspectives in society. Through my time with the youth program, I have seen great potential in the ideas and dreams of refugee children. They are influenced both by their countries-of-origin and American culture, which makes their viewpoints unique.

1. Please describe how participants will be selected and recruited. How will potential subjects be identified and approached for participation in the study? Please include, in the appendix, any solicitations that may be used for recruitment. This is a purposive sample, based on Ms.
Ford's experiences of working with the IRC. Three subjects will be identified by the following criteria: a) involvement in the IRC youth program (they must regularly attend the IRC youth program), b) gender (participants will be female), and c) age (participants must be of adolescent age). Subjects will be invited to participate by Ms. Ford's IRC supervisor in person—who will be informed of the study and its goals in order to best help the child understand for what they are being invited to—to prevent feelings of pressure from Ms. Ford, and they will be approached during the scheduled IRC youth program meetings. If the child agrees, then we will proceed with the consent and assent process.

1. Please describe your consent procedures. Acquire consent from the parent/guardian through bilingual assistance and a home visit to go through the Informed Consent document; assent from the subject through their signature on the child assent form.

Will participants be screened prior to consent? Yes  X  No

If yes, please explain what screening will take place, any information that will be recorded, and what will be done with that information in the case the prospective participant declines participation or withdraws:

Will the Consent Process be altered in any way? (e.g., required elements will be excluded from the consent form; consent will be obtained without a signature; deception will be used in the consent process) (NOTE: electronic signature for online survey is an acceptable form of documentation of consent. However, if no signature is collected, this requires a waiver of documentation of consent)

Yes  X  No If yes, please complete the Alteration/Waiver of Consent Form.

Do you expect to consent anyone whose first language is not English or who is not fluent in English? X Yes  No

If yes, please be advised that a translated consent form may be required. It is recommended that you receive approval for the English version first. Translated consents will need to be submitted to the IRB within 30 days of approval and before any research is conducted with the non-English speakers.

Please describe who will translate during the consent process. The individual must NOT be related to the potential participant: Swahili speakers at Abilene Christian University will assist me with translation for the parent/guardians whose English is not as advanced.
1. Study Group(s) [insert additional rows as needed]. Please complete the box below for each study group. Note, some studies may only have one group. The numbers requested to screen and to enroll are the **maximum** being requested. Please justify these numbers in the following question. Any enrollment over these numbers will require a future amendment to the protocol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group (e.g., sample, treatment group)</th>
<th>Inclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Maximum Number Requested to Screen</th>
<th>Maximum Number Requested to Enroll</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td>Female, adolescent, refugee, IRC Youth Program participant</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Justification for Participant Numbers: **This sample size is sufficient for transfer ability in a qualitative ethnography.**

Please describe the demographics of your target sample (age, sex, race/ethnicity, etc.). If you plan to exclude any demographic, please provide justification: **Adolescent, female, African-descent, refugee status.**

Will you include any special populations requiring additional considerations (see below)?

X Yes  

No

X **Children**

Pregnant Women or Fetuses

Neonates

Decisionally Impaired

Prisoners

Students

Other: ____________

If yes, please complete the Special Populations Form.
1. If you plan to compensate participants, please describe:

1. Research Plan:

   Detailed methods (Please include sufficient detail to demonstrate that the protocol meets the requirements for expedited review as outlined in the checklist above,;) The child will answer questions about their future goals/aspirations. Data from the interview protocol will be transcribed and matched with field notes from the sessions. Data will be analyzed for emerging themes, in-vivo coding and axial codes. Patterns from the transcript will be interpreted to identify definitions of flourishing.

   Data Analysis: A pseudonym will be used for each subject through which all coding and audit trails will follow. Transcripts, field notes, coding products will be stored on a thumb-drive in Dr. Self’s office for a period of three years. 3 coding passes will be used: emerging code, in-vivo coding, and axial coding.

