

©Copyright 2025

Larisa Ozeryansky

Interdisciplinary Health Research:  
Examining Research and Programmatic Methods for Supporting Refugees

Larisa Ozeryansky

A dissertation  
submitted in partial fulfillment  
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington  
2025

Reading Committee:

Zack Almquist, Chair

Amy Hagopian

Olivia Noble Gunn

Yonty Friesem

Melanie Martin

Program Authorized to Offer Degree:

Individual Ph.D. Program

University of Washington

**Abstract**

Interdisciplinary Health Research:  
Examining Research and Programmatic Methods for Supporting Refugees

Larisa Ozeryansky

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Zack Almquist

Department of Sociology

Support interventions for refugees in resettlement contexts are often perceived differently by the refugees than by those who design or facilitate them. Sociocultural nuances can shape both the ways refugees engage with support and how data on their needs is interpreted. While practical aspects of resettlement—such as healthcare, housing, or financial assistance—are often emphasized, deeper psychosocial needs like belonging, identity, and emotional well-being may be overlooked. Three interconnected themes can be used to explore these incongruencies: 1) post-migration psychosocial health, 2) the role of belonging during resettlement, and 3) the potential of nature experiences (NEs) to support inclusivity and well-being. This study uses surveys and interviews to explore how refugees experience and seek support, while also examining how providers view the provision of support and its intended benefits—highlighting potential gaps between these perspectives. The research further critically examines research methods as well as nature-based social support programs, exploring their potential to promote wellness while questioning provider assumptions about their results and benefits. Chapter 1

examines the influence of sociocultural and contextual factors on survey responses from Ukrainian refugees, highlighting the need for reflexive, mixed-method research approaches. Chapter 2 investigates the concept of belonging as experienced by resettled Ukrainian refugees, detailing structural and interpersonal barriers that exacerbate feelings of exclusion and exploring how social support efforts could better foster a sense of community and inclusion. Chapter 3 presents *friluftsliv*/nature-based initiatives in Norway as a case study, exploring their potential to address the compounded stresses of displacement and the challenges of resettlement, while also critiquing the normative cultural frameworks that may limit their inclusivity. Together, this dissertation explores and underlines the importance of cultural awareness and participatory approaches to refugee support, as well as the need to address systemic barriers to belonging and well-being.

## *Acknowledgments*

The author extends heartfelt gratitude to their PhD committee members at the University of Washington: Zack Almquist (Sociology), Amy Hagopian (Global Health), Olivia Noble Gunn (Scandinavian Studies), and Melanie Martin (Sociology), as well as Yonty Friesem (Columbia College Chicago) for their invaluable guidance and support. Special thanks to Angela Susan Labberton (Norwegian Institute of Public Health), the author's Fulbright mentor, for her encouragement and mentorship. The author also sincerely appreciates Olena Bidovanets for her contributions to the Ukrainian language translation and for conducting interviews as part of this study.

## *Declaration of Conflicting Interests*

The author declares no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

## *Ethical considerations*

University of Washington Ethical Approval

- IRB STUDY00015563 (Ukrainian Refugee Survey and Interviews, Chapters 1 and 2)
- IRB STUDY00020026: (Nature in Norway, Chapter 3)

## *Consent to participate*

This dissertation research utilized two surveys and an electronic-format interview, which all began with a consent statement (in the participant's chosen language) which each participant assented to in writing (surveys) or audibly (interview) before being able to continue to the questions. The Consent statements can be found in the Appendix.

## *Funding*

The author(s) was the recipient/grantee of The Fulbright Program (September 2023 - June 2024) and the Fritz International Fellowship (Autumn Quarter 2023).

The author also received funding to travel for conference presentations from the following University of Washington organizations/funds: the Individual Ph.D. Program's Graduate Student Conference Presentation Award, the Graduate and Professional Student Senate's Travel Grants, and the Center for Studies in Demography and Ecology CSDE Trainee PAA travel funds.

The author(s) also received thirty-two \$25 online gift cards (Total: \$800) as incentive for interview participants (14 cards were distributed, the remaining were unused), from Dr. Zack Almquist's research funding in the Department of Sociology, University of Washington.

## *ORCID ID*

Larisa Ozeryansky, 0000-0002-6579-1830

## Table of Contents

Dissertation Introduction	10
Chapter 1: Application of Cognitive Interviewing to Explore the Influence of Socio-Cultural and Contextual Factors on Survey Response by Refugees from Ukraine (2022-2023)	12
Abstract	12
Introduction	12
Theoretical Frameworks	13
Grounded Theory	13
Cognitive Theory	14
Study Objectives	14
Materials and Methods	14
Methodology	14
Cognitive Interviewing	15
Survey and Interview Tools	15
Results	16
Table 1. Survey Respondent Demographics	16
Table 2. Interviewee Demographics	17
Survey Results	17
Follow-up Interview Results	19
Discussion	19
On Instability and Liminality	20
On Shame	21
On Distrust	22
On Being Heard	23
Limitations	24
Conclusion	25
Chapter 2: A Sense of Belonging: Meaning and Barriers for Resettled Refugees from Ukraine (2022-2023)	27
Abstract	27
Introduction	27
Study Objectives	28
Theoretical Frameworks	29
Social Cognitive Theory	29
Materials and Methods	29
Methodology	29
Participant Recruitment	30

Questions on Belonging	30
Text Analysis Approach	31
Results	31
Table 3. Interviewee Demographics	32
Discussion	33
Language as a Barrier	33
Time and Effort Required for Integration	33
Cultural and Social Differences	34
Employment, Education, and Personal Contribution	34
Social Networks and Support Systems	35
Conclusion	36
Chapter 3: Building Belonging: A Critical Look at Nature-Based Interventions for Health and Social Support for Refugees and Migrants (Insights and Cautions from Norwegian Friluftsliv Integration Efforts)	38
Abstract	38
Introduction	38
Refugees and Nature Experiences: An Overlooked Subpopulation	38
The Norwegian Context: Friluftsliv and Its Cultural Significance	39
The Documented Benefits of Nature Experiences (NEs)	40
Friluftsliv and Refugees in Norway: Initiatives and Critiques	41
Global Recognition of Nature Experiences in Policy and Planning	43
Theoretical Frameworks	43
Biophilia Hypothesis	43
Attention Restoration Theory	44
Salutogenesis	44
Study Objectives	44
Materials and Methods	45
Methodology	45
Participant Recruitment	45
Survey Tool	45
Results	46
Represented Service Provider Organizations	46
Service Provider Perspectives on Refugee Friluftsliv Participant Demographics	47
Organizational Challenges and Continuity	47
Provider-Perceived Benefits	48
Types and Styles of Engagement	49
Discussion	49
Nature-Based Experiences and Social Integration	49

Health and Well-Being Benefits	51
Structural Implications, Policy, and Funding	51
A Note on Rhetoric and its Potential Effects	53
Limitations	54
Perspective	54
Challenges with Recruitment	55
Conclusion	55
Dissertation Conclusion	58
Bibliography	60
Appendix	66
I. (Survey) Ukrainian Refugee Migration Decision Making and Health, Survey Questions with Consent Form	66
II. (Interview) Ukrainian Refugee Migration Decision Making and Health, Interview Questions and Consent Form	96
III. (Survey) Norwegian friluftsliv Service Providers, Survey Questions and Consent Form	106

# Dissertation Introduction

Forced displacement has steadily increased in the last century (*The Economist* 2016), and is expected to worsen, particularly in response to an increasing severity of global conflict (Armed Conflict Location & Event Data 2024). As those forcibly displaced are relocating, multi-faceted issues around social cohesion in host countries are becoming more prominent. The 2023 World Bank report on Forced Displacement and Social Cohesion calls for more research about “how displacement changes various dimensions of social cohesion for those affected,” and notes that most studies to date focus on the psychological effects and not on other outcomes (World Bank 2023). One theme of overlooked outcomes could be at the nexus of refugee health and social disconnectedness. People who have escaped conflict and migrated as refugees or asylum seekers to other countries may face myriad barriers in pursuit of health care. Feeling socially disconnected, or lacking a sense of 'belonging,' may further discourage these individuals from seeking care, regardless of their access, awareness, or other potential barriers.

This dissertation utilized surveys, interviews, and literature review to examine what barriers refugees are facing and what modalities are or are not serving them in addressing these issues. An initial survey on migration decision-making and health behavior, for refugees who left Ukraine following the Russian invasion in 2022, resulted in non-response and long, detailed write-in responses. Follow-up interviews to explore these responses employed cognitive interviewing to learn more about this idiosyncratic survey behavior, namely the choice to skip questions or write-in text in a way that exceeded the expectations of the question (for example, the respondent’s answer could have fit an available answer option, but they chose to write a paragraph with additional details). These steps informed **Chapter 1**, “Application of Cognitive Interviewing to Explore the Influence of Socio-Cultural and Contextual Factors on Survey Response by Refugees from Ukraine (2022-2023),” and **Chapter 2**, “A Sense of Belonging: Meaning and Barriers for Resettled Refugees from Ukraine (2022-2023).” These analyses ultimately highlighted various stressors of the forced-displacement and migration experience and a gap in social connectedness, which affected refugee psychosocial health, health-seeking behavior, and more. Thus **Chapter 3**, “Building Belonging: A Critical Look at Nature-Based Interventions for Health and Social Support for Refugees and Migrants (Insights and Cautions from Norwegian *Friluftsliv* Integration Efforts),” explored a unique modality shown to improve health for many sub-populations: time spent in nature. Chapter 3 examines how Norway, specifically, integrates this approach into programs designed to enhance social connectedness for migrants and refugees.

This research underscores how a lack of social connectedness—rooted in feelings of non-belonging—exacerbates barriers to healthcare access and negatively impacts refugee well-being. Insights from surveys and interviews with Ukrainian refugees revealed how the stressors of displacement and migration, compounded by social disconnection, hinder psychosocial health and health-seeking behavior. Norway is widely recognized for its comprehensive resettlement support, providing refugees with robust assistance in economic, educational, and healthcare domains while promoting successful integration into society. A unique feature of Norway’s approach is its cultural emphasis on *friluftsliv* (see Chapter 3 for more description)—a deeply rooted value of spending time in nature and engaging in outdoor

activities, regarded as essential to well-being and quality of life. Beyond leisure, *friluftsliv* serves as a framework for fostering inclusivity and community-building, also for immigrants. Norway's model demonstrates the potential application of activity/group-time spent in nature as a healing and socially supportive way to address the psychosocial challenges faced by displaced populations. By integrating physical activity with cultural and social interaction, *friluftsliv* programs aim to create spaces where refugees can connect with their host communities, develop a sense of belonging, and improve their mental health. At the same time, they may unintentionally impose normative expectations about how nature should be experienced, framing outdoor activities as a means of assimilating refugees into dominant cultural values rather than centering their individual well-being and needs. This study explored this application through a survey of *friluftsliv* service providers in Norway, highlighting how these providers viewed the benefits and challenges of applying nature-based initiatives to the country's broader intentions around holistic refugee care and integration. Overall, by prioritizing a sense of belonging and tailoring programs to bridge social gaps, host countries can better support refugees in overcoming the physical and emotional toll of displacement, creating pathways to improved health, resilience, and community integration.

# **Chapter 1: Application of Cognitive Interviewing to Explore the Influence of Socio-Cultural and Contextual Factors on Survey Response by Refugees from Ukraine (2022-2023)**

## **Abstract**

Cognitive interviewing techniques provided unique insights into response behaviors in an online survey designed to examine health experiences and migration-related decision-making among Ukrainian refugees. Conducted six months after an initial survey (summer 2022), these interviews explored patterns of non-response, write-in tendencies, and the socio-cultural factors influencing participation. Refugees frequently selected the ‘other’ option and wrote long, emotive narratives, while often skipping questions with limited or potentially identifying response options, such as demographic questions. Interviewees suggested that the survey non-responses could be connected to contemporary and historical fears of spying, shame, stigma, and the instability (liminality) of post-evacuation life. At the same time, lengthy write-in responses reflected a strong desire to ‘be heard’—even anonymously—rather than burden family and friends. In this way, the survey itself appeared to serve a therapeutic function for those fleeing war and conflict. These findings highlight the value of mixed-methodology and cognitive interviewing in capturing nuanced data, particularly among refugees navigating displacement and sharing a socio-cultural context.

## **Introduction**

Refugees who fled Ukraine (2022-) have a unique sociocultural context that influences the way they interact with research and data-collection efforts such as standardized surveys. This context is foremost associated with the protracted conflict with Russia, which has embroiled Ukrainians, arguably, for more than a century (considering previous revolutions and bids for independence during the historical periods including Tsarist Russia and the Soviet Union) (Kessler 2022; Plokhly 2015; Reshetar 1968; Rogan and Morgan 2022; Rudnytsky 1972:197) . The military invasion of Ukraine by Russian forces, on February 24, 2022, marked a peak of the contemporary Russo-Ukrainian War, ongoing since 2014 (Fitzgerald and Davis 2023; Walker 2023). As of September 2023, a year and a half since the war’s latest escalation, more than 11 million people have been displaced – more than 6 million of them as refugees abroad (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2023a; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2023b).

Past and present elements of the conflict in Ukraine have the potential to inform how refugees from the region interpret and answer survey questions that may seem unrelated to war or issues of statehood. Considering survey response in light of a shared geographical, sociocultural, and historical origin provides insight for research with other refugee groups. It is important to understand the connections between such influences and response to standard data collection methods, so those designing such tools can refine them to mind contextual gaps. This informed approach has the potential to improve the quality and capabilities of academic approaches in migration research, better tailor programmatic support and service provision for refugee populations, as well as provide a more accurate picture to policymakers.

But how to glean nuanced sociocultural influences on survey response behavior, is just as important as the information itself. In combination with quantitative approaches, which produce measurable data, qualitative approaches to research provide in-depth insights into the context and meaning of human experiences and sociocultural influences (Creswell et al. 2011). This dual and complimentary assessment, itself, represents an underused approach to understanding the nuances of refugee needs. While mixed-methodology is recognized as an emergent method in health-related research, it is rarely applied to refugee-specific endeavors. A systematic literature review of 102 peer-reviewed publications on service-related research on refugees (2000-2020) found only 5% used mixed-methodology (Subramanian, Finsterwalder, and Hall 2022). research with recent (2022-) refugees from Ukraine also offer few studies employing mixed methodology. A four-part series by UNHCR, in partnership with the World Bank, used focus groups to add context to phone and internet-mediated surveys to understand the ‘intentions and different underlying factors influencing decision-making’ of refugees from Ukraine (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2022a; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2022b; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2023a; United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2023b). There does not seem to have been health-specific research with refugees from Ukraine, however, using mixed-methodology. Health needs assessments have been done with quantitative methods, such as with computer-assisted telephone interviews (CATI), by the World Health Organization (Cojocaru, Cojocaru, and Oancea 2022). Neither of these initiatives, though, appeared to additionally apply Cognitive Interviewing to explore how participants understood what they were being asked. Cognitive Interviewing is the critical element used in this study to elicit the ways sociocultural factors may influence refugee response behavior on health-based surveys.

## **Theoretical Frameworks**

### **Grounded Theory**

Cognitive interviewing is an appropriate method for evaluating how survey questions are interpreted by intended audiences (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2019; Miller et al. 2014). This approach to understanding survey data, which probes respondents to explain their reasoning behind certain responses, echoes Glaser and Strauss’s Grounded Theory. Grounded Theory seeks to explain and predict what is taking place rather than merely describe social phenomena identified through qualitative research (Glaser and Strauss 2010; Rich 2015). This approach allows for an analysis of the way knowledge is produced in society, along with the

underlying knowledge itself (such as survey results) (Partington 2000). Since “researchers cannot know exactly what the most significant social and social psychological processes are” (Charmaz 2002), cognitive interviewing can be a strong alternative to assumptions made through literature review (Dey 1999). This approach also meets Grounded Theory’s recommendations to magnify data by following leads which emerge through stages of collection, and the separation of these stages allows for clarity without sacrificing the details of each methodological step (Charmaz 2006).

## **Cognitive Theory**

Besides Grounded Theory, which informed the methodological step of following-up with survey respondents to understand their responses, Cognitive Theory was also applied as a way of assessing the cognitive aspects of survey methodology (CASM). Cognitive Theory proposes a model that examines (1) comprehension of the (survey) question, (2) retrieval from memory of relevant information, (3) decision processes, and (4) response processes (Tourangeau 1984). CASM began as an interdisciplinary field in the early 1980’s on the understanding that survey respondents interpret and form attitude judgments about questions beyond simply a literal understanding of the words. CASM seeks to understand the role cognition plays in various interpretations of survey questions, rather than simply reduce the likelihood of response ‘errors’ (Belli, Conrad, and Wright 2007). Besides avoiding uncomplicated wording or using simple terms (Bradburn, Sudman, and Wansink 2004), cognitive interviewing to explore CASM provides a way to derive insight on group psychology regarding the respondents’ context (Schwarz 2007). In the case of refugees from Ukraine, fleeing a particular context with significant historical, gender, social, and political implications, this exploration may hold value that surpasses a more direct examination of the survey data alone.

## **Study Objectives**

This paper aims to shed light on the ways the sociocultural context of refugees influences their survey response behavior and the way survey respondents’ refugee-related circumstances shape their interpretation of reported experiences.

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Methodology**

Using a Cognitive Interview approach and mixed-methodology design, this study followed up the initial online survey with interviews conducted on web-based and mobile platforms, to understand ‘Health Experiences and Migration-Related Decision Making.’ Of the three standard approaches to integrating both quantitative and qualitative forms of data (merging, connecting, and embedding), ‘connecting’ was applied at the ‘point of interface’ as the quantitative data (survey question responses) informed the subsequent qualitative data collection (interview questions) (Creswell et al. 2011). As survey responses are unreliable reflections of a person's full considerations, but prompting deeper recall can improve their reliability, follow-up interviews were planned from the onset of the study (Zaller and Feldman 1992). In the interview

stage, a multi-part Cognitive Interviewing question was asked to specifically understand participants' survey interpretation and response behavior.