   Identify whether the activities, procedures, and/or interventions described in the study plan are routine or research, and who will be conducting the activity (add additional rows as needed). Please note: Routine activities are those that exist outside of the research context, such as a classroom activity, a health clinic, or an existing service. These are activities that would occur regardless of whether research was being conducted or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Routine or Research</th>
<th>Who will conduct/ administer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Narrative Interview</td>
<td>Routine X Research</td>
<td>Tori Ford (PI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>Research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   How will the individuals above be trained to perform the activities listed? PI is a certified volunteer/intern with the IRC, other preparation is provided by ACU through English/Family Studies academic departments.
Section IV—Risks.

a. For each research activity listed in the table above, please identify potential risks in the appropriate category. All studies have some risk, breach of confidentiality being most common. It is assumed that studies involving expedited categories are minimal risk as defined in the regulations (“the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.”):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Narrative</td>
<td>Serious and Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>[Insert Risk or enter ”none”]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious and less likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Insert Risk or enter ”none”]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Serious and rare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Insert Risk or enter ”none”]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not serious and likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Insert Risk or enter ”none”]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not serious and less likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Insert Risk or enter ”none”] Less Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- I.d. of subject</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. How will risks be minimized? Confidentiality will be ensured by the PI obtaining a pseudonym from the participant before the study begins. Data will continually be coded under that pseudonym.

b. What are the benefits of the study?

To the participants: 
Participant will clearly evaluate and define her goals and contribute to refugee resettlement programs.

To science and society: 
Results and themes found in the sample will help refugee youth/education programs to better identify and help refugee needs and goals.

a. Please describe how you will protect the confidentiality of the participants, including how the data will be coded and stored. 
Data files will be coded by pseudonyms provided by the
subjects. The audit trail for all transcripts, field notes, and coding charts will be tracked in the data by the pseudonyms. Subject names or identifiers will not be maintained in the data, except for in the consent/assent documents. All transcripts, field notes, and coding charts will be preserved for a period of three years on an external drive in Dr. Self’s office. The external drive will be preserved off-line, and maintained until the three-year period is complete.

b. Will data be shared with anyone outside of the research team/ACU IRB? X Yes No

If yes, please describe the data to be shared; whether it is identifiable, limited data set, or de-identified, with whom it will be shared, and how the data will be transferred: Data findings, subject identity, and interview questions will be shared with the International Rescue Committee, to maintain transparency about intern/client interactions.

Section V—Conflicts of Interest

Do any of the study personnel have Conflicts of Interest to report? Yes X No

If yes, please list the individual, the conflict, and any plans to manage the conflict:

Section VI—HIPAA and FERPA (medical and educational records, respectively)

Does the identification of potential participants require a waiver of HIPAA or FERPA Authorization? Yes X No

Will you be viewing or collecting private information that is protected by HIPAA or FERPA? Yes X No

If the answer to either question is yes, please complete the HIPAA/FERPA Form.

Section VII—Risk Management

Does your study involve: No

Use of chemicals or hazardous materials
Hazardous waste
Large or dangerous equipment
Travel abroad
Use of an ACU vehicle or rental vehicle
If the answer to any of the above is yes, please contact the Office of Risk Management for proper training and consultation.
http://www.acu.edu/community/offices/administrative/risk-management/contact.html

APPENDIX

Identify which items are included in the submission (Please submit all documents as SEPARATE attachments)

X Signed Investigator assurance/signature form (required).
X NIH Protecting Human Subject Research Participants Training Certificates of Completion for ALL research team members (required). ** NIH Training is required of ALL research team members as of January 1, 2016.

EthicsCORE Responsible Conduct of Research Training Certificates of Completion for ALL research team members. EthicsCORE RCR training is required of ALL research team members as of January 1, 2017.

X Special Populations Form

Participant Solicitation materials

X Consent Form

Alteration/Waiver of Consent Form

HIPAA/FERPA Consent Form

HIPAA/FERPA Form

Survey(s)

X Other: Interview Protocol and Child Assent Form
Appendix C

IRB Special Populations Form

SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Section I. Vulnerable Populations

1. Will your study include vulnerable populations? (Vulnerable populations are those “who are vulnerable to coercion or undue influence, such as children, prisoners, individuals with impaired decision-making capacity, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons.”) **Yes**

If yes, which vulnerable populations will be included in your study?

**X** Children [Box 1]
- Decisionally Impaired [Box 2]
- Prisoners [Box 3]
- Students [Box 4]
- Other [Box 5]: ____________

**Box 1: Children [45 CFR 46 (D)]**

Please select the appropriate category below:

1. Minimal Risk **X**
2. Greater than minimal risk but with prospect of benefit to the individual participant
3. Greater than minimal risk, no prospect of direct benefit to the participants, but expected to yield generalizable knowledge applicable to the participants’ condition.

Please describe the risks relative to the assessment above:

None

For category 2, please describe how the risk is at least as favorable to the subjects as that presented by available alternative approaches:

For category 3:
- a. please describe how the risk represents a minor increase over minimal risk:
- b. How the procedures present experiences to subjects that are reasonably commensurate with those inherent in their actual or expected medical, dental psychological, social or educational situations:
- c. How the study will yield generalizable knowledge about the subjects' disorder or condition which is of vital importance for the understanding or amelioration of the condition:
Please describe the prospective benefits relative to the assessment above:
To the participants: **The children clearly define their goals for themselves, contribute to the improvement of resettlement programs, and improve their writing skills.**
To science/society: **These results will help refugee youth programs in Abilene and elsewhere better identify and adapt to the needs of refugee children.**

Please justify the need to use children: **They are the population being served by the refugee programs this study seeks to improve. Their input is vital.**

Please describe in the main application:
1) how will parental consent from both parents will be obtained
2) how assent or dissent of the children will be obtained/assessed.

**Acquire consent from the parent/guardian through bilingual assistance and a home visit to go through the Informed Consent document; assent from the subject through their signature on the child assent form**

**Or, for #1 or 2 above, if you are requesting a waiver of consent from one or both parents or a waiver of assent from the children, please complete the Alteration or Waiver of Consent Form and justify and explain how the rights and welfare of the children will be protected in this case.**

Will any of the children be wards of the state? **XNo**

If the research is greater than minimal risk and not of direct benefit to the participant, additional justifications and protections are required:

Is the research:
related to their status as wards; or
conducted in schools, camps, hospitals, institutions, or similar settings in which the majority of children involved as subjects are not wards

Federal regulations (45 CFR 46.409) require the appointment of an advocate for each child who is a ward, in addition to any other individual acting on behalf of the child as guardian or in loco parentis. Please describe:
Who is/are the advocate(s):

Will they serve for one or more than one child:

Each advocate’s background and experience to serve in this role:

Confirm that the advocate is not associated in any other way with the research, the investigator(s), or the guardian organization

**Box 2: Decisionally Impaired**
Please provide justification for including decisionally impaired individuals in the research:

How will participants be determined as diminished decision-making capacity, incompetent, or incapacitated, and who will make this determination:

Is there reason to believe that the impairment may be temporary and could change throughout the course of the research? If yes, how will this be assessed?
Please describe **in the main application:**

1. How you will obtain consent, including ensuring that the participant understands the research, the risks, and the benefits. This may include a subject advocate who has the participant's best interest in mind.

2. Whether any participants require the consent of a legally authorized representative? If so, how you will determine this need and obtain consent from this individual?

3. How will you determine assent or assess dissent from the participant?

Will any of the participants be institutionalized? If so, please justify their use and explain how the research will affect the institution routine:

---

**Box 3: Prisoners [45 CFR 46 (C)]**

Please check here if this research is supported by the Department of Health and Human Services (e.g., CDC, FDA, NIH)

Please identify which category below best describes the research:

- Study is not recruiting prisoners, but may incidentally include prisoners as part of the broader study population (may stop here).