## **Cognitive Interviewing**

The cognitive interviewing question (Q2), the primary question used for the purpose of this analysis, was as follows: “You signed up for this interview after doing a survey online about Ukrainian Refugee Health and Migration Decision-Making during the Summer of 2022. While your answers were anonymous, I’d like to ask you a few questions about your experience with the survey in general:

***[Q2A] NON-RESPONSES:*** There were many questions that people left unanswered, such as gender or current location. Why do you think a person would choose not to answer those or other questions in the survey?

***[Q2B] PREFERENCE FOR WRITE-IN RESPONSE:*** When respondents did answer questions, many chose to select the “other” category, when it was available, and wrote long responses. Why do you think respondents seemed to prefer to write their own, long answers over choosing one of the options?

Example Q2B.1: In response to the question “Do you know how to get medical attention if you need it?” With options Yes, No, or Other, respondents chose “other” and wrote responses such as “I think I know.”

Example Q2B.2: In response to a question that asked “What were your reasons for leaving Ukraine” one of the options was “war,” but several respondents did not select that option, and instead selected “other” and wrote extensive details about war-related violence like bombs or rockets.

## **Survey and Interview Tools**

Our 80-question online survey was conducted during summer 2022 (June-September). The survey was designed in Qualtrics in Ukrainian, Russian, and English, and posted (including a project description and links to an associated website and Instagram and Twitter accounts), on 23 Facebook groups that referenced refugees from Ukraine (ex. “Ukrainian Refugees in Spain”). The survey questions were adapted from standardized self-rated health questionnaires (Hays and Morales 2001:200; Ohlsson-Nevo et al. 2021; Ware and Sherbourne 1992) and the Ukraine Demographic and Health Survey 2007 (USAID 2007).

The follow-up interviews were conducted from February to March 2023 (six months after survey data collection ended). Interviewees were recruited through a second survey link (maintaining anonymity of the original survey) at the end of the survey, inviting survey respondents to provide their contact information if they were interested in a follow-up interview with a \$25.00 incentive. Incentives were offered to increase interest and engagement with the survey (Groves, Cialdini, and Couper 1992). At the time of sign-up, respondents could select their preferred language (Ukrainian, Russian, or English). In January 2023 invitations with links

to a calendar-scheduling platform were sent out by email to those who signed-up, as well as through social messaging tools, based on preferences indicated in the online sign-up tool. Both the invitations and the calendar-scheduling platform were available in Ukrainian, Russian, and English with associated study information and a link to the study website (participants received this information in the language they indicated at the time of signing-up). Interview questions were based on the survey results, written initially in English and then translated to Ukrainian and Russian and tested with native speakers for comprehension. The Russian-language interviews were conducted by a PhD-student (the author), who was trained in motivational interview and experienced in leading interviews on numerous previous studies; the Ukrainian-language interviews were conducted by a Master of Public Health student (“research collaborator”) from Ukraine (with training and observation by the author). Of the 18 interview questions, a single two-part question (Q2), using techniques from literature on cognitive interviewing, asked participants to provide potential explanations for non-response and preference for the ‘other’ answer option on the original survey.

Both survey and interview tools were tested on native speakers (Ukrainian, Russian) for cultural and language comprehension, adjusted, and re-tested, before implementation. Quantitative survey data was analyzed using R, and write-in text was translated into English by the author. Interviews were recorded using the Zoom platform while the software Ava synchronously created spoken language (Russian or Ukrainian) and live-translated (English) transcripts. To make up for transcription software error, the recorded interviews were manually corrected by the author and research collaborator. Interpretation was executed in cases when English and Ukrainian/Russian phraseology did not allow for direct translation (these decisions were confirmed with native speakers on an as-needed basis).

The recruitment method used in this study (sharing the survey link via Facebook groups for refugees from Ukraine), cannot necessarily produce a representative or random sample of the population from Ukraine as a whole. Instead, this study maximizes a small sample size (n=91 survey response, and n-15 interviewees) to apply long-form interviewing methodology as a means of exploring how sociocultural factors influence survey response.

## Results

The original, anonymous survey received 91 responses with digital consent during the data collection period, June-September 2022. Key demographics of the survey and interview participants are in Figures 1 and 2. Of the total 55 survey-respondents who chose to click the link at the end of the survey inviting them to sign-up for a follow-up interview (with \$25 incentive), 15 people completed interviews: 7 in Russian and 8 in Ukrainian. The 18-question interview (range 40 min – 2.5 hours) and conducted over Zoom (14) and Viber (1).

<b>Table 1. Survey Respondent Demographics</b>	
Participants	91
Current Location	11 Sweden, 11 Germany, 8 Norway, 8 Poland, 10 USA, remaining 0-4 per country

Sex	Female 53	Male 10	27 No response
Ethnic origin	53 Ukrainian	1 Syria, 1 Latvian, 1 Moldova, 1 Russian, 1 Kazakh, 1 Belarussian	
Religious beliefs	Christian, Muslim, Jewish, Atheist		
Ages	19-66		
Survey Language (selected by survey respondent)	Russian 54	Ukrainian 32	English 5

**Table 2. Interviewee Demographics**

Chosen Interview Language	Gender	Marital Status	Location	Age Range	Caring for Minor Children	Ethnic Origin	Religions	Sexual Identity
8 Ukrainian 7 Russian	2 Male 13 Female	9 Married 2 Single 3 Divorced 1 Other: "cat and dog"	5 Sweden 3 Norway 2 Germany 1 USA 1 Portugal 1 Hungary 1 Poland 1 Returnee to Ukraine after Seeking Asylum in Austria	27, 29, 33, 36, 38, 38, 39, 42, 42, 44, 45, 49, 52, 53, 64	8 Yes 7 No	14 Ukrainian 1 Syrian	13 Christian 1 Jewish 1 Atheist	14 Heterosexual 1 "married to a woman"

Notes:

1. Chosen Interview Language: Of the 8 people who chose to do the survey in Ukrainian, one preferred English during the actual interview and another preferred to hear Ukrainian but respond in Russian. A total of 3 interviewees said they spoke English fluently and one spoke Arabic fluently.
2. Marital Status: Even when directly asked about their marital status, one respondent chose to answer in an idiosyncratic way: "cat and dog"
3. Sexual Identity: This respondent chose not to identify their sexual identity, and instead state that they were married to a woman

These responses suggest a persistent, possibly culturally influenced, preference for nonconformity or expressive individuality when answering demographic questions.

## Survey Results

One key observation from the survey response behavior was that many questions, particularly demographic ones, were left unanswered, yet respondents offered lengthy, detailed responses when offered the option of a write-in textbox. Even questions such as Q35 "Where are you now," Q43 "What is your gender," and Q66 "What year were you born," saw 36% (33/91),

40% (36/91), 41% (37/91) non-response, respectively. But, when given the option to explain themselves in detail, respondents chose to write long answers that were very personal, seemed to stray from the question, or provided significant detail that could have fit another answer choice. For instance, Q18 asked “What were your reasons for leaving Ukraine? (Select all that may apply):” the answer choices included “war/violence” as an option. Instead of choosing this option, there were respondents who chose “other” and wrote-in answers including “War, damn it! There are no other reasons!”, “Military actions of the aggressor country,” and long explanations about bombing and destruction that occurred in their vicinity. Another example is Q42 “What, if any, of the following challenges are you currently experiencing? (Select all that apply; please explain more in the boxes below your answer choices)” and “local language” and “healthcare access” were response options. Instead of choosing these, there were respondents who explained their challenges with language barriers and said “sometimes there are terrible psychological conditions. From sudden changes in mood from sharply positive to sharply negative. I did not seek help from a specialist because I do not have insurance.” These detailed responses highlight complex challenges that spanned beyond the listed options, touching on both mental health struggles and systemic barriers to care.

This pattern suggests that respondents utilized open-ended text boxes as avenues to express deeper personal experiences—particularly when predefined options were somehow insufficient. In contexts of crisis or displacement, surveys may inadvertently provide respondents with opportunities for self-expression and catharsis. Existing literature highlights the therapeutic effects of narrative expression, particularly among those who have experienced trauma or displacement. Studies show that narrative-based interventions help individuals construct meaningful coherence of their experiences. Relevant therapeutic interventions include Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Cognitive Processing Therapy, Cognitive Therapy, Consolidation/Reconsolidation Therapy, Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing, and Prolonged Exposure (Raeder, Clayton, and Boeckle 2023). Narrative Exposure Therapy (NET) is one type of narrative-based intervention which has shown efficacy in reducing post-traumatic stress disorder symptoms by encouraging individuals to construct detailed narratives of their traumatic experiences, facilitating emotional processing and integration (Lely et al. 2019; Schauer, Neuner, and Elbert 2025). In fact, “current research on NET provides evidence on its effectiveness especially with refugee populations for whom it was initially intended” (Grech and Grech 2018). Though these interventions are meant to occur as deliberate therapy over the course of multiple sessions, the concept still applies—telling one’s story can have a therapeutic effect.

Furthermore, trauma-informed survey practices emphasize the importance of allowing respondents to provide answers beyond predefined options, recognizing that fixed choices may not fully capture the complexity of their experiences. Open-ended responses are especially valuable when working with trauma-affected populations, such as refugees, as they offer greater autonomy and control over how individuals share their stories—an essential aspect of trauma-informed research. Open-ended questions also offer respondents more opportunity to share information that otherwise might be excluded from a more specific question (Sudman and

Bradburn 1974). This flexibility also helps minimize retraumatization by enabling respondents to choose the depth and focus of their disclosures, fostering a safer and more respectful space for self-expression (Johnson 2016; Ott et al. 2025). For individuals who have experienced displacement or conflict, this approach can validate their agency and recognize the significance of their personal narratives, ultimately strengthening both the ethical integrity of the research and the authenticity of the data collected. As the survey respondents in this study seemed to prefer the long, write-in options, and omission of identifying information, it seems that they embraced the survey as a trauma-informed engagement.

## **Follow-up Interview Results**

Cognitive interview Q2A inquired about why people might not respond to some survey questions. All interviewees (see Discussion for selected quotes) suggested that the instability of their lives and their associated uncertainty limited the ability to answer anything definitively. They also cited shame, secrecy, guilt, and fear of judgment—primarily around “abandoning” their motherland. This topic was also cited by nearly all interviewees as a potential explanation for the lack of sex reporting (and low number of self-identified male participants) – as men either left Ukraine illegally or were otherwise not contributing to defending their country as they were expected to by their community members. Finally, interviewees also suggested survey respondents may fear the survey isn’t truly anonymous or was run by Russians, spies, or others seeking to collect information from Ukrainians in support of Russia.

Cognitive interview question 2B inquired about the preference of survey respondents to choose “other” or otherwise write-in long explanations when the option was available. All interviewees (see Discussion for selected quotes) suggested the answer options likely did not capture the extent of respondents’ experience/feelings, and respondents may have had a desire to express emotions or provide more details to fully-answer the questions. Interviewees also suggested respondents may have wanted an anonymous outlet to express themselves and used the survey to share their unique experiences which they otherwise didn’t feel comfortable talking about to the people in their lives. Alternatively, interviewees suggested respondents could feel lonely or isolated in their new locations, and feel limited in their opportunities to discuss their experiences in general—a motivation to take the survey (as an outlet)—this also was employed as an explanation as to why some chose to skip questions that provided less opportunity for them to explain their personal circumstances (such as demographic questions).

## **Discussion**

Interviewees’ responses to cognitive interviewing about their survey experience demonstrate how complexity and context can be missed by narrow answer options, and also how this unaccounted-for information about the refugee experience can lead to results that tell an incomplete story. The rigidity of assessment tools based on limited-answer options do not allow for responses with nuance, and this can limit data comprehension. The critical themes reported by interviewees to explain survey question non-response were instability (liminality), shame, and distrust. The primary theme reported by interviewees to explain the preference for choosing ‘other’ or otherwise writing-in answers when a multiple choice option was available, was a

desire to tell one's story—to be 'heard.' The fact that most of the interviewees gave the same explanations hints at the shared nature of their historical, socio-cultural, and contextual ties.

### **On Instability and Liminality**

One quarter of the survey respondents did not answer key questions, such as Q35 “Where are you now?”—preventing cross-country comparison of the data. When interviewees were asked why they thought survey participants chose not to answer this and other basic questions, some suggested the instability of their lives constrained their ability to report a single place, even momentarily:

“I wouldn't answer if I myself didn't know if I was staying in Germany. Maybe a person wanted to move to another country or return soon to Ukraine.” (Female, 39, Germany)
“Because we do not have stability, we sometimes do not understand that if we are talking about that location where we are, I can't say where we are either, I'm constantly on the move for a whole year, or maybe we are changing the place... We simply cannot tell you because today we are here, tomorrow we will be already in another country or in another city somewhere... we simply do not physically have a permanent place of residence.” (Female, 45, Poland)
“It's clear that a person didn't yet find a place where they could be...” (Female, 52, Sweden)
“Maybe it's because they don't know where you are, because you left, you were afraid.” (Female, 38, Germany)

Other respondents also cited the stress caused by wartime chaos as preventing them from being able to process any question in the first place, including whether they know where to receive medical care:

“Well, in order to answer questions, you need to think deeply. Maybe a person doesn't have the psychological (mental) energy to think now. You see, when a person is under stress, he is focused on himself, this is a painful experience to analyze for him, it can be once again traumatizing and hard...” (Female, 44, Sweden)
“When life changes so drastically at once, I believe that thinking deeply about how to get medical assistance would not be a person's first priority... When there was a lot of immigration, and there was a lot of uncertainty for me and the people I knew, we didn't even always know what country we were living in, whether or not we would get help here...” (Female, 49, Norway)

In their answers to the cognitive interview questions, the participants hint at the concept of liminality. The refugee-specific experience with states of limbo or liminality after displacement have been explored in anthropological and sociological research (Hartonen et al. 2022). Liminality was first described in the refugee context by Genep (1960) as occurring between a separation from the initial social context and followed by a 'reaggregation' into society with a changed social status. Next, Turner (1969) described refugees as 'threshold people' who fall between ambiguous or indeterminate positions typically outlined by law,

custom, convention, and ceremony. Migrants face various vulnerabilities due to their being without legal protections (International Organization for Migration 2019), though Ukrainian refugees were fortunate to be granted advantages under the EU Temporary Protection Directive, such as residence permits and access to social welfare, medical care, education, family reunification, banking services, and free movement within the EU (The Council of the European Union 2001). Even so, there is always the possibility of return to Ukraine, which may not be up to the refugees themselves, as the Temporary Protection Directive and/or war can end, and that type of liminality can have a negative effect on the mental health of refugees (Côté-Olijnyk et al. 2024). Either way, the state of ‘permanent temporariness’ imposed by separation from family and loss of opportunity (Carpi 2020; Menjivar 2006) along with many other emotional and practical struggles, could all still contribute to a sense of being unsettled, and therefore unable to answer questions with precision about the state of one’s life. Also, though some level of inclusion can be said to be provided by legally recognized permanent protection status, this has also been described as ‘incomplete inclusion’ since the protection is temporary, which can be stressful in its own right (all the protections could be revoked at any time, meanwhile home is still at war and life is still upended) (Abrego and Lakhani 2015).

This liminal state limits respondent ability to answer (with certainty) the question “Where are you now?” Researchers might otherwise miss this nuance without a qualitative component to explore why such a seemingly simple question would be otherwise left unanswered. Without the cognitive interviewing follow-up (or other opportunity for qualitative context), non-responders are recorded as being nowhere, so they become invisible as a consequence of methodological decisions (Saltsman and Majidi 2021)—a well-known problem in refugee research (Fiddian-Qasmiyeh 2020; Harrell-Bond and Voutira 2007; Polzer and Hammond 2008).

## On Shame

Interviewees cited stigma and shame as potential reasons for not answering survey questions, especially questions associated with leaving Ukraine, particularly for men.

“Because a lot of people think that if you left Ukraine, you are not a patriot, perhaps that is why some people do not want to indicate that they are not in Ukraine.” (Female, 45, Poland)
“If there were men among them, then they would not want to advertise their gender, because the question remains, how they left Ukraine.” (Female, 27, USA)
“Until now, many people do not display their location, where they are, so that friends do not judge. They are afraid of the opinions of others. [Some of my] acquaintances traveled abroad; her husband stayed in Ukraine, and she went abroad—she did not post any photos that she was abroad. Then she came back. And [others do] similar actions, probably, so that people do not condemn [them].…” (Male, 33, USA)

Participants expressed shame associated with leaving their motherland or loved ones behind in a time of war, and some indicated the social and legal expectations for men, in particular, to stay in Ukraine and fight. Ukraine’s “sex-selective” martial law (technically a cabinet decree), in place since the beginning of the 2022 invasion, prevents men between the ages of 18 and 60 to leave Ukraine (Waldie 2022). There are exemptions related to health status,

presence of minor children, or other special family or work circumstances (Qiblawi and Alvarado 2022), though, even men who left legally, having fallen under one of these exceptions, have still reported feeling shame (Harlan 2022). Outside of the legal requirements, social pressure from military generals and citizens alike emphasize the expectations for men to remain in Ukraine (Chevtayeva 2022; Maguire 2022; Stanton 2022). Connections can be made between these contemporary social pressures and historical ties to the Soviet Union, during which dedication to the ‘motherland’ was highly emphasized and there was a gendered character type of the “working mother” and an emphasized patriarchy particularly in terms of militarization and bureaucracy (Temkina and Zdravomyslova 2003). Even push-back, which has also been significant, has been met with shame-based and gendered criticism, such as when a petition criticizing the ban on men leaving Ukraine garnered 27,000 signatures, and Ukraine’s President Zelensky responded with: “Can we show this petition to parents who lost their sons to defend the country?” (Waldie 2022).

These concepts are important in research design with specific populations, such as Ukrainian refugees who face gender-based war-time restrictions. While researchers may make the logical assumption, that since fewer male Ukrainians are outside Ukraine—so fewer males participated in their survey—they may miss the fact that male participants were motivated by stigma or shame to withhold their gender entirely but nonetheless were represented in the survey data.

## On Distrust

In the unique context of Ukraine, both a post-Soviet state and a nation at war, secrecy is normalized and trust can be withheld. Survey participants suggested that distrust in the survey instrument/intention itself was a potential reason for participants choosing to consent to the survey but not actually answer questions.

<p>“Perhaps this is not some kind of test in the direction of help, but on the contrary, they somehow want to know some information collected. Because since the beginning of the war, we have been told in different ways that ‘do not send any of your data anywhere, to any applications.’ Maybe that's why they didn't want to.” (Female, 29, Norway)</p>
<p>“People have the experience that they shouldn’t share very personal information with people they don’t know.” (Male, 64, Austria-Ukraine)</p>
<p>“... When I talk to my friends on the phone... [about Ukraine], they are silent. They say: ‘We have no comment. You understand.’ Because they are told that everything is bugged, everything is recorded on the phone. They try to talk less about such things. I mean, maybe that's why a person didn't say where they were, because they were afraid that there would be some kind of persecution. But I don't think it's persecution from the Ukrainian side.” (Female, 38, Germany)</p>

The findings underscore how deeply rooted distrust is to the context of post-Soviet Ukraine. Secrecy became normalized based on censorship, mutual surveillance, and informant culture that was typical during the Soviet Union under state-sponsored mechanisms like the KGB and other intelligence agencies (Siddiqi 2023; Svenonius and Björklund 2018). This is only

exacerbated by the ongoing war in Ukraine, which certainly affects participation in research efforts. The reluctance of participants to disclose information, even after providing consent, reflects a broader cultural and psychological landscape where secrecy and caution are survival mechanisms. As participants noted, fears of surveillance, misuse of personal data, or misinterpretation of intentions are significant barriers to engagement.

Participants also claimed the nature of an anonymous survey meant that no potentially identifying information was expected of them, not even their gender:

“What does it matter where I am located? it doesn't matter.” (Female, 43, Norway)
“Anonymous means completely anonymous, you know, so I won't say who I am at all. A person is a person.” (Female, 42, Portugal)
“Well it shouldn't matter if I am a woman or a man, my opinion should be taken into account regardless of gender.” (Female, 39, Germany)

This distrust is particularly concerning for programmatic and policy interventions, as effective support for refugees and displaced populations relies on social trust, transparent communication, and collaboration between stakeholders. Research shows trust deficits hinder the development and implementation of responsive, sustainable solution (El-Bialy et al. 2022; Hall and Werner 2022; Hynes 2009; Strang and Ager 2010:201; Strang and Quinn 2021). Addressing these challenges requires a nuanced understanding of the historical and sociopolitical context, coupled with trust-building measures that prioritize participant safety, agency, and transparency.

## On Being Heard

Refugees expressed a desire to tell their story in a way that didn't overburden their loved ones and somehow also stayed private – they used the write-in response options of the survey as a way of doing that:

“They want to share. Perhaps no one asked him about his traumatic experience and he thinks ‘Oh, finally, I can tell at least someone!’” (Female, 44, Sweden)
“People did not choose an option, that means their option was not there. Their feelings were not considered, and they decided to share their experience.” (Female, 42, Sweden)
“They want to share. There is such a situation when you don't have anyone to tell what is happening to you, no one cares about you. There are people who move to small towns and they are the only Ukrainians there. They don't know the language, they don't know where to go, they don't know who to complain to, they don't know what to do, and that's why they participate in the survey” (Female, 42, Portugal)
“Maybe he has more information than is there or wants to tell more than what's on the answer-option list, or wants to talk more about his experience. He may feel that the list doesn't capture the extent of how he feels.” (Female, 39, Germany)
“Maybe they wanted to share, talk... Perhaps [where they are now] there is no such circle of communication as there was in Ukraine” (Female, 38, Hungary)
“Maybe what they wanted to say didn't fit into one short, specific answer.” (Female, 36, Sweden)

“At the beginning of the war, there were more emotions, emotions, and that's why they wanted to write more” (Male, 33, USA)
“Perhaps people had no one to share their situation with—in the way they wanted to, and thus wanted to convey information to someone. Perhaps you know, sometimes it is difficult to talk about it with relatives. So to type it on the computer to a stranger, the way you want to say it, can provide relief.” (Female, 29, Norway)
“I think that among those proposed there was no suitable option, or some suitable options seemed to them that it was not extensive, or not specific, or they did not think that it was this option and decided to explain. And maybe they needed to be heard.” (Female, 27, USA)
“Because everyone has their own story, and everyone probably wanted to tell it in their own way, from their own side.” (Female, 38, Germany)
“I think that every person has many nuances about what has happened, therefore, pre-prepared questions may not reflect the real picture of what is happening.” (Male, 64, Austria-Ukraine)
“Well from the very beginning, emotions were very high... Maybe people wanted to tell their pain, their fears, their horrors, what they went through... Maybe there is opportunity to speak...” (Female, 43, Norway)
“Because these options that were offered, they do not correspond to reality, they generally do not suit us emigrants, we have completely different criteria” (Female, 45, Poland)

Survey responses highlight the competing desires among refugees to share their personal stories and to maintain privacy, reflecting both the catharsis of being heard and the caution born of vulnerability. The write-in survey options provided a unique outlet for participants to express their experiences in a way that transcended the limitations of predefined answer choices, allowing them to share their emotions, fears, and stories authentically. This aligns with literature on the human need to narrate trauma as a means of processing and validating lived experiences, especially in situations where conventional social networks may be absent or strained. At the same time, participants' preference for anonymity underscores the balance between wanting to be understood and fearing exposure or judgment. The desire to avoid identifying details—such as location or gender—suggests a mistrust of systems or a reluctance to add further burdens to already complex personal narratives. Together, these findings reveal the importance of creating platforms that are flexible, empathetic, and sensitive to the nuanced needs of those sharing their stories, ensuring both safety and acknowledgment.

**Limitations**

Inherently missing from this study are explanations of survey response behavior by the individuals themselves who made the choices to skip questions or write in long and/or personal text responses when it was not requested or seemingly necessary. The 15 of the 91 survey respondents who participated in the Cognitive Interviews provided presumptions on the reasons behind the highlighted response behavior patterns—though the behaviors may not have been their own. This information is still insightful, though more personal decisions or influences related to those behaviors are missing. Also potentially absent are anything that wasn't directly asked about, such as political or ideological friction in new communities. Though an integral aspect to considerations of “belonging,” topics related to ideological or political fiction did not

arise naturally in the open-ended interview. Moreover, given the sensitivity of these issues - especially in the context of the Russo-Ukraine war—participants may have been hesitant to openly discuss political or ideological tensions, particularly in a recorded interview and research context. Cultural norms around privacy, historical legacies of secrecy in the region, and deeply ingrained concerns over surveillance or political repercussions (Svenonius and Björklund 2018) may have further influenced participants' willingness to share certain perspectives. As a result, some of the more complex sociopolitical dimensions of belonging and exclusion may remain unspoken, despite being critical to the resettlement experience.

## **Conclusion**

This research on survey response behavior by refugees from Ukraine was explored to inform survey instruments and data collection tools for greater data quality in insecure environments – and to encourage researchers to reflexively look back at survey response data and consider what it may have missed. Survey instruments could be restructured to welcome lengthy commentary, even if they also encourage respondents to pick a pre-supplied category, or researchers could add or strengthen a qualitative portion of their overall plan for data collection. The best option would be to supplement limited-answer option surveys with qualitative methods to elicit context-rich data (such as qualitative data from write-in responses, interviews, or alternative methods) (Abraham et al. 2020). While this may seem hard to scale for research with large populations, there are options to supplement with a subsection of the wider population of respondents (as was the case with the 91 respondents of the survey that is the basis for this study, supplemented by interviews with 15 of them); this has also been done in CATI-mediated research with refugees from Ukraine in Poland (Łączyński, Marcin et al. 2022) .

Though survey respondents were hesitant to provide identifying details, they appeared more willing to share what made their story unique or particularly challenging in the open-ended textboxes. This behavior reflected a preference for flexibility in how and what they shared, potentially offering insights into how refugees choose to engage with survey research. Cognitive interviews revealed that the survey provided a rare outlet for self-expression, especially for those who, as one interviewee explained, avoided sharing their experiences with loved ones to prevent adding to their emotional burden. While these observations are specific to this research, they align with trauma-informed survey design principles, which emphasize offering alternative response options to fixed-choice questions to foster greater autonomy, flexibility, and emotional safety (Johnson 2016; Ott et al. 2025). Although broader conclusions require further research, this study highlights the potential for open-ended questions to offer emotional value to respondents, particularly in studies involving trauma-affected populations.

The perceptions of refugees are a dual focus here, along with bringing awareness to potential assumptions of the researcher. This paper calls for more consideration regarding how research participants understand what is being asked of them and thus how they engage with it. More effort to consider the context of the research participants might significantly mediate the way they respond to the research questions or interact with the research tools. This also speaks to the cognizance of the researcher or research team regarding the sociocultural context of the study

population. In the case of this study, the PI has a family refugee background from Ukraine, local language skills, and relevant regional experience. This background and skill set enabled the PI to identify or at least initially be aware of a semblance of patterns regarding sociocultural context translating into idiosyncratic survey response behavior worth exploring further. This was in addition to engaging a research collaborator who was themselves from Ukraine. The Ukrainian collaborator, who assisted with translation and Ukrainian-language interviews, was able to use data from this study for their master's thesis—further amplifying the potential of this research initiative and effort (Bidovanets 2023). This type of inclusive research “describe[s how] engaging with those closest to the issue makes for better science and a greater impact,” and also emphasizes other aspects adopted in this study, such as paying research participants for their time and choosing to do research which has the potential for positive social impact (National Institute of Justice 2023). Thus, the author recommends future researchers undertake inclusive research and co-create study designs with people connected to the study population, such as by having similar backgrounds or contexts from which they can relate and maybe understand the study population.

Overall, this study suggests that the socio-historical complexity of people's lives should be considered in the design and process of research about people experiencing forced displacement, and research participants or co-creators should be provided the opportunity to express that complexity. As trauma-informed approaches gain traction across diverse fields (D'Andrea et al. 2013; Donisch, Bray, and Gewirtz 2016; Purtle 2020; Raja et al. 2015), there is a growing recognition that research practices, including survey design, must also adopt trauma-informed principles (Moreland-Capuia et al. 2023). While this is not an entirely new concept, the response patterns observed in this study—where refugees often bypassed limited-choice questions yet engaged deeply with open-ended textboxes to share personal narratives of trauma—serve as a reminder that traditional survey formats may unintentionally silence or constrain already-marginalized voices. As the interviewees in this study shared, there are many reasons why a survey respondent might choose not to answer a question; analytic approaches that merely mark non-answers as missing may themselves be missing a calling for a deeper probe. That exploration can provide insight, which may be especially relevant in refugee research, which the researcher(s) did not know to seek out in the first place. These non-answers, or other incongruencies with the research format as originally intended, may signal underlying emotions—such as shame, taboo, or personal desire/need—that point to deeper or more complex dynamics than the study initially anticipated or was designed to uncover. By bringing more awareness to this, this study encourages researchers to not just collect data from trauma-affected populations but to truly respect their agency—designing tools that acknowledge and accommodate the ways people want to tell their stories. As Irene Levin advises in her work *Silence, Memory, and Migration*, researchers must avoid contributing to the silencing that displaced people already experience at a macro level, and instead consider and recognize the significance of their silences (2013). Understanding these silent undercurrents is crucial, particularly in refugee research, as they may reveal unspoken struggles, social norms, or cultural influences that offer more profound insight into the refugee experience overall than the research could have initially hoped—or been designed—to uncover.

# **Chapter 2: A Sense of Belonging: Meaning and Barriers for Resettled Refugees from Ukraine (2022-2023)**

## **Abstract**

The concept of "belonging" encompasses political, social, and emotional dimensions that can significantly enhance health, illness, and healing—particularly for refugees, whose circumstances often expose them to exclusion, marginalization, and displacement. In the summer of 2022, an online survey explored the health experiences and migration-related decision-making of refugees from Ukraine following the February 2022 Russian invasion. Follow-up interviews with survey respondents explored the idea of "belonging," which appeared in write-in responses on the original survey. Participants highlighted various barriers to feeling a sense of inclusion or meaningful part of society, especially language challenges, that hindered their sense of connection. They also offered insights into how support programs could better foster a sense of belonging. These insights help to establish the importance of a sense of belonging in refugees' overall well-being and can help future interventions shape and enhance the experience of "belonging" for other refugees in their resettlement process.

## **Introduction**

For refugees, exclusion or non-belonging is a profound and multifaceted experience with far-reaching consequences for mental health, well-being, and ability to integrate into host communities. This is particularly evident in the case of Ukrainian refugees displaced by the Russian invasion, who were forced to flee their homeland rapidly, leaving behind loved ones, homes, and a sense of stability. Many Ukrainian families were separated, as most men were required to stay to fight, leaving women, children, and the elderly to navigate displacement alone. This separation, combined with the uncertainty of whether they would ever return home or see their loved ones again, has the potential to deeply disrupt a sense of self and community.

The disruption extends beyond emotional trauma to tangible difficulties in their new environments. Ukrainian refugees, scattered across Europe in a short time frame, have faced the daunting task of starting over—learning new languages, adapting to unfamiliar education systems, and rebuilding economic and social support networks. In such circumstances, the absence of belonging compounds these challenges, influencing their ability to access healthcare,

engage socially, and maintain their mental health. Non-belonging is a tangible, lived experience that undermines psychosocial health and health-seeking behavior.

Belonging involves being recognized and valued as a respected member of a community, which is entangled with the political, social, and emotional dimensions of health and healing (Mattes and Lang 2021). Without a sense of belonging, refugees can feel isolated and excluded, which can lead to anxiety and fear, shaping how social spaces are perceived and accessed (Sibley 1995). In contrast, belonging can also foster integration, life satisfaction, and psychological resilience (Song, Corcoran, and Zahnow 2024). Also, the shared experience of non-belonging can catalyze the creation of supportive spaces (Ahmed 2000), yet such spaces often remain inaccessible for refugees who face systemic barriers and societal exclusion.

The concept of belonging has been defined as the sharing of “... a history, values, and practices and, most importantly, to feel recognized and appreciated as a morally equivalent member of a community” (Grey 2010); it has also been referred to as embedded belonging, the “...understanding of the entanglements of the political, social, and affective dimensions of belonging and their effects on health, illness, and healing” (Mattes and Lang 2021). Social engagement supports psychological and physical well-being, cultivating feelings of integration and belonging. “Belonging itself consistently emerges as a positive factor, linked to better settlement experiences, life satisfaction, and psychological well-being” (Song et al. 2024). Thus, a sense of non-belonging is much more than an issue of loneliness, and instead a well-researched indicator hindering well-being.

The concept of embodied belonging offers a valuable lens for analyzing how refugees from Ukraine (2022-) navigate displacement, highlighting the social, political, and emotional dimensions that shape their experiences. For refugees, non-belonging extends beyond emotion—it materializes through structural barriers, alienation, and a loss of agency, all of which directly impact health and well-being. Refugees described these experiences as deeply disorienting, creating both emotional and physical strain (Mattes and Lang 2021). Displacement often leads to estrangement from familiar social and cultural networks, crucial sources of identity and support. Unfamiliar and unwelcoming environments can contribute to discomfort and alienation – by contrast, fostering a sense of belonging can mitigate these effects and support resilience. For refugees from Ukraine, the pervasive sense of displacement and uncertainty exacerbates these dynamics, creating a critical need to understand and address non-belonging. This context underscores the importance of exploring how belonging—or its absence—shapes refugees' access to healthcare, ability to rebuild their lives, and overall well-being in the aftermath of forced migration.

## **Study Objectives**

This paper explores how refugees from Ukraine experience belonging (or not) in new places of resettlement, and how and why that enhances or disturbs the migration and resettlement experience. It also posits the possibilities to improve on situations of non-belonging.

## **Theoretical Frameworks**

### **Social Cognitive Theory**

Albert Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (SCT) (2000) is an interpersonal level theory that emphasizes how people are both products and dynamic producers of their social systems. The theory utilizes a Reciprocal Determinism construct based on behavior being a result of the personal and environmental factors that all constantly influence each other. The theory focuses on how personal agency "enable[s] people to play a part in their self-development, adaptation, and self-renewal with changing times"—a fitting theory to apply to research on refugee behavior. The theory lauds "agentic action" and all its potential for people to accomplish incredible feats and overcome obstacles, but also explains "underminers of efficacy," which can stand in the way of human potential (Bandura 2000). These underminers stem from contemporary challenges related to global politics and economics. Bandura cites mass migration as one of these conditions that can contribute to social fragmentation and increase the demand on migrants to both manage their roles in their larger society while maintaining ties to their ethnic subculture. This is certainly the case for refugees who can face many constraints in the same context as they are receiving support. Refugee social exclusion presents a barrier to accessing medical care. This theory is based on people actively interpreting and demonstrating processes of cognition (such as conceptions, judgment, and motivation) based on the outcomes of their actions, and then transmuting that learning into future behavior (Schunk and Usher 2012). This could be used to explain how refugees who have social experiences that make them feel excluded might become less likely to seek care when they believe their new society perceives them in a negative manner (Bandura 2000).

## **Materials and Methods**

### **Methodology**

A qualitative text analysis was conducted using interview transcripts from a mixed-method study that included both survey and interview components. The study began with an online survey consisting primarily of limited-answer questions, some of which included an "Other" write-in option. Analysis of these write-in responses revealed emerging themes related to belonging, which informed the development of subsequent interview questions. The interviews were conducted in an open-ended format, allowing participants to elaborate on their experiences and emotions beyond direct questioning. To ensure the findings were theoretically grounded and participant-driven, exemplar quotes were selected from the transcripts to illustrate key themes and their alignment with established literature on belonging.

## **Participant Recruitment**

Participants for the interview were recruited through an initial online survey during summer 2022 (June-September). The survey was designed in Qualtrics in Ukrainian, Russian, and English, and posted (including a project description and links to an associated website and Instagram and Twitter accounts), on 23 Facebook groups that referenced refugees from Ukraine (ex. “Ukrainian Refugees in Spain”).