- Study of possible causes, effects, and processes of incarceration, and of criminal behavior
  
  Please describe how the research is no more than minimal risk and no more than an inconvenience to the subjects:

- Study of prisons as institutional structures or of prisoners as incarcerated persons
  
  Please describe how the research is no more than minimal risk and no more than an inconvenience to the subjects:

- Research on conditions particularly affecting prisoners as a class (for example, vaccine trials and other research on hepatitis which is much more prevalent in prisons than elsewhere; and research on social and psychological problems such as alcoholism, drug addiction, and sexual assaults)
  
  Please explain the condition and the justification:

- Research on practices, both innovative and accepted, which have the intent and reasonable probability of improving the health or well-being of the subject.
  
  Please describe the practice and how it is expected to improve the health and/or well-being of the subjects:

Will the research provide the prisoner with any advantage related to general living conditions, medical care, quality of food, amenities, or opportunities for earnings in the prison? If yes, please describe how these advantages are **not** of such a magnitude that his or her ability to weigh the risks of the research against the value of such advantages in the limited choice environment of the prison is impaired:

Describe how the risks involved in the research are commensurate with risks that would be accepted by nonprisoner volunteers:

Describe the procedures for the selection of subjects within the prison, ensuring that they are fair to all prisoners and immune from arbitrary intervention by prison authorities or prisoners:

If there is a control group, please provide assurance that the control subjects will be selected randomly from the group of available prisoners who meet the characteristics needed, or otherwise justify your selection procedures:
Please describe how the study information will be presented to the subjects, ensuring that it is presented in a language which is understandable to the subject population:

**Please describe:**

- What steps have been taken to ensure that the parole boards will not take into account a prisoner’s participation in the research in making decisions regarding parole?

- How the prisoners will be clearly informed in advance that participation in the research will have no effect on his or her parole:

- Do you anticipate the need for follow-up examination or care of participants after the end of their participation? **Yes**  **No**

  - If yes:
    - What provisions have been made to provide this examination or care, taking into account the varying lengths of individual prisoners’ sentences?
    - How will participants be notified of this?

**Box 4: Students**

- Are any of the researchers (including the faculty mentor) a faculty person intending to recruit students?  **Yes**  **No**

- Is the study minimal risk?  **Yes**  **No**

- Does the faculty person (including the mentor) intend to recruit his/her own students?  **Yes**  **No**

  - If yes, please describe what you will do to ensure that students do not feel coerced or compelled to participate (e.g., in order to gain favor with the instructor). Recommendations include having a person other than the instructor manage the recruitment, informed consent, and data collection until the end of the semester, or recruiting broadly and generally outside of the classroom. It is also recommended that the consent form explicitly state these protections:

  - Will students receive extra credit for participating in the study?  **Yes**  **No**

  - If yes, please describe what alternative options will be offered for students who do not wish to participate:

  - If the study is greater than minimal risk, please describe what will be done to further protect students’ privacy regarding sensitive information that may affect the student-instructor relationship:  **or N/A**
Box 5: Other

Please describe the vulnerable population and why they are viewed as vulnerable to coercion or undue influence in the context of this research project:

Please explain why it is necessary to conduct the research using these populations:

Please describe what steps are being taken to reduce the potential for coercion or undue influence, real or perceived:

Section II. Other Populations Requiring Special Protections:

If your study involves any of the populations below, please select the population/s and complete the Box.

Pregnant Women or Fetuses [Box 6] (Please note: the below requirements for pregnant women are aimed at protecting pregnant women from studies that may involve potential harm to the woman or the fetus. Low risk studies involving activities such as benign surveys need not complete the box below)

Neonates [Box 7]

Box 6: Pregnant Women or Fetuses [45 CFR 46 (B)]

Have preclinical and clinical studies been conducted? What is the assessed potential risk to pregnant women and fetuses?

The risk to the fetus is caused solely by interventions or procedures that hold out the prospect of direct benefit for the woman or the fetus; or

The risk to the fetus is not greater than minimal and the purpose of the research is the development of important biomedical knowledge which cannot be obtained by any other means; or

There is no risk to the fetus. The only risk is breach of confidentiality for the pregnant woman.