The follow-up interviews were conducted from February to March 2023 (six months after survey data collection ended). Interviewees were recruited through a second survey link (maintaining anonymity of the original survey) at the end of the survey, inviting survey respondents to provide their contact information if they were interested in a follow-up interview with a \$25.00 incentive. Incentives were offered to increase interest and engagement with the survey. At the time of sign-up, respondents could select their preferred language (Ukrainian, Russian, or English). In January 2023 invitations with links to a calendar-scheduling platform were sent by email to those who signed up, as well as through social messaging tools, based on preferences indicated in the online sign-up tool. Both the invitations and the calendar-scheduling platform were available in Ukrainian, Russian, and English with associated study information and a link to the study website (participants received this information in the language they indicated at the time of signing-up). Interview questions were based on the survey results, written initially in English and then translated to Ukrainian and Russian and tested with native speakers for comprehension. The Russian-language interviews were conducted by a PhD-student (the author), who was trained in motivational interview and experienced in leading interviews on numerous previous studies; the Ukrainian-language interviews were conducted by a Master of Public Health student (“research collaborator”) from Ukraine (with training and observation by the author).

The interview tool was tested on native speakers (Ukrainian, Russian) for cultural and language comprehension, adjusted, and re-tested, before implementation. Interviews were recorded using the Zoom platform while the software Ava synchronously created spoken language (Russian or Ukrainian) and live translated (English) transcripts. To make up for transcription software error, the recorded interviews were manually corrected by the author and research collaborator. Interpretation occurred in cases where direct translation between English and Ukrainian or Russian was not possible, with decisions confirmed by native speakers as needed.

The recruitment method used in this study (sharing the survey link via Facebook groups for refugees from Ukraine), cannot necessarily produce a representative or random sample of the population from Ukraine as a whole. Instead, this study maximizes a small sample size (n=91 survey response, and n=15 interviewees) to apply long-form interviewing methodology as a means of exploring how sociocultural factors influence survey response.

## **Questions on Belonging**

In the interviews participants were asked (Q12) “...how do/did you feel about your place in the new society?” and “How you feel in terms of “belonging” in the society you live in now?” In Russian and Ukrainian there is no direct translation for the word belonging, so the question was explained as (Russian) “как вы относитесь к своему месту в новом обществе?” and “Чувствуете ли вы что являетесь частью общества, в котором вы живете сейчас?” and (Ukrainian) “...як Ви сприймаєте своє місце в новому суспільстві?” and “Чи відчуваєте ви себе частиною суспільства, в якому живете зараз?” which directly translate (in both languages) as “how do you relate to your place in your new society” and “do you feel a part of the society in which you now live?” If interviewees answered that they did not feel like they belong, they were asked “Is there something that could change that?” If interviewees asked for clarification about this the dimensions of this concept, or did not seem to understand, it was explained with the following questions, depending on the context of the interviewees’ response: “Do you have friends or a social life?” “Do you have someone you can go to for help if you need it?” “Do you have someone you feel you can talk to about personal or private matters?” “Do you feel people have sympathy for your situation (especially related to Ukraine)?” “Do you feel like people you see regularly (neighbors, colleagues, others) care about you?”

## **Text Analysis Approach**

To explore themes of belonging and non-belonging among refugees from Ukraine, the interview data were analyzed using an inductive thematic approach. The interviews were both recorded and automatically transcribed in their original Russian or Ukrainian languages. Errors in the automated transcripts were corrected following a relistening of each recorded interview, then translated into English while preserving linguistic and cultural nuances. When linguistic expressions lacked direct translations, discussions with native speakers (including the research collaborator) helped interpret culturally embedded meanings, ensuring that the sociolinguistic context of interviewees remained intact.

An Excel table was used to systematically organize the data, with each interviewee represented in a row and thematic categories assigned to columns. The thematic categories were identified using (field) notes taken during the interview process as well as through the relistening, transcription-fixing, and translation steps. This structure facilitated the identification of emerging themes and patterns, including potential demographic influences on participants' experiences, as demographic qualities were also included in the Excel table in each interviewee's row. This structured yet flexible approach allowed for both cross-comparative analysis and the preservation of individual narratives.

## **Results**

Of the 15 interviewees (Table 3), only one expressed feeling a sense of belonging in their resettlement community, distinguishing them as an outlier among participants. This individual was English-speaking and resettled in the USA with their family, where they could speak the local language fluently. This person chose to conduct the interview in English, even though they had initially signed up for a Ukrainian-language interview. Their ability (and choice) to

communicate effectively in English likely played a significant role in their integration, as it removed language as a barrier to forming connections and accessing services. Furthermore, they were actively involved in a local Ukrainian church, which provided them with a strong sense of community and cultural familiarity, blending ties to both their Ukrainian heritage and their new environment.

In contrast, the remaining 14 interviewees reported feeling disconnected from their new communities. They lacked local friends or trusted individuals for support or confiding and cited language barriers as a significant obstacle to building relationships, accessing services, or feeling integrated into their new environments. Several noted that, despite locals showing kindness or sympathy, they could sense a lack of genuine acceptance, which further deepened their feelings of exclusion. For some, the idea of belonging seemed unattainable, with a few stating that the only way to restore their sense of home and connection would be to return to Ukraine. Others, however, expressed hope, suggesting that learning the local language, gaining recognition for their education credentials, and finding opportunities for meaningful work could help them feel more connected and foster a sense of belonging in their place of resettlement.

**Table 3. Interviewee Demographics**

Chosen Interview Language	Gender	Marital Status	Location	Age Range	Caring for Minor Children	Ethnic Origin	Religions	Sexual Identity
8 Ukrainian 7 Russian	2 Male 13 Female	9 Married 2 Single 3 Divorced 1 Other: "cat and dog"	5 Sweden 3 Norway 2 Germany 1 USA 1 Portugal 1 Hungary 1 Poland 1 Returnee to Ukraine after Seeking Asylum in Austria	27, 29, 33, 36, 38, 38, 39, 42, 42, 44, 45, 49, 52, 53, 64	8 Yes 7 No	14 Ukrainian 1 Syrian	13 Christian 1 Jewish 1 Atheist	14 Heterosexual 1 "married to a woman"

Notes:

4. Chosen Interview Language: Of the 8 people who chose to do the survey in Ukrainian, one preferred English during the actual interview and another preferred to hear Ukrainian but respond in Russian. A total of 3 interviewees said they spoke English fluently and one spoke Arabic fluently.
5. Marital Status: Even when directly asked about their marital status, one respondent chose to answer in an idiosyncratic way: "cat and dog"
6. Sexual Identity: This respondent chose not to identify their sexual identity, and instead state that they were married to a woman

These responses suggest a persistent, possibly culturally influenced, preference for nonconformity or expressive individuality when answering demographic questions.

# Discussion

## Language as a Barrier

Language emerged as one of the most significant barriers to belonging, shaping both practical integration and emotional inclusion. Many respondents described how their inability to communicate fluently in the host society's language created profound social and institutional challenges, leaving them feeling alienated and disempowered. One participant noted, *"Until now, I cannot feel that I belong, because the big obstacle is the lack of knowledge of the language."* Language operates here not only as a tool for interaction but also as a boundary that signals who belongs within a community. For refugees, the inability to speak the dominant language reinforces structural vulnerability, or *"positionality that imposes physical/emotional suffering on specific population groups and individuals in patterned ways"* (Quesada, Hart, and Bourgois 2011).

Structural inadequacies in language training further compound this issue. One respondent lamented, *"They tell us that they teach us the language, but they cover 30 hours of language learning in 2-3 months. How can we learn a language for [only] 30 hours in 8 weeks?"* This highlights systemic gaps that reflect broader dynamics of non/belonging, where exclusion manifests not just socially but also through insufficient institutions (Mattes and Lang 2021). Even in multilingual environments, the symbolic significance of language serves as a dividing line. One participant described feeling excluded during informal interactions at work: *"Here, people will talk to each other in Swedish during breaks, even if they know you don't speak it."* This participant was fluent in English, which helped them obtain work in their place of resettlement (Sweden), but were still excluded due to not knowing the local language. These dynamics highlight how the presence or absence of belonging has the power to create intimate, exclusionary, and even violent divides (Wright 2015).

Language barriers also have direct implications for health and well-being. Non/belonging undermines health by shaping how individuals navigate healthcare systems (Mattes and Lang 2021). Refugees who lack fluency often struggle to advocate for themselves or access appropriate services, leading to further marginalization and health disparities. This underscores the importance of addressing language as a critical determinant of integration and well-being.

## Time and Effort Required for Integration

For many, language acquisition was seen as one part of the greater time and effort required for integration. One respondent explained, *"To be a part of society, it seems to me that you need to live here for 5 years, 10 years, learn the language well, understand the nuances."* This aligns with how non/belonging is a complex, continuous, and dynamic process, shaped by multiple factors including structural and personal elements (Mattes and Lang 2021). Another participant remarked, *"It will take two years to study the language very well to somehow become*

*a full-fledged member of society.*" Belonging was widely described here as a process that unfolds over time, requiring sustained effort and adaptation. This underscores the need for inclusive policies that actively facilitate integration, particularly for refugees from Ukraine, to address both immediate and long-term challenges (Kulhánová et al. 2024).

## **Cultural and Social Differences**

Cultural dissonance amplified feelings of alienation among respondents, who frequently encountered challenges in navigating the norms and traditions of their host societies. One participant reflected, *"They have a lot of traditions, they have a different mentality in general. Sometimes I don't understand them."* This resonates with Wise's (2010) notion of "affective dissonance," which arises when unfamiliar environments create a mismatch between individuals' embodied memories and their day-to-day sensory experiences. Over time, such dissonance can lead to a profound sense of estrangement, which may harm both mental and physical health (Lems 2014).

For some respondents, engaging with cultural practices was viewed as essential for belonging. One participant noted, *"To feel like a part of society, you need to...understand the culture, understand the traditions, understand why they do this and not that."* This aligns with Mattes and Lang's concept of embodied belonging, which emphasizes the interplay of social, moral, and sensorial dimensions of belonging (Mattes and Lang 2021). However, not all respondents aspired to this level of integration. One individual stated, *"I feel part of my family, but not part of this society. And I do not want that. I'm fine like this."* This perspective highlights how individuals navigate the boundaries of belonging by prioritizing personal and familial connections over societal inclusion, reflecting the flexibility of the concept (Wright 2015).

Perceived exclusionary attitudes deepened feelings of disconnection. One respondent observed, *"They support us, but they will be happy when we leave. Sweden is for Swedes, and they don't want Ukrainians."* This statement reflects a dynamic in which the power to define belonging rests with the local population, aligning with the "politics of belonging," where social position and power intersect to determine who is considered an insider (Yuval-Davis 2006). Such perceptions can hinder both social and emotional integration, reinforcing patterns of marginalization.

## **Employment, Education, and Personal Contribution**

Employment emerged as a critical pathway to belonging, offering refugees not only economic stability, along with a sense of agency and recognition. One participant articulated this clearly: *"To feel like a part of society, you need to understand your contribution to this society."* Work offers a means of asserting one's value and becoming embedded within local networks, which research has shown to be essential for resettlement and life satisfaction (Disney, McPherson, and Jamal 2021; Song et al. 2024).

However, systemic barriers often prevented refugees from fully participating in the labor market. One respondent shared, *"Personal realization in a career of some kind [would help]. But when you arrive, in Ukraine you have a diploma, but here – nothing."* Another interviewee voiced deep frustration over the non-recognition of their educational qualifications in their country of resettlement, pessimistically remarking that *"the moon would fall"* before their credentials would be acknowledged. This non-recognition of qualifications limits economic opportunities, undermines refugees' sense of identity and purpose, and, in the case of the latter respondent, leads to feelings of disillusionment about future prospects and a sense of being undervalued within the host society. Such barriers align with structural vulnerabilities that disproportionately affect displaced populations. A loss of past identity associated with the education and career one worked for can certainly erode one's sense of worth. research has also found that migrants have been seen as, or can themselves feel, less-deserving of state benefits like health care if they are limited in their ability to contribute to their host society context through legal work (Willen 2012).

Despite these challenges, many respondents emphasized the symbolic importance of even small contributions. One individual stated, *"I have a dream to contribute to society by paying taxes... I see it as part of being a responsible citizen. When I arrived here, I quickly found a job. I went to school as a parent, attending for about two weeks. Then the school director said, 'I'd like to hire you, but you don't have the proper documents.' I replied, 'Alright, how can we resolve this?' The director suggested that I continue volunteering for now, and we'd figure out the payment later. So we agreed—not about money initially, but about time and commitment. Now, of course, I pay taxes because I'm officially part of the system. I'm a contributing member of society, making an impact. I also help Ukrainians here with organizational matters, especially when questions or challenges arise. In these cases, the director often involves me to assist in finding solutions."* This underscores how economic and other contributory participation can foster a sense of inclusion, usefulness, and shared responsibility, as well as feeling needed. Such acts of engagement, however modest, can serve as resources for resilience and healing, enabling individuals to reclaim a sense of agency and belonging (Mattes and Lang 2021). That said, and though that interviewee worked, paid taxes, and spoke English—allowing them to find a job quickly—they still ultimately expressed lacking a sense of belonging, as their diploma wasn't recognized and they couldn't speak the local language.

## **Social Networks and Support Systems**

Social connections were a cornerstone of belonging for many respondents, offering vital emotional and practical support. Structured environments such as workplaces, religious institutions, and community programs often serve as entry points for building relationships. One participant noted that their social connections came *"From work, those who work with me. And from the church, respectively,"* highlighting how these spaces can create a sense of stability and inclusion. Another person, in responding to where they found a sense of belonging or social connection, said, *"I started getting to know others, taking part in various programs, and then they offered me to be the head of cultural programs."* The fact that the refugees accessed social

programs that they had some familiarity with, from Ukrainian cultural activities to their religious backgrounds, implies they found community in what was familiar to them. These experiences may indicate emotional and social support emerged through supportive networks, aligning with findings that such supportive networks can help reduce acculturative stress and improve mental health outcomes (Baeza-Rivera et al. 2022).

Family also played a critical role in fostering belonging. One respondent stated that their sense of belonging comes from their family: *"Most of all it is family—husband, children, and our friend...besides them, there is very few."* While family ties may not directly alleviate emotional distress, they can enhance psychological quality of life by providing continuity and stability (Green et al. 2013; Song et al. 2024). However, the absence of broader social connections often left respondents feeling isolated, with one individual observing, *"I see that my children are already more integrated than I am."* This generational gap reflects the layered and dynamic nature of belonging, as family members may experience integration at varying paces with different challenges for different age groups (Berry and Annis 1974; Suárez-Orozco, Todorova, and Louie 2002; Yuval-Davis 2006).

## Conclusion

The experience of non-belonging among refugees, particularly those displaced by conflict, reveals profound and intersecting challenges that extend beyond individual struggles to systemic and structural dimensions. Ukrainian refugees, forced to flee their homeland after the Russian invasion, exemplify how displacement disrupts not only physical spaces but also deeply held social, cultural, and emotional connections. Their separation from familiar environments, loved ones, and roles within their communities has left many navigating a precarious and unfamiliar existence, often without the support or tools necessary to rebuild their lives. This disruption has tangible effects, influencing their ability to access services, form relationships, and maintain mental and physical health.

Non-belonging is not simply a passive state of being, it actively shapes refugees' behaviors, perceptions, and interactions with their new environments. Non-belonging is inscribed in the body, manifesting as disorientation, alienation, loss of agency, and other challenges (Mattes and Lang 2021). Refugees' experiences of systemic exclusion—whether through language barriers, unrecognized qualifications, or implicit societal attitudes—compound this, leaving them feeling marginalized and undervalued. The interplay of these factors not only hinders integration but also exacerbates mental health challenges, creating a cycle where exclusion fuels anxiety, which in turn reinforces withdrawal from societal participation (Crawford et al. 2023; Nguyen et al. 2024). This dynamic echoes Bandura's Social Cognitive Theory (2000), which posits that human behavior is shaped by reciprocal interactions between personal, behavioral, and environmental factors. For refugees, negative feedback from their environment—whether in the form of exclusionary attitudes or inaccessible systems—diminishes their sense of agency and motivation.

Interviewees in this study underscored how belonging operates on multiple levels: social, cultural, political and structural. They identified language as a key barrier, not only as a means of communication but as a marker of inclusion. Limited language ability was coupled with limited language-learning support; language-based exclusion included both social and employment opportunities which reinforced an outsider status. These linguistic barriers, coupled with unfamiliar cultural practices and perceived hostility, deepened their sense of exclusion. Still, interviewees did say they felt a sense of community, but it was typically with other Ukrainians through church, therapy groups, or through long-distance relationships with family still in Ukraine or abroad. This hints at the power of social networks which, when available, act as critical lifelines, providing both emotional and practical support (Espinoza et al. 2023). However, as nearly all interviewees expressed a lack of belonging in their place of resettlement—despite many forming connections with other Ukrainians—it appears that social networks could be more effective if they include diverse and locally embedded relationships with members of the host community. However, this can be challenging when refugees do not speak the local language, limiting their ability to communicate, and when adults have few opportunities to engage with peers in professional settings that resemble their previous work environments.

Employment emerged as a potential pathway to reclaiming belonging, offering a means for refugees to contribute and feel recognized. Yet systemic barriers, such as the non-recognition of foreign qualifications, left many unable to access meaningful work. This not only hindered their economic stability but also eroded their sense of purpose and self-worth. Conversely, those who were able to participate in the labor market or contribute through volunteerism or paying taxes, expressed a greater sense of integration and agency, though they still lacked a full sense of belonging.

Time and sustained effort were frequently cited as prerequisites for belonging, with respondents emphasizing that integration requires years of adaptation, learning, and interaction. Yet the prolonged nature of this process often left individuals in a state of liminality, neither fully included nor entirely excluded. This underscores the need for policies and systems that actively facilitate integration, addressing barriers at every level—from language training and employment opportunities to social support and cultural orientation. By fostering inclusive environments, host societies can not only mitigate the effects of non-belonging but also access the potential of refugees as active and valued members of their communities (Council of Europe 2023).

Ultimately, the concept of belonging must be understood as both a lived experience and a structural condition, shaped by the intersections of social, political, and emotional dimensions. For many refugees, this sense of belonging remains fragile, constantly undermined by the uncertainty of their future (Hartonen et al. 2022). This persistent state of limbo has the potential to further strain their mental health (Côté-Olijnyk et al. 2024), as it can foster social withdrawal, mistrust in institutions, and emotional detachment: individuals hesitate to invest in communities they may ultimately have to leave. Support efforts often focus solely on the “key domains of integration... employment, housing, education and health” (Ager and Strang 2008), overlooking the psychological toll of uncertainty and the systemic barriers that perpetuate exclusion. The

findings of this study make this gap clear: almost none of the surveyed refugees reported a genuine sense of belonging, despite all the support they are receiving. This absence reflects missed opportunities—refugees remain in limbo, while host communities lose out on the resilience, skills, and cultural richness that can be offered through the full participation of newcomers. To cultivate diverse, stable, and cohesive societies of the future, policy and support programs must address belonging as a central element, not a secondary consideration.

## **Chapter 3: Building Belonging: A Critical Look at Nature-Based Interventions for Health and Social Support for Refugees and Migrants (Insights and Cautions from Norwegian *Friluftsliv* Integration Efforts)**

### **Abstract**

Refugees can struggle to maintain good health and feel social connection during resettlement. Nature-based interventions have been successfully applied to address the same cadre of symptoms for many non-migrant sub-populations, but not refugees. In Norway, a unique cultural concept known as *friluftsliv* has been applied to refugee and migrant social support programming. The *friluftsliv* programs for refugees are publicized with great enthusiasm, though their actual effect on health and wellness does not seem to have been studied. That being said, encouraging refugees to interact with nature in social groups or as part of a local, socialized tradition seems to have a lot of positive potential based on the well-known, health-promoting powers of nature and inclusive support practices. While few studies have inquired about Norwegian *friluftsliv* program experiences with participant migrants and refugees themselves, it seems that none have queried the service providers who mediate them. The perspective of these service providers can help add knowledge about the intent and reality of such initiatives and provide insight into how they can be adapted globally to provide social support and promote health and wellness of refugees.

### **Introduction**

#### **Refugees and Nature Experiences: An Overlooked Subpopulation**

Refugees are a missing subpopulation in the prolific academic literature about the wide-ranging health and social support benefits of time spent with or in nature. Such research has fallen under several categories including Nature-Based Interventions (NBIs), Nature-Based

Activities (NBAs), Interaction(s) with Nature (INs), and Nature-Assisted Therapy (NAT). These terms reflect nuanced distinctions based on the intentions and structures of the programs: NBIs, NBAs, and INs encompass varying approaches to using nature to boost well-being, typically for specific sub-populations; Nature-Assisted Therapy focuses more on “...therapeutic intervention[s] targeting the need of a special population, where the natural environment is specially designed or specially chosen for the specific therapeutic activity” (Jensen, Caludi, and Nilsson 2010; Poulsen, Stigsdotter, and Refshage 2015). Refugees, however, a group recognized by many humanitarian agencies, governments, non-governmental organizations, and advocacy groups as needing both social support and at risk of facing health inequities, have not been researched as beneficiaries in relation to such programs (hereinafter referred to as Nature Experiences, NEs).

## **The Norwegian Context: Friluftsliv and Its Cultural Significance**

In Norway specifically, society has embraced the benefits of time spent in nature to such an extent that there is a unique Norwegian concept for it called *friluftsliv*. *Friluftsliv* is embedded in Norwegian culture, rhetoric, and law (“*Friluftsløven*,” a legal act relating to outdoor recreation, was first passed in 1957) (Flemsæter, Setten, and Brown 2015). *Friluftsliv*, translates literally to “free air life.” The word was first published by one of Norway’s most famous playwrights, Henrik Ibsen, in his poem “On the Heights” (“På vidderne”) in 1859, but the concept has been a cultural component of Norwegian life, in distinct forms, for more than 5000 years (Elgvin 2009; TEDx Talks 2018). In its first use by Ibsen, the word is used in a critical way, to contrast the freedom of solitude in nature with the stifling norms and expectations of life in society (Elgvin 2009). Today that critical implication is long forgotten; instead, it is a cheery, arguably commercialized (Margaryan 2017), concept. There are countless *friluftsliv* organizations and initiatives, there is even an official webpage on it maintained by the Norwegian government (Miljøverndepartementet 2006). The concept is not limited to nature, and is instead referred to as a “...whole philosophy... a way of life” (Innovation Norway 2024), highlighting its expansive scope. Refugees to Norway are even said to be systematically introduced to *friluftsliv*, with the intent to increase their social inclusion (Anderson and Setten 2023). This communal framing may surprise readers from cultures where outdoor recreation is often seen as a type of athleticism, with solitary or escapist connotations. Instead, in Norway, *friluftsliv* is generally seen as an equitable avenue for embracing the values of Norwegian land and society. So where better to look for the application of NEs as a means of refugee-related support, than Norway?

Norway’s *friluftsliv* eco-philosophy is deeply embedded in its broader culture, and the country has a strong track record of applying it to migrant integration. Norwegian philosopher Arne Næss, a pioneer of deep ecology, developed the concept of ecosophy—a philosophy that intertwines social responsibility with environmental protection. The Platform Principles of the movement state that “all living beings have intrinsic value” and that “the diversity and richness of life have intrinsic value” (Drengson, Devall, and Schroll 2011). Though Næss was advocating more for the diversity and value of non-human (plant, animal, earth) life, the concepts fits well with the way offering *friluftsliv* activities to migrants is understood in Norway as offering support (whether the migrant themselves sees it that way or not). Though critique is certainly possible and viable, the role of time spent engaging in the outdoors not only shapes Norway’s cultural identity but also offers a framework for inclusive initiatives, by emphasizing shared

values of community, well-being, and respect for nature. With the right approach, the broader benefits of NEs can be harnessed for refugees in other contexts, with potential inspiration from the Norwegian *friluftsliv* model.

## **The Documented Benefits of Nature Experiences (NEs)**

Interventions and research which leverage NEs are typically intended to prevent illness, promote wellbeing and treat specific physical, mental or social health and wellbeing conditions. These can be mildly-interventionist, such as adding plants to elderly homes, or can permanently alter the physical environment, such as through construction or installation of greenspaces (Shanahan et al. 2019). The overwhelming, documented benefits of NEs include social support (such as improved relationships, positive impacts on communities, increased trust, and increased social engagement, interaction, and connectedness), health benefits (such as improved sleep, improved psychological condition, improved cognitive functioning, success in reaching mental health treatment goals, increased physical activity, reduction of depression severity, reduction in blood pressure levels, improved memory and attention, improved immune system function, and reduction in stress and anxiety), and overall wellness (such as cultivating a sense of purpose). These were the conclusions of single studies and literature reviews on NEs for the elderly (Catissi et al. 2024; Gagliardi and Piccinini 2019; Sia et al. 2020), prison inmates (Toews, Wagenfeld, and Stevens 2018), the elderly in prisons (Farrier, Baybutt, and Sayers 2024), veterans with PTSD (Poulsen et al. 2015), people with hypertension (Ideno et al. 2017), cancer patients (Morris et al. 2021; Song et al. 2022), cancer survivors (Ray and Jakubec 2014; Timko Olson et al. 2023), cancer caregivers (Lehto et al. 2021), people in institutional settings more broadly (hospitals, care homes, prisons) (Moeller et al. 2018; Sterckx et al. 2024) and those in institutional settings with dementia (de Boer et al. 2017), postpartum women and parents (Hall et al. 2024; Peters et al. 2020; South et al. 2021), workplace employees (Daniels et al. 2022; Gritzka et al. 2020), people with clinical depression (Gonzalez et al. 2011; Hyvönen et al. 2023; Joschko et al. 2023; Owens and Bunce 2022; Rosa et al. 2023), children with ADHD (Hood and Baumann 2024; Stevenson, Schilhab, and Bentsen 2018), people living in “socio-economically deprived communities” (Harrison et al. 2023) and in public/social housing (Houle et al. 2017; Snep et al. 2023), people with stress-related illness (Johansson, Juuso, and Engström 2022), university students (Boyd and Brindley 2023; Rakow and Ibes 2022; Vitagliano et al. 2023), vulnerable youth (Overbey, Diekmann, and Lekies 2023), adolescent girls (Wiens et al. 2021), and more. None of the studies, however, focus on or otherwise specify that they included refugees.

Besides providing physical and emotional health benefits, NEs can also help refugees build connections to their place of resettlement. This is supported in the literature in the concepts of “affective place-making” and “embedded geographies,” as ways that engagement with physical environments could lead to a positive sense of ownership. Affective place-making describes “actively creating positive affective ties to place through sensorial practices... [that] can equally contribute to people’s sense of belonging and well-being” (Sibley 1995), while embedded geographies develop through “...engaging in a meaningful relationship with place through particular strategies [that access the space,] ... which provide marginalized people with a sense of agency, security, and confidence” (Dilger, Kasmani, and Mattes 2018). Meaningful relationship making with places can lead to place attachment and then a desire to maintain and care for that place (“place stewardship”), and these associations can enhance psychological

well-being and promote resilience through continuity (Scannell et al. 2019). The relationship between people and places are also key to social and community resilience (Berkes and Ross 2013; Maclean, Cuthill, and Ross 2014), and part of this comes from a sense of enchantment with one's natural environment (Herman 2015). This building of connection to place can also create a sense of belonging which, in turn, can foster "a readiness to give and contribute to the interests of those who co-constitute a social collective" (Grey 2010), suggesting that when refugees feel connected to their new environment, they also contribute socially and economically to Norwegian society. In these ways, NEs can go beyond immediate health benefits, serving as powerful tools for fostering deeper emotional ties to resettlement contexts, which can strengthen social cohesion, promote mutual understanding, support more inclusive and resilient communities, and increase engagement between refugees and their new social contexts.

## **Friluftsliv and Refugees in Norway: Initiatives and Critiques**

There are many efforts to engage immigrants in Norway in *friluftsliv*, documented in media, reports about past projects, and a few studies critiquing these programs. These activities fall under what is more typical for Norwegian culture conceptions of *friluftsliv* rather than covering the wide range of NEs that are showcased in the interventionist studies in other countries. The Norwegian *friluftsliv* version of outdoor activities have greater emphasis on interaction with the wild outdoors, such as hiking, skiing, mountaineering, angling, camping, and foraging for wild foods. Organized sports have also been argued to qualify as *friluftsliv* by some as well, but even the argument is contentious—not just anything can count as *friluftsliv* (Gurholt and Broch 2019). Some of the most publicized of these initiatives were organized by *Den Norske TuristForening's* (DNT; The Norwegian Trekking Organization), the Governmental Agency for Integration and Diversity (IMDi), the Norwegian Red Cross (NoRC), local NGOs, and Norwegian municipalities, but most seem to be one-time affairs. One long-standing event, "Til topps!" ("All the way to the mountain peak!"), specifically invited people with immigrant backgrounds to climb the country's highest peak, Galdhøpiggen. This event, led by NoRC in collaboration with the other organizations, occurred 11 times from 2006 to 2018 (Røde Kors n.d.). There are also accounts of *friluftsliv* initiatives organized for refugees by asylum centers and other community organizations. The topic of migrants engaging in *friluftsliv* in Norway is prolific.

Though popular and prolific, there is also important criticism to consider on the applications of Norwegian *friluftsliv* for migrant and refugee integration. First and foremost, Norwegian *friluftsliv* reflects a majority cultural lens that has been criticized for being normative and erasing Indigenous and migrant perspectives. In their refugee and migrant-focused offerings, *friluftsliv* programs often focus more on the resultant cultural integration implied through engaging in *friluftsliv* than the health and wellness benefits associated with typical NE interventions. In her dissertation "Making 'Good Citizens' in the Norwegian Outdoors? Friluftsliv as a citizen-making project in refugee integration initiatives," Sarah Anderson concluded that unwritten rules and regulations of *friluftsliv* impose normative parameters on how nature should be experienced, particularly for refugees (Anderson and Setten 2023; Flemsæter et al. 2015). In his thesis "Social inclusion & integration: The process of redefining the identity of reception centers in Norway," Lee Cheng-Han concluded that integration-focused nature activities do not address the most critical needs of asylum seekers, which include knowledge of local language, addressing trauma, and forming connections with Norwegians—and how, in fact,

these activities can be isolating without language knowledge and when they only include other asylum seekers (Cheng-Han 2020).

Other relevant criticisms related to the normative cultural aspects of *friluftsliv* programs overlap with the differences between Norwegian dominant culture and Indigenous Sámi perspectives. The traditional (and often contemporary) Sámi world view emphasizes the inherent, everyday connection between humans and nature—their worldview emphasizes a deep interdependence between humans and the land, rejecting the notion of nature as something external that people must be 'exposed' to (Skille, Pedersen, and Skille 2023). Sámi perspectives challenge the Norwegian *friluftsliv* understanding of nature as a space to be used for a certain purpose (resources, activity) rather than the landscape of every-day life (Muotka 2025). Contemporary Norwegian *friluftsliv*, on the other hand, frames nature as a separate, often recreational, space distinct from social and work life (Skille et al. 2023). This contrast can be traced back to the origins of the term *friluftsliv*, which, as previously mentioned, first appeared in Henrik Ibsen's poem *På vidderne* (Elgvin 2009). In Ibsen's framing, nature becomes an escape from the confinements of ordinary life (Sturtevant 1910), in contrast to the Sámi perspective, where human life is inherently woven into nature rather than separate from it. Considering the assimilation history of the Sámi people in Norway, this is an important criticism to consider in terms of how outdoor engagement policies and practices may unintentionally reinforce cultural dominance and limit inclusive approaches to NEs. When applied to refugee integration, these culturally normative frameworks shape how NEs are designed and implemented—often positioning refugees as outsiders who need to be *introduced* to nature in ways aligned with dominant Norwegian cultural values. This approach risks overlooking the diverse relationships that refugees may already have with nature (Kloek et al. 2017; Lorentzen and Viken 2022b), and it can inadvertently reproduce exclusionary practices under the guise of inclusion. Thus, while nature-based interventions in Norway aim to promote social integration, they may, in practice, reinforce cultural norms that limit truly inclusive and culturally sensitive pathways to belonging.

Other critiques relevant to Norway's efforts towards refugee integration via *friluftsliv*, center on the lack of intentionality in incorporating social support into program structures. This issue is symptomatic of a broader systemic challenge: the Norwegian political landscape often restricts avenues for equitable burden-sharing in refugee protection. This limitation stems from a narrow normative and political framework that dictates the scope of feasible policy options (Reklev Grytvik 2015). This constrained perspective influences the design and implementation of integration initiatives, resulting in fragmented efforts like well-known, one-off NEs for refugees (ex. "Til Tops!") that are visually strong representations of unity and support (in nature and for refugees) but lack depth and sustainability. For example, a major cross-Nordic project called ORIGIN (Outdoor recreation, nature interpretation and integration in Nordic countries) (funded by the Nordic Council of Ministers, 2016) surveyed local researchers and relevant NGOs and public/private actors about "the role of nature and cultural ecosystem services in the social integration of immigrants into the Nordic societies" with the intention "to launch Nordic cooperation within 'nature based integration'" (Pitkänen et al. 2017). All the participants were positive about these initiatives and their potential, but analysis suggested that the goals of the programs were unclear and the academic benefits of such interventions were not translated into informed program designs (Pitkänen et al. 2017). Besides these critical takes, it seems that media and academic publications on the concept of *friluftsliv* are overwhelmingly positive regarding *friluftsliv*'s application towards integration (notwithstanding other health benefits), and do not

demonstrate any consideration of the potential effect of isolation or any critical views of the concept at all.

## **Global Recognition of Nature Experiences in Policy and Planning**

In general, the overwhelming evidence supporting the benefits of NEs around the world has led to an increasing number of governments, non-government organizations, and other public and private stakeholders incorporating them into their policy and planning frameworks (Shanahan et al. 2019). Examples include Melbourne’s Metropolitan Strategy, developed by the Department of Infrastructure (Maller et al. 2009; Parks Victoria 2004), Scotland’s National Planning Framework (Lloyd and Purves 2008), England’s “Healthy Lives, Healthy People: Strategy for Public Health” (which aims to make “...nature part of everyday life”) (Great Britain: Department of Health 2010), and, of course, Norway. The government of Norway, through both the Ministry of Climate and the Environment and the Ministry of Culture’s national Gambling Scheme, provide significant funding to all the inter-municipal outdoor councils, outdoor organizations, and grants for outdoor activities for various target groups with priority for children, young people, people who are not physically active, and people with an immigrant background (Miljøverndepartementet 2006). In 2024 alone the Gambling Scheme (the monopoly system of legal gambling in Norway) provided NOK 7.1 billion to fund sports, culture and volunteering in 2024 (NOK 505 million more than the previous year)—and *friluftsliv*-specific funding is partially funded through this mechanism (Ministry of Gender Equality 2024). In fact, the 2025 budget for Norway’s “Year of Outdoor Activities” was already allocated in 2023 so that the joint organization Norsk Friluftsliv could start planning well-ahead (Miljøverndepartementet 2006).

This growing policy integration reflects a global recognition of the potential for NEs to promote public health, social inclusion, and community well-being. However, as governments and organizations continue to scale up NEs for the general public and as interventions for specific sub-populations, it becomes crucial to critically examine how these programs are designed and implemented—especially in multicultural contexts where cultural perceptions of nature and outdoor activities may differ significantly. This study explores how such dynamics play out within Norway’s *friluftsliv* initiatives, from the perspective of the provider, particularly in their efforts to engage refugees and migrants, and highlights the importance of culturally sensitive approaches in ensuring that NEs truly serve diverse populations.

## **Theoretical Frameworks**

The following three theories are closely tied to nature’s power to heal: the Biophilia Hypothesis, Attention Restoration Theory, and Salutogenesis. This paper made use of all three of these theories as a foundation to inform how and why NEs could be beneficial and applicable for refugee populations.

### **Biophilia Hypothesis**

The Biophilia Hypothesis proposes that humans have an innate love of nature and an ability to thrive in a natural environment, dictated by evolutionary drives and instincts. Edward

O. Wilson's (Wilson 1986) landmark book examined the human tendency to focus on life/lifelike processes as a potentially biologically-based need, integral to our development as both individuals and members of a species. In this way, exposure to nature is imagined to have a healing effect, in that it acts as a way for humans to return to their natural predispositions and basic instincts (Gullone 2000; Kellert and Wilson 1995; Tidball 2012). This paper utilizes the Biophilia Hypothesis to support the idea that people, Norwegians and migrants alike, are naturally inclined to engage in nature to some extent.