Please describe how the risk is the least possible for achieving the objectives of the research:

If the research holds out the prospect of direct benefit solely to the fetus, then the father** must also provide consent. If the pregnant woman is also a minor, then her parents must also provide consent.

Please describe who will be asked to sign the consent form and justify:

**except in the case that the father is unable to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity or the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest.
Please check to confirm:

No inducements, monetary or otherwise, will be offered to terminate a pregnancy.

Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in any decisions as to the timing, method, or procedures used to terminate a pregnancy.

Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in determining the viability of a neonate.

Box 7: Neonates [45 CFR 46 (B)]

After delivery, neonates should be identified as viable, uncertain viability, or nonviable. Individuals engaged in the research will have no part in determining the viability of a neonate.

For neonates of uncertain viability or nonviable neonates:

Describe the preclinical and clinical studies that have been conducted. What is the assessed risk of the research to the neonate?

For neonates of uncertain viability

1. Please describe:

How the research holds out the prospect of enhancing the probability of survival for the neonate to the point of viability:

How the risk is the least possible for achieving the above objective:

Or, if there is no added risk to the neonate, how the research will lead to the development of important biomedical knowledge which cannot be obtained by other means:

1. Each individual providing consent must be fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable impact of the research on the neonate. Consent may be obtained from either parent or, if neither parent is able to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity, the legally effective informed consent of either parent’s legally authorized representative is acceptable. The consent of the father or his legally authorized representative need not be obtained if the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest. Please describe in the main application who will provide consent that is consistent with these guidelines.
Nonviable neonates

1. Please confirm that the following conditions are met:

- The vital functions of the neonate will not be artificially maintained
- The research will not terminate the heartbeat or respiration of the neonate
- There will be no added risk to the neonate resulting from the research.
- The purpose of the research is the development of important biomedical knowledge that cannot be obtained by other means.

1. Each individual providing consent must be fully informed regarding the reasonably foreseeable impact of the research on the neonate. Consent may be obtained from both parents. However, if either parent is able to consent because of unavailability, incompetence, or temporary incapacity, the informed consent of one parent will suffice. The consent of the father need not be obtained if the pregnancy resulted from rape or incest. The consent of a legally authorized representative of either or both of the parents will not suffice in this case. Please describe in the main application who will provide consent that is consistent with these guidelines.

Viable Neonates: Neonates that have determined to be viable after delivery should be treated as children. Complete Box 1.
Appendix D

IRB Informed Consent Form

Tori Ford
Abilene Christian University
International Rescue Committee
Honors Project Thesis: The Goals of Refugee Youth

This Informed Consent Form has two parts:

• Information Sheet (to share information about the study with you)
• Consent Form (for signatures if you allow your child to participate)

Part 1: Information Sheet

My Honors Project

I am Tori Ford, a student at Abilene Christian University and intern at the IRC. I am doing research on the goals of refugee children in Abilene, and how those goals can be used to help refugee youth programs in the United States.

Your child is being asked to be in my research study, with yours and her full consent. Your child being in this study would be completely decided by you and her, and she can stop or ask questions at any time during the study. You do not need to decide now. This form may have words that you do not know, so please stop and ask questions if you don’t understand.

Project Information

I believe that refugees help Abilene. I have been with the IRC youth program for a year and worked with many good children. I want to help refugee children succeed, and I have seen ways that the IRC works to meet their needs.

By allowing your child to share her goals, I hope that youth programs can help more refugee children in school. I want to learn more about what refugee children want to be when they grow up, where they want to live, what they like to do, and more about the future they want. I want to learn what a “good life” in the United States is like to refugee children, and how resettlement programs—like the IRC—can help.

This study is not for the IRC. It is for Abilene Christian University. The results from this study may be shared with the IRC to help them.

If you say yes, this research will be me interviewing your child, for 90 minutes. Allowing your child to participate will cost you nothing; the interview will be at the IRC Youth Program.
Risks and Benefits

This study has little risk.