## **Attention Restoration Theory**

Attention Restoration Theory, derived from the work of William James (1984), proposes that contact with nature allows the human mind to restore mental fatigue and cognitive resources (Kaplan 1995). This is based on the following four components: (1) Being Away, a physical distancing from ordinary work or one's day-to-day environment, (2) Extent of Connectedness with the natural environment, (3) Soft Fascination, an appreciation of elements of nature but which does not require directed attention, and (4) Compatibility, a suitability of the natural environment to that person's personal preferences or purposes in being there (Kaplan 1995; Vitagliano et al. 2023). The combination of these aspects of time in nature are thus theorized to have a healing effect, for refugees/migrants and other groups alike, through mental/cognitive restoration and relaxation.

## **Salutogenesis**

Salutogenesis, developed by Aaron Antonovsky (1980), focuses on factors that promote health and well-being, emphasizing the "Sense of Coherence" —life's comprehensibility, manageability, and meaningfulness—rather than the causes of illness. The Norwegian concept of *friluftsliv*, which involves connecting with nature for recreation and restoration, inherently aligns with salutogenic principles and can, hypothetically, serve as a resource for refugees in Norway to find healing and integration. By engaging in outdoor activities, refugees may experience mental and physical renewal, build social connections, and develop a greater sense of coherence as they adapt to their new environment. *Friluftsliv* could also facilitate cultural integration by offering a meaningful way to connect with Norwegian values and traditions, and that is how it is viewed in the dominant perspective in Norway today (though this may not be the reality for migrants themselves). Meaningful connections with the values and traditions of one's place of resettlement could foster a sense of belonging and well-being, though it will ultimately be modulated by the experience and perspective of the migrants themselves.

## **Study Objectives**

This paper examines the perceived benefits and range of outdoor programs available to refugees in Norway, from the perspective of service providers. This study was done specifically in the context of Norway due to its strong cultural traditions of *friluftsliv* and the associated public funding and enthusiasm to support these types of programs (in general and for refugees).

# Materials and Methods

## Methodology

A 15-question survey (See Appendix III) with all write-in (qualitative) answer options was the primary method for data collection. Conversations and experiences in the field also helped direct the author's literature search, to support the findings from the survey data analysis, and awareness of relevant Norway-based programs.

## Participant Recruitment

The survey was initially posted on Norway-based Facebook groups that referenced volunteerism, nature, refugees, and similar topics. Emails with the survey link and request for participation were also sent to many outdoor organizations across Norway. The author physically went to various organizations in Oslo to ask for people to take or pass along the survey. The author's own engagement in *friluftsliv* in Norway led to several survey engagements, though other attempts were less fruitful. While shopping for maps for a weekend hike at the DNT's Oslo boutique, the author was advised by a staff member who became a survey participant. The author tried, through this connection and by emails and calls, to connect further with DNT staff, including attending several DNT nature outings and completing the training to lead day-hikes for DNT (becoming a DNT guide herself), but either did not receive responses or did not find someone who had engaged with refugees in their DNT role. The author also attended events and registered as a volunteer at Redd Barna (the Norwegian branch of Save the Children) after discovering the "A Natural Meeting" walking activity through Google and LinkedIn, but found no staff aware of the program or interested in similar future initiatives. Another time, the author went to rent outdoor equipment from BUA (barn- unge- aktivitet; children- youth- activities). As BUA is not a refugee-focused organization or an organization which facilitates outdoor activities, but instead provides free equipment to anyone with a Norwegian phone number, the author did not originally plan to recruit survey respondents through BUA. However, through engaging in a BUA equipment rental herself, the author learned from the staff about occasions where refugees were escorted to BUA and guided in making membership accounts by social workers from NAV (the Norwegian Labour and Welfare Administration). The BUA staff member who handled the author's equipment reservation became a survey respondent and directed the author to the website of BUA contact information. As a result, the author was able to recruit several more survey participants from BUA offices across Norway, many of whom reported involvement in other *friluftsliv* organizations at a local level that the author otherwise may not have known to contact. There were also unexpected engagements; one survey participant via a Facebook post helped the author get a summer job as a tour guide on the islands in the Oslo Fjord; later, another tour guide (then a co-worker, at Viking Hiking, Biking) agreed to take the survey too. Beyond their participation in the survey, the author engaged in in-depth conversations with many people who did not participate in the survey but otherwise engaged in *friluftsliv* activities alongside the author during her time in Norway. These dialogues broadened the author's perspective, offering insights she might not have otherwise encountered or discovered through formal study or online research, deepening her understanding of the cultural and personal significance of *friluftsliv*.

## Survey Tool

A 15-question online survey was conducted during summer 2024 (April-September). The survey was designed in Qualtrics in Norwegian and English. The survey tool was tested on native speakers (Norwegian, English) for cultural and language comprehension, adjusted, and re-tested, before implementation. Interpretation of responses was executed in cases when English and Norwegian phraseology did not allow for direct translation; these cases are mentioned in the discussion section “Rhetoric.”

The recruitment method used in this study (sharing the survey link via Facebook groups, in-person conversations, and email) cannot necessarily be extrapolated to the population of other NE service-providers in Norway or refugee-support service providers. The perspective of the service providers also excludes the refugees themselves.

## Results

### Represented Service Provider Organizations

<p><i>"Det var stort å få 14 flyktninger opp på toppen av Norges høyeste fjell, Galdhøpiggen. Mange av dem hadde aldri gått på tur før, og noen sa at dette var det største de hadde opplevd siden de kom til Norge."</i></p>	<p>"It was a big moment to get 14 refugees up to the top of Norway's highest mountain, Galdhøpiggen. Many of them had never been on a hike before, and some said this was the greatest experience they had since arriving in Norway."</p>
---	---



The survey participants represented organizations based across Norway (Figure 1), including the very north of Norway, BUA Vågan, to the southernmost tip, BUA Lyngdalm. They also represented a wide range of programs and activities such as hiking, skiing, canoe/kayaking, foraging, volunteering, church-based, and outdoor equipment rental. The 15 survey participants represented 11 different organizations including the outdoor equipment free-rental organization BUA, which was represented seven times (in addition to the 10 other organizations). To be clear, several respondents listed associations with more than one organization. BUA survey participants came from BUA facilities across Norway, including BUA Sandefjord (southeastern Norway), BUA Vågan (Northern tip of Norway), BUA Lyngdal (Southern tip of Norway), BUA Hjellestad (southwestern Norway),

Figure 1. Map of organizations (offices) represented by the survey respondents.

BUA Bjørnafjorden (southwestern Norway), BUA Tinn (central Norway), and one from an undisclosed BUA location. While their offices share the same name, the individual BUAs generally operate independently, including in their fundraising efforts. The survey respondents also represented Canoe/Kayaking organizations included the Akerselva River Paddleclub (*Akerselva Padleklubb*) and the Oslo Kayak Club. Volunteer organizations included the Oslo Red Cross's Refugee Guide program (*Oslo Røde Kors, Flyktningguide*), and the Volunteer Centers of Horten, Vågan, and Rjukan and Tinn (*Frivilligsentral Horten, Frivilligsentral Vågan, Frivilligsentral Rjukan og Tinn*). The other organizations included the Oslo Regional Council of Outdoor Life (*Oslo og Omland Friluftsråd*), the Norwegian Society of Mycology and Foraging (in collaboration with Asylum Centers, minority school classes, Red Cross, and Blue Cross), The Church City Mission (*Kirkens Bymisjon*), The Ski Association (*Skiforeningen*), and the Norwegian Tourist Organization of the Drammen Region (*Den Norsk Turistforening, DNT Drammen og Omegn*).

### **Service Provider Perspectives on Refugee *Friluftsliv* Participant Demographics**

"*Friluftsliv* is central to our organization. Our primary role is to promote outdoor activities 'for all' and advocate for the natural areas in the Oslo region."

In response to an open-ended question about the demographics of the people who participated in their refugee-focused *friluftsliv* NEs, Survey respondents focused on country of origin, listing the following: "countries in Africa," "the Middle East," Afghanistan, Chile, Eritrea, Ethiopia, the Gambia, Iran, Iraq, Mexico, Kenya, Somalia, Syria, Sudan, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Ukraine, and "25 different countries." Several respondents also gave age categories, reporting that the refugees were children, young adults, families, and adults; only one respondent, representing the Mycology and Paddling organizations, mentioned the elderly. Half the respondents mentioned that both sexes were represented equally ("both men and women," "both girls and boys," "50%-50%" etc.). Several respondents stated or implied that they do not necessarily keep records or keep track of demographics, saying things like "this is not registered information," "we do not record such data about our participants," "difficult to quantify," "exact numbers are hard to say..." and "...we do not distinguish between refugees and other residents... we mainly focus on measures that do not differentiate between the groups (where you come from)." Finally, in response to asking how many refugees were served by the program, answers ranged from 18 to "thousands."

### **Organizational Challenges and Continuity**

The survey responses highlight several organizational capacity limitations in supporting refugees through nature-based programs. One of the most cited challenges is funding. Many organizations rely on a mix of municipal, state, and private grants to sustain their activities, but these resources are often insufficient or inconsistent. For example, some organizations mentioned dependence on sporadic external grants from private foundations or state bodies, leaving their programs vulnerable to interruptions. This financial instability limits the ability to scale programs, invest in infrastructure, or hire specialized staff to better support refugees.

Another major limitation is language and cultural barriers. Several respondents indicated that refugees often face challenges understanding program instructions or using the provided equipment, requiring organizations to invest additional time in communication and training. The lack of multilingual staff or translation resources further complicates efforts to bridge these gaps. Some organizations also mentioned the need to spend significant time creating user profiles or explaining services to participants, which diverts attention from expanding or improving their offerings.

In addition to these issues, some organizations noted challenges in tailoring programs to meet the diverse needs of refugees. Factors such as lack of swimming or outdoor experience and difficulties in matching activities to the interests or skill levels of participants were common. These challenges highlight the need for better funding, training, and strategic planning to build the organizational capacity required for inclusive, effective refugee support.

### Provider-Perceived Benefits

"It is a great way to share the joy of local nature with people who are new to the landscape. People can learn the basics of local activities that not only help them understand the local environment better but also the local cultural connections to the natural environment."

"Happiness, integration, mastery, physical and mental health, quality of life, socialization, and less likelihood of being involved in drugs, gangs, or crime."

*"Det var fantastisk å se barna, mange av dem fra krigsrammede områder, leke fritt i naturen. Noen av dem hadde aldri sett snø før, og gleden i ansiktene deres da de bygde sin første snømann var ubeskrivelig."*

"It was amazing to see the children, many of them from war-torn areas, play freely in nature. Some of them had never seen snow before, and the joy on their faces when they built their first snowman was indescribable."

Nature-based programs help refugees explore local nature, learn outdoor skills, and connect with Norwegian culture through activities like skiing, canoeing, berry picking, and hiking. According to providers, these experiences promote happiness, integration, physical and mental well-being, and language learning. According to the service providers, *friluftsliv* program participants build social networks, gain confidence, and become familiar with Norwegian nature and culture. For some, these activities seemed to normalize nature, easing fears from past experiences. Overall, these programs are perceived to enhance inclusion, well-being, and quality of life.

## Types and Styles of Engagement

<p>"Det er dyrt med utstyr, og økonomien til en flyktningfamilie kan være stram. Derfor er vi veldig enkle å bruke, da det går fort og enkelt."</p>	<p>"Equipment is expensive, and a refugee family's finances can be tight. That's why we make it very easy to use our service—it's quick and simple."</p>
---	--

Organizations reported offering nature-based programs for refugees including day programs, summer and winter camps, and outdoor activities linked to language and cultural integration courses (*Introduksjonsprogrammet*, or Introduction Programs). Activities include kayaking, hiking, skiing, yoga, and nature sports instruction. Many initiatives focus on free equipment loans, providing access to skiing, snowboarding, hiking, and general outdoor gear. Some programs facilitate participation in local volunteer organizations and coordinate free equipment rentals through BUA. Providers said that providing free outdoor equipment (via BUA) reduces financial barriers, allowing children to join school trips and adults to engage beyond municipal services. Other efforts, like *FamilieLøkkis* (Family Tree), promote parent-child outdoor interaction, supporting integration by introducing families to Norwegian nature and local outdoor opportunities. Additional offerings include guided tours in Oslo, mountain trips, and outdoor events such as skating and activity days. Programs emphasize *friluftsglede* (enjoyment of nature) in schools and during holidays, ensuring refugees can experience and integrate into Norwegian outdoor culture.

Refugees reportedly engaged with *friluftsliv* through special days like *Fri-friluftsdager* (Free Friluft Days), where they participate in kayaking, guided hikes, skiing, yoga, and foraging. Many borrow equipment repeatedly, integrating outdoor activities into their routines. Some have also volunteered, gaining language practice and work experience through programs like BUA. Survey respondents said that this repeated participation fosters social connection and cultural integration, with some refugees learning about Norwegian outdoor customs, flora, fauna, and *hyttekultur* (cabin culture) in the process. Others, who might have remained isolated in reception centers, instead joined outdoor excursions. While engagement levels varied, those involved gained exposure to Norwegian traditions and opportunities to connect with their new environment.

## Discussion

### Nature-Based Experiences and Social Integration

<p><i>"Vi bare tar dem med ut hit og gir dem verktøyene og mulighetene, og håper at noen av dem kanskje ser mulighetene og bestemmer seg for å prøve ting som ski eller fiske på egen hånd."</i></p>	<p><i>"We just bring them out here and give them the tools and the opportunities, and hope that some of them might see the possibilities and decide to pursue things like skiing or fishing on their own."</i></p>
--	--

“We saw several positive effects, including many positive nature experiences, a sense of mastery, and a feeling of community. It also made the forest and nature less intimidating—especially important for those who have fled and see nature as a scary place.”

<p><i>"Vi ser at voksne flyktninger ofte trenger mer tid til å bli kjent med friluftsliv, mens barn raskt blir en del av aktivitetene. Mange av dem blir senere guider for sine egne familier og venner."</i></p>	<p><i>"We see that adult refugees often need more time to get familiar with friluftsliv, while children quickly become part of the activities. Many of them later become guides for their own families and friends."</i></p>
---	--

The survey responses explain that *friluftsliv*-based programs in Norway are being used as a tool for refugee integration, with refugees engaging in activities such as skiing, hiking, kayaking, and berry picking. Many programs aim to introduce participants to Norwegian outdoor culture, an approach that aligns with affective place-making and embedded geographies—concepts that suggest engagement with physical spaces fosters belonging and agency (Dilger et al. 2018; Mattes and Lang 2021; Sibley 1995). These programs seem to seek not only provision of access to nature but also the building of social networks and development of confidence through repeated participation in outdoor activities.

The reported use of Free Friluftsliv Days and repeated equipment borrowing suggests that some refugees are actively integrating *friluftsliv* into their routines rather than engaging in it as a one-time experience. This contradicts critiques that nature-based refugee programs are largely symbolic or short-term, though that critique is levied at more well-known events and even refugee asylum center-managed events (Cheng-Han 2020), instead indicating that at least some participants see continued value in outdoor engagement. However, it remains unclear whether this integration is widespread, or whether certain subgroups—such as younger participants or those with prior outdoor experience—are more likely to benefit.

One interesting point made by a service provider-respondent, is that some refugees, who might have otherwise remained isolated in reception centers, joined outdoor excursions. This speaks to previous research which highlighted nature as a social equalizer that can facilitate interaction between marginalized groups and local communities (Harrison et al. 2023). However,

it is important to note that simply providing access to nature does not guarantee social integration. Refugees facing language barriers, trauma, or cultural differences in how nature is experienced may struggle to fully engage with these programs. This echoes critiques that friluftsliv-based integration initiatives can inadvertently exclude those who do not fit dominant Norwegian outdoor norms (Anderson and Setten 2023).

## Health and Well-Being Benefits

“Nature sports are the best activities to get them integrated, healthy, and happy, and less likely to engage in crime. It improves quality of life and benefits society as a whole.”

Service providers asserted that nature-based programs promote refugee well-being, particularly through hiking, skiing, and kayaking, which they believe contribute to happiness, stress relief, and improved quality of life. This perspective aligns well with Attention Restoration Theory (Kaplan 1995), which highlights nature’s role in reducing mental fatigue. Additionally, Salutogenesis (Antonovsky 1980) supports the idea that physical activity, social connection, and structured engagement contribute to well-being. However, while the respondents did provide some anecdotes, it seemed that these assertions were based more on their assumptions based on their own understanding of the value of *friluftsliv*, rather than from direct information or observation from/of migrants themselves. Many highlighted the role of physical activity and time in nature in fostering mental resilience. Though these statements appeared to be assumptions on the part of the provider, they also align with research on NEs that link nature exposure to reduced stress, anxiety, and depression (Gonzalez et al. 2011; Hyvönen et al. 2023; Shanahan et al. 2019). While service providers see *friluftsliv* as beneficial, further research is needed to assess refugees’ direct experiences and perspectives.

## Structural Implications, Policy, and Funding

"We help refugees with language training. With borrowed equipment, they have been able to participate in activities they otherwise would not have had the opportunity to, and this contributes to increased inclusion in society."

"We help refugees with language training. With borrowed equipment, they have been able to participate in activities they otherwise would not have had the opportunity to, and this contributes to increased inclusion in society."

*"Vi ser jo at vi kan skape mindre forskjeller. Særlig når det kommer til barn på skolen. Vi gjør det mulig for barn og unge som ikke har råd til diverse utstyr å kunne være med*

"We see that we can reduce disparities, especially when it comes to children in schools. We make it possible for children and youth who cannot afford various equipment to

<i>klassen sin på fjelltur, skitur eller andre aktiviteter.”</i>	join their class on mountain hikes, ski trips, or other activities."
--	--

While NEs and friluftsliv programs may provide significant benefits for refugees, their adaptability and scalability remain key concerns, particularly for countries with fewer financial resources than Norway. Survey respondents reported multiple funding sources (despite still feeling funding precarity) supporting their programs, primarily from government agencies and financial foundations. Financial support from institutions such as DNB (Norway’s largest financial services group), Spare Bank Stiftelse, SpareBank 1’s Community Promise (*Samfunnsløftet*), and the 200-year-old Gjensidigestiftelsen financial foundation demonstrates a well-established public-private funding model. Government funding sources were similarly diverse, coming from municipal and county governments, state-level funding, and migrant-specific agencies including UDI (the Directorate of Immigration), IMDi (the Directorate of Integration and Diversity), and BufDir (the Norwegian Directorate for Education and Training). Survey participants noted that they conduct additional fundraising on an as-needed basis.

This strong financial backing reflects Norway’s sovereign wealth fund, high-tax system, and commitment to equitable social programs. Norway is consistently ranked among the world’s wealthiest countries, primarily due to its success in the oil and energy sectors, and is characterized by high GDP per capita, income equity, and robust social support programs, including universal health and social insurance coverage (International Trade Administration 2024; Tikkanen et al. 2020). Beyond earmarked funding, Norway also has an institutionalized cultural and legal framework supporting *friluftsliv*, which makes outdoor recreation an integral part of not only Norwegian social life but also government-funded refugee integration efforts. Programs that combine *friluftsliv* with language training, cultural education, and social inclusion initiatives are justified in policy reports citing the positive effects of outdoor engagement on health and well-being, particularly for children, people with disabilities, and immigrants (Regjeringa.no 2001).

While many other European and North American countries accept more refugees in total numbers, Norway has been among the top four countries in recent years in refugee intake relative to population size (Christophersen 2023). By 2024, 107,186 people in Norway had a refugee background (including those not yet granted asylum), making up 5.7% of the population (Statistic Norway 2024). The small number of people to support, combined with Norway’s extensive funding mechanisms, may make sustained investment in nature-based refugee programs more feasible, in ways that may not be easily replicable elsewhere.

Adapting Norway’s nature-based refugee integration model to resource-limited contexts requires alternative funding and policy approaches. Governments and humanitarian organizations can explore public-private partnerships, leverage health and environmental funding, and seek international donor support. Integrating nature-based activities into broader programs—such as language learning, employment training, and psychosocial support—can enhance impact, while prioritizing low-cost, community-driven initiatives improves accessibility. While Norway demonstrates the potential of nature in refugee integration, its financial and structural advantages make direct replication challenging. Instead, countries can adapt key elements, such as access to outdoor spaces and *friluftsliv* principles, to fit local economic and social conditions.

## A Note on Rhetoric and its Potential Effects

*Friluftsliv* is a cultural concept that has been integrated into the Norwegian language in myriad ways. Most of the 15 survey respondents used versions of the Norwegian word *friluftsliv* to describe refugees' benefits and ways of engaging with their organizations. This could suggest that the refugees are perceived as engaging in *friluftsliv* in an inherently *friluftsliv* manner, though whether the refugees themselves were aware of this was not mentioned. For example, one survey respondent explained that participants in their Ski Organization (*Skiforeningen*) had the opportunity to "enjoy the outdoors at school and during holidays" using the word *friluftsglede* (*glede* = joy) for "enjoy the outdoors." They also described their programs as *friluftstilbud* (*tilbud* = offerings). A BUA respondent used the word *friluftsutstyr* (*utstyr* = equipment) to describe the kind of equipment refugees could borrow from their organization. Another BUA representative said that refugees can "...familiarize themselves with which outdoor activities the equipment we lend can be used for. And they get a good insight into Norwegian outdoor life." Here outdoor activities were *friluftaktiviteter* and Norwegian outdoor life was *Norsk friluftsliv*. A respondent from the *Oslo og Omland Friluftsråd* (Oslo Regional Council of Outdoor Life; note *Friluftsråd*, *Råd*=advice/council) described their *friluftsdager*, or special days on which they host free *friluftsliv* activities. Another BUA representative said refugees get to "*føle på felleskapet og nettopp dette med å kunne delta i det som gjerne er Norsk kultur. Skiturer, fjellturer og andre type friluftsturer...*" or "feel the community, precisely because they are able to participate in what is often Norwegian culture. Ski trips, mountain trips and other types of outdoor trips..."

It remains unclear if rhetoric steeped in the cultural concept of *friluftsliv* has any effect, positive or negative, on those new to it, or if this could be demonstrative of Anderson's criticisms of the normative expectations of Norwegian NEs (Anderson 2024). What is widely established in refugee literature, though, is the extent to which language barriers can have an exclusionary effect. Language barriers can cause refugees to struggle with speaking and comprehension, leading them to feel isolated, hopeless, and anti-social, depressive, lacking confidence to speak up or participate in education courses, missed job opportunities, and can make it difficult to make friends (BRYCS 2016). If the programs that support refugees in Norway engage in NEs with complexity regarding culturally mediated language, it may not simply be a difference in translation, but of an inherently exclusionary mindset (that 'we' all experience the outdoors in the same, Norwegian way). This mindset can lead to inadvertent exclusion or acculturation.

Acculturation, the homogenizing of cultures which is associated with migrants adapting and adopting the culture of their place of resettlement, can be clinically harmful. This overriding or erasure of one's lifelong culture can induce psychosocial stress and stress-related health problems including cardiovascular disease, depression, and gastrointestinal problems (Fox, Thayer, and Wadhwa 2017). The greater the discrepancy between origin and host environments, the harsher this effect, because there are greater challenges for migrants to learn how to navigate their new systems and life (Berry and Annis 1974). The support that *friluftsliv* NEs could provide thus may be inhibited due to the very Norwegian way they are meant to be experienced. These effects may be inadvertent, but nevertheless barriers relating to language and acculturation processes can even lead to a decreased ability or willingness by refugees to access and obtain care (Morris et al. 2021). Support services should instead emphasize inclusivity, be

culturally-tailored, and intentionally reduce language barriers (Coumans and Wark 2024; Federici and O'Brien 2022).

## Limitations

### Perspective

This study was based on service provider perspectives, with support from the literature. It did not include the perspectives of the refugees or migrants themselves, who had actually engaged with NEs in Norway. This information is hard to come by. For instance, one series of studies about immigrant women experiencing nature in Norway, by Catherine Anne Nicole Lorentzen and Berit Viken (both affiliated with the University of Southeast Norway), interviewed 14 immigrant women about their perceptions of time spent in nature. The women reported that they generally had positive attitudes towards nature and wanted to participate in outdoor activities like hiking and skiing but faced barriers due to a lack of information on how to start, where to go, whom to contact, and what equipment or regulations applied, leaving them uncertain about access and participation (Lorentzen and Viken 2020, 2022b, 2022a). Though one of the studies addressed the mental health and nature engagement, the others primarily focused on where immigrant women went (urban vs. rural nature) and what types of walks they took, without examining relevant cultural expectations, normative standards, or social barriers. Notably, the women did not seem to engage in specially designated immigrant *friluftsliv* activities, despite their interest in participating—suggesting a lack of accessible entry points and clear information. Similar challenges arose in the present study, particularly regarding the difficulty of identifying and accessing such initiatives or staff members involved in immigrant-focused *friluftsliv* programs (see Materials and Methods, Participant Recruitment). Future research should explore not only the type of nature activity or indicators of health, but also examine structural barriers limiting participation, and the ways in which cultural perceptions, social belonging, and institutional support shape immigrants' and refugees' engagement with nature.

There is some Norway-based research to suggest that immigrant-*friluftsliv*-NEs may not all be as positive as they are perceived by the providers, researchers, and lawmakers. Sarah Anderson and Gunhild Setten's research on the 'systematic introduction' of refugees to *friluftsliv* provides significant critique about the normative implications and reinforcement of tradition and 'sameness' on those who participate (Anderson and Setten 2023; Flemsæter et al. 2015; Pitkänen et al. 2017). One of their conclusions was that refugees perceived *friluftsliv* as "a Norwegian tradition that 'ought to be' learned" and this can impose a sense of being different (Anderson and Setten 2023). Synnøve K. N. Bendixsen's research on embodied belonging with migrants in Norway is also a source of some insight, though there was only a single mention of nature. In this example, a study participant criticized the healthcare they received in Norway because they were prescribed more physical activity and time spent in nature. Bendixsen explains that "while Norwegian citizens would be familiar with such medical advice, to [the migrant-participant] it was culturally unfamiliar, and perhaps also somewhat demeaning" (Bendixsen 2020). This scant research is largely anecdotal, but hints that more information needs to be assessed from the perspective of the refugee-participant about how NEs affect their lives and integration

experiences, as is done in the research with so many other sub-populations who receive NEs as interventions.

Finally, it is unclear from the service providers in this study whether they are aware of the specific elements of NEs that contribute to the desired outcomes, such as increased social engagement or decreased stress. Additionally, it is not evident how these programs were perceived by the migrant participants, leaving a gap in understanding their impact from the participants' perspective. There is also uncertainty about whether the service providers are themselves migrants, which could influence their approach and connection to the participants. Finally, it remains unclear whether these providers have received any formal education or training that would help them better understand the experiences and perspectives of the refugee participants.

## **Challenges with Recruitment**

The aforementioned challenges (Materials and Methods, Participant Recruitment) with survey recruitment may serve as a note of awareness to future non-Norwegian researchers attempting online and in-person research in or about Norway. Future researchers may also consider social dynamics in the Norwegian setting. For example, market research companies reported that Norwegians may be difficult to recruit for online research due to strong privacy concerns and a general distrust of data handling. Additionally, Norwegians tend to trust public institutions more than private companies, especially regarding data handling, with particularly low trust in social media and digital platforms, which may further contribute to reluctance in participating in online research (Datatilsynet 2020). While this study did not intentionally set out to examine Norwegian-foreigner interactions in research or collaboration, the author encountered notable challenges over 1.5 years in Norway, including difficulties in securing institutional support, ethical approvals, research funding, and partnerships. These experiences underscore potential obstacles that non-Norwegian researchers may face and highlight the importance of anticipating structural and social barriers when planning research in or about Norway.

## **Conclusion**

Incorporating NEs into refugee support programs has the potential to enhance wellness-promoting approaches that foster connections between refugees and their host countries. Norway's version of an NE, *friluftsliv*, is rooted in government support, private sector funding, and longstanding cultural values, making its model unique. Research highlights that NEs influence “the environment in which people live, work, learn, recreate or heal” (Shanahan et al. 2019) and can enhance practical support efforts like employment and education. Moreover, NEs foster social connections, a critical component in developing a sense of belonging (Song, Corcoran, and Zahnow 2024). As belonging is linked to community involvement (Grey 2010), investing in NEs for resettling refugees could lead to more cohesive and engaged communities. The example of *friluftsliv*-NEs in Norway is not without criticism though, as it purportedly can be facilitated in a normative manner, and this may be more exclusionary than supportive. The Norwegian *Friluftsliv* website (Norskfriluftsliv.no) presents these assumptions clearly on their Diversity and Inclusion page: “Nature is a unique tool for contributing to increased inclusion.

Many people experience nature as an open and unprejudiced arena that does not ask questions about who you are and where you come from. Therefore, Norsk Friluftsliv believes that outdoor activities can become Norway's largest arena for inclusion” (NorskFriluftsliv 2025). Such statements beg the questions—do migrants or refugees really prefer not to be asked about who they are or where they come from? Is that the best way to be inclusive?

That said, service providers surveyed in this study overwhelmingly perceived *friluftsliv* as a means of enjoying fresh air and nature, improving health through physical activity, and fostering cultural adaptation through embracing the values of the host community. These assumed results align with theories of Biophilia, that humans have an innate affinity for nature, which fosters well-being when they engage with natural environments (Wilson 1986), Salutogenesis, which emphasizes how engaging life experiences can bolster an individual's sense of coherence—thereby promoting health and well-being (Antonovsky 1980), and Attention Restoration, which suggests that exposure to natural environments can alleviate mental fatigue and improve concentration, thereby supporting cognitive functioning and overall mental health (Kaplan 1995). However, the effectiveness of *friluftsliv* to support refugee well-being is context dependent. Norway’s deeply ingrained ‘get outside’ culture makes social connection through outdoor activities more plausible, but in reality, there are several barriers to interacting with locals such as unaddressed language barriers or refugee/migrant-focused activities which limit interaction with ethnic Norwegians all-together. Future refugee support programs incorporating NEs, wherever they occur in the world, must ensure accessibility for all participants, offering language support, adaptive equipment, and trauma-informed programming to prevent exclusion.

Further research is needed to understand how NEs can be optimized for refugee support programs in other, non-Norwegian contexts. What works (or doesn’t) in Norway may (also) not necessarily work elsewhere, as the funding, popularity, and accessibility of *friluftsliv*/NE programs is partially due to a unique combination of Norway’s sovereign wealth fund, high-tax system, and commitment to equitable social programs. The concept also may not translate to countries where nature-based recreation is not culturally embedded. For nature-based programs to be effective elsewhere, structured mentorship, accessibility measures, and cultural adaptation must be prioritized (Cheng-Han 2020). Also, the country’s small population, and relatively small proportion of refugees (5.7% of Norway’s total) may make extensive investment in social goods more feasible (Statistics Norway 2024). In countries with larger refugee populations and fewer resources, alternative funding structures, public-private partnerships, and integration of nature-based activities into broader social programs could help bridge gaps related to reduced availability of such support.

Another important consideration in promoting NEs for effective refugee support is ensuring that their lived-experienced and real needs are central to program planning and facilitation. A significant gap in this study—and the broader literature—is the limited direct input from refugees themselves on how NEs and *friluftsliv* programs have influenced their migration and resettlement experiences. While service providers emphasize the benefits of these programs, prior studies in Norway suggest that beneficiaries may perceive them differently (Anderson 2024; Anderson and Setten 2023; Cheng-Han 2020; Flemsæter et al. 2015). Filling this gap in data and input is essential to avoid replicating the suggested shortcomings of Norway’s *friluftsliv* model, which risks being used as tools for “making good citizens” of its refugee and migrant participants (Anderson 2024). Still, leveraging nature experiences in refugee support programs is a recommended method to cultivate holistic well-being among refugees, including health, happiness, social connection, adaptation, and a sense of belonging. However, for these initiatives

to be effective and honor the experiences and backgrounds of the refugees themselves, it is essential to prioritize cultural contextualization, accessibility, and active involvement of refugees in program development.

# Dissertation Conclusion

The experiences of refugees navigating resettlement highlight the complexity of structural barriers, dimensions of socio-cultural adaptation, and how host-country institutional and social support mechanisms are enacted and perceived. Central to this discussion is a call for refugees' voices and values to be integrated into refugee research. This ensures that refugee insights not only inform more effective research methodologies but also shape the policies and programs meant to support them. The perspectives analyzed in this dissertation, obtained through surveys and interviews with both refugees and service providers and supplemented with literature review, shed light on meaningful forms of support as well as service gaps that often lie beyond the viewpoint of non-refugee academics and practitioners. Engaging these stakeholders as active participants in research enhances the relevance of findings and ensures support systems reflect the diverse realities, priorities, and agency of those they intend to serve. This approach could foster more adaptive, sustainable, and equitable resettlement strategies, ultimately strengthening both individual and collective health and social outcomes.

One of the most salient points to emerge from these connected studies is the critical role of belonging in refugee resettlement—a factor often overlooked in support programs. Well-established in the literature as a key determinant of well-being, a lack of belonging—stemming from displacement, exclusion, or marginalization—can profoundly disrupt mental, emotional, and physical health. The survey results and interviews with refugees from Ukraine reveal that belonging is deeply shaped by social interactions, perceived acceptance, and daily experiences of inclusion or exclusion, all of which directly impact holistic health during migration and resettlement. However, despite their intentions, critique of support programs serving refugees from Ukraine—and even Norway's *friluftsliv* initiatives designed to foster unity and integration—suggest they are unintentionally exclusionary in practice.

Language and cultural familiarity emerged as central to either facilitating or hindering integration. Refugees from Ukraine reported significant difficulties in accessing resources and employment due to linguistic barriers, which in turn affected their ability to form meaningful social connections and establish a sense of belonging. Even when free language classes were offered, participants expressed frustration with the inadequacy of these programs, citing infrequent classes and lack of depth as systemic obstacles. Furthermore, while community support networks and structured social initiatives can foster inclusion, some interviewees found themselves confined within social circles of other Ukrainians, which, rather than alleviating homesickness, sometimes amplified feelings of disconnection from the host community. Critiques of *friluftsliv* as a normative Norwegian cultural concept highlight similar exclusionary effects. Without intentional efforts to adapt to needs such as language barriers and be open to refugees' and migrants' unique cultural perspectives and modes of being, NE programs intended to be supportive may ultimately alienate newcomers rather than bring people closer together. This is especially true when their main goal is to assimilate migrants and refugees to the dominant Norwegian way of experiencing nature.

Despite these challenges, NEs, such as Norway's *friluftsliv* programs, offer innovative models for promoting refugee well-being. Drawing from frameworks like the Biophilia

Hypothesis, which posits an innate human affinity for nature, and Attention Restoration Theory, which highlights nature's capacity to reduce mental fatigue and stress, these programs present alternative avenues for socialization, mental health support, and cultural exchange. Additionally, the principles of Salutogenesis, focusing on factors that promote well-being and a sense of coherence, align with the restorative aims of *friluftsliv*. However, findings from this study reveal that while such programs hold potential, their benefits are contingent on how inclusively they are designed and implemented. Nature programs that encourage independent exploration (e.g., BUA outdoor equipment rentals) or refugee-only activities (e.g., Red Cross-organized hikes) risk reinforcing social divides unless intentionally designed to foster meaningful cross-cultural connections.

Cognitive interviewing in this study aligned with Grounded Theory (following emergent leads during data collection) enabled a deeper understanding of how refugees interpret survey questions and share their experiences. Cognitive Theory further illuminated how refugees process survey questions, especially considering the cognitive impacts of trauma and displacement, enhancing the accuracy and relevance of the findings. Social Cognitive Theory provided a lens to explore how refugees' behaviors and decisions—such as seeking support services—are shaped by the interplay of personal agency, social dynamics, and systemic barriers, helping explain how exclusionary experiences may discourage future engagement with available resources.

Participatory research methods, which engage these stakeholders as active contributors rather than passive subjects, are essential for addressing gaps in service provision and for enhancing the relevance of both programmatic and research outcomes. Research must seek to understand perspectives from the eye of the refugee themselves, rather than through the lens of the researchers' carefully constructed questions or through the NE/*friluftsliv*-provider's self-limiting assumptions about refugee needs and experiences. Traditional quantitative indicators of integration, such as employment rates and language proficiency, fail to capture the nuanced realities and complicated challenges that refugees may face even when they meet formal criteria of assessment. Thus, refugee research must bridge the divide between lived experiences and measurable outcomes through mixed-method approaches that combine qualitative narratives with empirical data.