Your child will not be paid to be in this study. She may like the interview because making her goals for the future is helpful.

Voluntary Participation

You may decide if you want your child to be in this study. Also, your child may choose if she wants to be in the study. If she decides she does not want to talk anymore during the interview, she may stop at any time. There is no cost if you choose not to allow your child to be in the study. The IRC will not reward you if your child is in the study, nor will the IRC punish you if she does not.

Privacy

If you permit your child to be in this study, your child will choose a pseudonym, or a fake name, to keep her personal information safe. The results of the study may be shared with the IRC or Abilene Christian University, but your child’s personal information will not be shared.

I will interview your child one-on-one, and then look at her answers to better know the ways that refugee children plan for their futures. I will not share the name or personal information about your child when I share this study with other people.

Keeping of Personal Information

When people read my research, they will not be able to find the children who were in the study. No personal information will be used. Your child will provide a pseudonym (fake name), and all names and places will be kept private. If you allow your child to be in my study, her answers in the interview may be used for future studies; but no one will be able to figure out who she is.

Contacts

If you have any questions about the study, the Principal Investigator is Tori Ford, ACU student and IRC intern, who can be emailed at vlf14a@acu.edu. If you are unable to reach me or want to speak to someone other than me, you may contact Scott Self, PhD, at scott.self@acu.edu. If you have concerns about this study, believe you may have been injured because of this study, or have general questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call or email ACU’s Chair of the Institutional Review Board and Executive Director of Research, Megan Roth, Ph.D. Dr. Roth who may be reached at:

(325) 674-2885
megan.roth@acu.edu

320 Hardin Administration Building, ACU Box 29103
Abilene, TX 79699

You may decide if you want your child to be in this study. Also, your child may choose if she wants to be in the study. If she becomes uncomfortable or unhappy during the interview, she may stop at any time. There is no harm if you choose not to allow your child to be in the study.
Part Two: Consent Signature

Please sign this form if you voluntarily agree for your child to be in this study. Sign only after you have read all the information and you understand. You should get a copy of this signed consent form. You do not give up any rights by signing this form.

__________________________         __________________________ __________
Printed Name of Participant Signature of Participant Date

__________________________ __________________________ __________
Printed Name of Surrogate                Signature of Surrogate Date

Role of Surrogate (Please check one): __ Parent __ Guardian __ Legally Authorized Representative

__________________________ __________________________ __________
Printed Name of Person Signature of Person Date

Obtaining Consent Obtaining Consent

__________________________  __________________________ __________
Printed Name of Witness Signature of Witness Date

Appendix E
IRB Child Assent Form

Tori Ford
Abilene Christian University
International Rescue Committee
Honors Project Thesis: Refugee Youth Development

This Informed Consent Form has two parts:
• Information Sheet (to share information about the study with you)
• Assent Form (for signatures if you choose to participate)

Part 1: Information Sheet

My Honors Project

I am Tori Ford, a student at Abilene Christian University and intern at the IRC. I am doing research on the goals of refugee children in Abilene, and how those goals can be used to help refugee youth programs in the United States.

You are being asked to be in my research study, with your full assent. Your being in this study would be completely decided by you and your parent/guardian, and you can stop or ask questions at any time during the study. You do not need to decide now. This form may have words that you do not know, so please stop and ask questions if you don't understand.

Project Information

I believe that refugees help Abilene. I have been with the IRC youth program for a year and worked with many good children. I want to help refugee children succeed, and I have seen ways that the IRC works to meet their needs.

By sharing your goals, I hope that youth programs can help more refugee children in school. I want to learn more about what refugee children want to be when they grow up, where they want to live, what they like to do, and more about the future they want. I want to learn what a “good life” in the United States is like to refugee children, and how resettlement programs—like the IRC—can help.

This study is not for the IRC. It is for Abilene Christian University. The results from this study may be shared with the IRC to help them.

If you say yes, this research will be me interviewing you for 90 minutes. Participating will cost you nothing; the interview will be at the IRC Youth Program.

Risks and Benefits
This study has little risk.

You will not be paid to be in this study. You may like the interview because making your goals for the future is helpful.

**Voluntary Participation**

You may decide if you want to be in this study. If you decide you do not want to talk anymore during the interview, you may stop at any time. There is no cost if you choose not to be in the study. The IRC will not reward you if you are in the study, nor will the IRC punish you if you are not.

**Privacy**

If you want to be in this study, you will choose a pseudonym, or a fake name, to keep your personal information safe. The results of the study may be shared with the IRC or Abilene Christian University, but your personal information will not be shared.

I will interview you one-on-one, and then look at your answers to better know the ways that refugee children plan for their futures. I will not share your name or personal information when I share this study with other people.

**Keeping of Personal Information**

When people read my research, they will not be able to find the children who were in the study. No personal information will be used. You will provide a pseudonym (fake name), and all names and places will be kept private. If you want to be in my study, your answers in the interview may be used for future studies; but no one will be able to figure out who you are.

**Contacts**

If you have any questions about the study, the Principal Investigator is Tori Ford, ACU student and IRC intern, who can be emailed at vlf14a@acu.edu. If you are unable to reach me or want to speak to someone other than me, you may contact Scott Self, PhD, at scott.self@acu.edu. If you have concerns about this study, believe you may have been injured because of this study, or have general questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call or email ACU’s Chair of the Institutional Review Board and Executive Director of Research, Megan Roth, Ph.D. Dr. Roth who may be reached at:

(325) 674-2885
megan.roth@acu.edu

320 Hardin Administration Building, ACU Box 29103
Abilene, TX 79699

You may decide if you want to be in this study. If you decide you do not want to talk anymore during the interview, you may stop at any time. There is no cost if you choose not to be in the study. The IRC will not reward you if you are in the study, nor will the IRC punish you if you are not.
**Part Two: Assent Signature**

Please sign this form if you voluntarily agree to be in this study. Sign only after you have read all the information provided and you understand. You should get a copy of this signed consent form. You do not give up any rights by signing this form. After the study has been done, you have the right to take back your assent.

__________________________________________________________________________  ____________________________  __________
Printed Name of Participant             Signature of Participant  Date

__________________________________________________________________________  ____________________________  __________
Printed Name of Person Signature of Person Date

Obtaining Consent

Obtaining Consent

__________________________________________________________________________  ____________________________  __________
Printed Name of Witness Signature of Witness Date
Appendix F

Interview Protocol

Future Narratives and the Goals of Refugee Children: Semi-Structured Interview Protocol

Research Site: IRC Youth Program

4:00pm- PI will silently escort one participant into a separate room at the site. PI will sit down with the participant and facilitate a warm environment.

4:05pm- PI will start recording by asking the participant for a pseudonym that will be used throughout the activity. PI will explain the expectations and goals of the research activity. PI will reiterate that the subject’s participation is completely voluntary and can be stopped at any time in the activity.

4:10pm- PI will explain the concepts of future world-building and address any questions that the subject might have.

- Let’s imagine that we’re talking to each other 10 years from now. Pretend that you’re very happy, and that you are loving your life. Where do you live?
  - What does a normal day for you look like? (Occupation? Family routines? Hobbies?)
  - Did you go to college? What did you study in college?
  - Tell me about your house. What does it look like? Where do you go on vacations? Why? Who do you take with you?
  - Tell me about your religious practices. What is your favorite holiday? How are you spending that holiday? Who is with you?
  - We said that you are happy. Why are you happy?
  - Now, imagine that you have encountered a problem in your future.
    - Where is the conflict occurring? With whom? Why?
    - How do you solve this conflict?
    - What do you do to move on from the conflict?

5:40pm- Review and reflect over the world-building.

5:50pm- PI will explain to the participant how confidentiality will be kept, and thank the subject for their voluntary participation in the research.