Policymakers, practitioners, researchers, and refugees themselves must work collaboratively to design support systems that are not only effective but also inclusive, adaptive, and sustainable. The findings from this study highlight that support programs—including *friluftsliv* or NE initiatives—can unintentionally reinforce divisions between refugees/migrants and host communities or otherwise exclude refugees/migrants. By recognizing and addressing both structural and psychosocial barriers, societies can create spaces where refugees are not merely accommodated but actively welcomed and valued as members of their new communities. Through more participatory, culturally responsive, and intersectional approaches, refugee research and policy can co-create solutions that better reflect the realities of displacement and resettlement. In doing so, support programs become more capable of fostering well-being, social cohesion, and long-term integration—ultimately contributing to healthier refugees and more unified host communities.

# Bibliography

- Abrego, Leisy J., and Sarah M. Lakhani. 2015. "Incomplete Inclusion: Legal Violence and Immigrants in Liminal Legal Statuses." *Law & Policy* 37(4):265–93. doi: 10.1111/lapo.12039.
- Ahmed, Sara. 2000. *Strange Encounters: Embodied Others in Post-Coloniality*. Psychology Press.
- Armed Conflict Location & Event Data. 2024. "Conflict Index Results: January 2024." *ACLED*. Retrieved November 3, 2024 (<https://acleddata.com/conflict-index/index-january-2024/>).
- Baeza-Rivera, María José, Camila Salazar-Fernández, Diego Manríquez-Robles, Natalia Salinas-Oñate, and Vanessa Smith-Castro. 2022. "Acculturative Stress, Perceived Social Support, and Mental Health: The Mediating Effect of Negative Emotions Associated with Discrimination." *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19(24):16522. doi: 10.3390/ijerph192416522.
- Bandura, Albert. 2000. "Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective."
- Belli, Robert F., Frederick G. Conrad, and Daniel B. Wright. 2007. "Cognitive Psychology and Survey Methodology: Nurturing the Continuing Dialogue between Disciplines." *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 21:141–44. doi: 10.1002/acp.1333.
- Berry, John W., and Robert C. Annis. 1974. "Acculturative Stress: The Role of Ecology, Culture and Differentiation." *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 5(4):382–406. doi: 10.1177/002202217400500402.
- Bidovanets, Olena. 2023. "Post-Traumatic Growth among Ukrainian Women Refugees during the Ongoing Russian-Ukrainian War." *University of Washington: Global Health Theses*. Retrieved March 16, 2025 (<http://hdl.handle.net/1773/50082>).
- Bradburn, Norman M., Seymour Sudman, and Brian Wansink. 2004. *Asking Questions: The Definitive Guide to Questionnaire Design -- For Market Research, Political Polls, and Social and Health Questionnaires, 2nd, Revised Edition* | Wiley. Wiley.
- Carpi, Estella. 2020. "Towards a Neo-Cosmetic Humanitarianism: Refugee Self-Reliance as a Social-Cohesion Regime in Lebanon's Halba." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 33(1):224–44. doi: 10.1093/jrs/fez083.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. 2019. "CCQDER - Cognitive Interviewing." Retrieved April 24, 2023 (<https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/ccqder/evaluation/CognitiveInterviewing.htm>).
- Charmaz, Kathy. 2006. *Constructing Grounded Theory*. London ; Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications.
- Chevtayeva, Irina. 2022. "How Men Try to Get around the Ban to Leave Ukraine." *Dw.Com*, July 19.
- Cojocar, Elena, Cristian Cojocar, and Cristian Iulian Oancea. 2022. "Health Risks During Ukrainian Humanitarian Crisis." *Risk Management and Healthcare Policy* 15:1775–81. doi: 10.2147/RMHP.S375021.
- Creswell, JW, VL Piano Clark, AC Klassen, and KC Smith. 2011. *Designing and Conducting Mixed Methods Research*. National Institutes of Health.

- D'Andrea, Wendy, Lou Bergholz, Andrea Fortunato, and Joseph Spinazzola. 2013. "Play to the Whistle: A Pilot Investigation of a Sports-Based Intervention for Traumatized Girls in Residential Treatment." *Journal of Family Violence* 28(7):739–49. doi: 10.1007/s10896-013-9533-x.
- Dey, Ian. 1999. *Grounding Grounded Theory: Guidelines for Qualitative Inquiry*. San Diego: Academic Press.
- Disney, Lindsey R., Jane McPherson, and Ziad S. Jamal. 2021. "'We Know More than That': The Underemployment Experiences of College-Educated Iraqi Refugees Living in the US." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 34(1):1168–84. doi: 10.1093/jrs/feaa128.
- Donisch, Katelyn, Chris Bray, and Abigail Gewirtz. 2016. "Child Welfare, Juvenile Justice, Mental Health, and Education Providers' Conceptualizations of Trauma-Informed Practice." *Child Maltreatment* 21(2):125–34. doi: 10.1177/1077559516633304.
- El-Bialy, Nora, Elisa Fraile Aranda, Andreas Nicklisch, Lamis Saleh, and Stefan Voigt. 2022. "To Cooperate or Not to Cooperate? An Analysis of Cooperation and Peer Punishment among Syrian Refugees, Germans, and Jordanians." *Journal of Economic Psychology* 89:102484. doi: 10.1016/j.joep.2022.102484.
- Fiddian-Qasmiyeh, Elena, ed. 2020. *Refuge in a Moving World: Tracing Refugee and Migrant Journeys across Disciplines*. UCL Press.
- Fitzgerald, Madeline, and Elliot Davis. 2023. "Russia Invades Ukraine: A Timeline of the Crisis." *US News & World Report*, July 25.
- Gennep, Arnold van. 1960. *The Rites of Passage*. 1st ed. University of Chicago Press.
- Glaser, Barney G., and Anselm L. Strauss. 2010. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*. 5. paperback print. New Brunswick: Aldine Transaction.
- Grech, Paulann, and Reuben Grech. 2018. "Narrative Exposure Therapy for Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder." *Alternative & Integrative Medicine* 7(2). doi: 10.4172/2327-5162.1000264.
- Green, Harold D., Joan S. Tucker, Daniela Golinelli, and Suzanne L. Wenzel. 2013. "Social Networks, Time Homeless, and Social Support: A Study of Men on Skid Row." *Network Science* 1(3):305–20. doi: 10.1017/nws.2013.18.
- Grey, Jackie. 2010. "'Labor' of Belonging." *International Journal of Critical Indigenous Studies* 3(1):2–14. doi: 10.5204/ijcis.v3i1.54.
- Hall, Jonathan, and Katharina Werner. 2022. "Trauma and Trust: How War Exposure Shapes Social and Institutional Trust Among Refugees." *Frontiers in Psychology* 13. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2022.786838.
- Harlan, Chico. 2022. "In a War of Terrible Choices, These Are the Fighting-Age Men Who Left Ukraine." *Washington Post*, March 9.
- Harrell-Bond, Barbara, and Eftihia Voutira. 2007. "In Search of 'Invisible' Actors: Barriers to Access in Refugee Research." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 20(2):281–98. doi: 10.1093/jrs/fem015.
- Hays, Ron D., and Leo S. Morales. 2001. "The RAND-36 Measure of Health-Related Quality of Life." *Annals of Medicine* 33(5):350–57. doi: 10.3109/07853890109002089.

Hynes, Patricia. 2009. "Contemporary Compulsory Dispersal and the Absence of Space for the Restoration of Trust." doi: 10.1093/jrs/fen049.

International Organization for Migration. 2019. *Migrants and Their Vulnerabilities*.

Johnson, Elizabeth M. 2016. "Creating a Trauma-Informed Survey: A How-To." *Elizabeth M. Johnson, MA*. Retrieved February 24, 2025 (<https://sparkequity.org/blog/trauma-informed-survey>).

Kessler, Mario. 2022. "The Forgotten History of Ukrainian Independence." *Rosa-Luxemburg-Stiftung: To Start Page*, March 21.

Kloek, Marjolein E., Arjen E. Buijs, Jan J. Boersema, and Matthijs G. C. Schouten. 2017. "Beyond Ethnic Stereotypes – Identities and Outdoor Recreation Among Immigrants and Nonimmigrants in the Netherlands." *Leisure Sciences* 39(1):59–78. doi: 10.1080/01490400.2016.1151843.

Kulhánová, Ivana, Michala Lustigová, Dušan Drbohlav, Yana Leontiyeva, and Dagmar Džúrová. 2024. "Determinants of Self-Rated Health among Highly Educated Ukrainian Women Refugees in Czechia: Analysis Based on Cross-Sectional Study in 2022." *BMC Women's Health* 24(1):206-. doi: 10.1186/s12905-024-03053-8.

Łaczyński, Marcin, Mierzecka, Anna, Marlena Szyber, Grzegorz Kowalczyk, Tomasz Gackowski, and Karolina Brylska. 2022. *The War in Ukraine in the Opinion of Poles LBM UW CATI Survey*. Warsaw: Laboratory of Media Studies.

Lely, Jeannette C. G., Geert E. Smid, Ruud A. Jongedijk, Jeroen W. Knipscheer, and Rolf J. Kleber. 2019. "The Effectiveness of Narrative Exposure Therapy: A Review, Meta-Analysis and Meta-Regression Analysis." *European Journal of Psychotraumatology* 10(1):1550344. doi: 10.1080/20008198.2018.1550344.

Lems, Annika. 2014. "Placing Displacement: Place-Making in a World of Movement: Ethnos." *Journal of Anthropology* 81(1). doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00141844.2014.931328>.

Levin, Irene. 2013. "Silence, Memory and Migration." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 44(6):715–23.

Lorentzen, Catherine Anne Nicole, and Berit Viken. 2020. "Immigrant Women, Nature and Mental Health." *International Journal of Migration, Health and Social Care* 16(4):359–72. doi: 10.1108/IJMHS-11-2019-0089.

Lorentzen, Catherine Anne Nicole, and Berit Viken. 2022a. "A Qualitative Exploration of Interactions with Natural Environments among Immigrant Women in Norway." *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education* 60(5):248–61. doi: 10.1080/14635240.2021.1921609.

Lorentzen, Catherine Anne Nicole, and Berit Viken. 2022b. "Influences on Outdoor Recreation Behavior Among Immigrant Women in Norway." *Nordic Journal of Migration Research* 12(1). doi: 10.33134/njmr.382.

Maguire, Amy. 2022. "Why Banning Men from Leaving Ukraine Violates Their Human Rights." *The University of Newcastle, Australia*, March 8.

Mattes, Dominik, and Claudia Lang. 2021. "Embodied Belonging: In/Exclusion, Health Care, and Well-Being in a World in Motion." *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry* 45(1):2–21. doi: 10.1007/s11013-020-09693-3.

- Menjívar, Cecilia. 2006. "Liminal Legality: Salvadoran and Guatemalan Immigrants' Lives in the United States." *American Journal of Sociology* 111(4):999–1037. doi: 10.1086/499509.
- Miller, Kristen, Valerie Chepp, Stephanie Willson, and Jose-Luis Padilla. 2014. *Cognitive Interviewing Methodology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Moreland-Capuia, Alisha, Nathalie M. Dumornay, Alexandra Mangus, Caitlin Ravichandran, Shelly F. Greenfield, and Kerry J. Ressler. 2023. "Establishing and Validating a Survey for Trauma-Informed, Culturally Responsive Change across Multiple Systems." *Journal of Public Health* 31(12):2089–2102. doi: 10.1007/s10389-022-01765-5.
- National Institute of Justice. 2023. "The Importance of Inclusive Research | National Institute of Justice." Retrieved October 1, 2024 (<https://nij.ojp.gov/topics/articles/importance-inclusive-research>).
- Ohlsson-Nevo, Emma, Ayako Hiyoshi, Paulina Norén, Margareta Möller, and Jan Karlsson. 2021. "The Swedish RAND-36: Psychometric Characteristics and Reference Data from the Mid-Swed Health Survey." *Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes* 5:66. doi: 10.1186/s41687-021-00331-z.
- Ott, Mary, Teresa Imburgia, Doug Cope-Barnes, Abby Hunt, and Devon Hensel. 2025. "Making Surveys Trauma-Informed: Early Adolescents Who Are Uncomfortable With Questions About Sexual Behavior." *Journal of Adolescent Health* 76(3):S71–72. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2024.11.154.
- Plokhly, Serhii. 2015. *The Gates of Europe: A History of Ukraine*.
- Polzer, Tara, and Laura Hammond. 2008. "Invisible Displacement." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 21(4):417–31. doi: 10.1093/jrs/fen045.
- Purtle, Jonathan. 2020. "Systematic Review of Evaluations of Trauma-Informed Organizational Interventions That Include Staff Trainings." *Trauma Violence Abuse* 21(4). doi: 10.1177/1524838018791304.
- Qiblawi, Tamara, and Caroll Alvarado. 2022. "Ukrainian Males Aged 18-60 Are Banned from Leaving the Country, Zelensky Says in New Declaration." *CNN*. Retrieved September 19, 2023 (<https://www.cnn.com/europe/live-news/ukraine-russia-news-02-24-22-intl/index.html>).
- Quesada, James, Laurie Kain Hart, and Philippe Bourgois. 2011. "Structural Vulnerability and Health: Latino Migrant Laborers in the United States." *Medical Anthropology* 30(4):339–62. doi: 10.1080/01459740.2011.576725.
- Raeder, Robert, Nicola S. Clayton, and Markus Boeckle. 2023. "Narrative-Based Autobiographical Memory Interventions for PTSD: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials." *Frontiers in Psychology* 14. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1215225.
- Raja, Sheela, Chelsea F. Rajagopalan, Mariela Kruthoff, Alexandra Kuperschmidt, Priscilla Chang, and Michelle Hoersch. 2015. "Teaching Dental Students to Interact with Survivors of Traumatic Events: Development of a Two-Day Module." *Journal of Dental Education* 79(1):47–55. doi: 10.1002/j.0022-0337.2015.79.1.tb05856.x.
- Reshetar, John S. 1968. "The Ukrainian Revolution in Retrospect." *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne Des Slavistes* 10(2):116–32.
- Rich, Peter. 2015. "Inside the Black Box: Revealing the Process in Applying a Grounded Theory Analysis." *The Qualitative Report*. doi: 10.46743/2160-3715/2012.1759.

- Rogan, Ali, and Till Morgan, dirs. 2022. "Ukraine's History and Its Centuries-Long Road to Independence." *PBS NewsHour*.
- Rudnytsky, Ivan L. 1972. "The Soviet Ukraine in Historical Perspective." *Canadian Slavonic Papers / Revue Canadienne Des Slavistes* 14(2):235–50.
- Saltsman, Adam, and Nassim Majidi. 2021. "Storytelling in Research with Refugees: On the Promise and Politics of Audibility and Visibility in Participatory Research in Contexts of Forced Migration." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 34(3):2522–38. doi: 10.1093/jrs/feab071.
- Schauer, Maggie, Frank Neuner, and Thomas Elbert. 2025. *Narrative Exposure Therapy (NET) For Survivors of Traumatic Stress*. Hogrefe Publishing.
- Schunk, Dale H., and Ellen L. Usher. 2012. "Social Cognitive Theory and Motivation." P. 0 in *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*, edited by R. M. Ryan. Oxford University Press.
- Schwarz, Norbert. 2007. "Cognitive Aspects of Survey Methodology." *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 21(2):277–87. doi: 10.1002/acp.1340.
- Sibley, David. 1995. *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*. New York: Burns & Oates.
- Song, Jinyeong, Jonathan Corcoran, and Renee Zahnow. 2024. "The Resettlement Journey: Understanding The Role of Social Connectedness on Well-Being and Life Satisfaction among (Im)Migrants and Refugees: A Systematic Review." *Journal of Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities*. doi: 10.1007/s40615-024-02036-7.
- Stanton, Andrew. 2022. "Zelensky Frustrated Ukraine Military Made Decision Without Him." *Newsweek*, July 5.
- Strang, Alison, and Alastair Ager. 2010. "Refugee Integration: Emerging Trends and Remaining Agendas." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 23(4):589–607. doi: 10.1093/jrs/feq046.
- Strang, Alison B., and Neil Quinn. 2021. "Integration or Isolation? Refugees' Social Connections and Wellbeing." *Journal of Refugee Studies* 34(1):328–53. doi: 10.1093/jrs/fez040.
- Suárez-Orozco, Carola, Irina L. G. Todorova, and Josephine Louie. 2002. "Making up for Lost Time: The Experience of Separation and Reunification among Immigrant Families." *Family Process* 41(4):625–43. doi: 10.1111/j.1545-5300.2002.00625.x.
- Subramanian, Ilayaraja, Jörg Finsterwalder, and C. Michael Hall. 2022. "A Systematic Literature Review of Service-Related Research on Refugees." *Journal of Services Marketing* 36(7):908–39. doi: 10.1108/JSM-09-2021-0312.
- Temkina, Anna, and Elena Zdravomyslova. 2003. "Gender Studies in Post-Soviet Society: Western Frames and Cultural Differences." *Studies in East European Thought* 55(1):51–61.
- The Council of the European Union. 2001. *Council Directive 2001/55/EC of 20 July 2001 on Minimum Standards for Giving Temporary Protection in the Event of a Mass Influx of Displaced Persons and on Measures Promoting a Balance of Efforts between Member States in Receiving Such Persons and Bearing the Consequences Thereof*. Vol. 212.
- The Economist. 2016. "The World's Refugee Crisis: Past and Present." *The Economist*, May 27.

- Tourangeau, Roger. 1984. *Cognitive Aspects of Survey Methodology: Building a Bridge Between Disciplines*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Turner, Victor. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*. 1st ed. Routledge.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2022a. *Lives on Hold: Intentions and Perspectives of Refugees from Ukraine #2*.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2022b. *Lives on Hold: Profiles and Intentions of Refugees from Ukraine #1*.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2023a. *Lives On Hold : Intentions And Perspectives Of Internally Displaced Persons In Ukraine #3*.
- United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2023b. *Lives on Hold: Intentions and Perspectives of Refugees and IDPs from Ukraine #4*.
- USAID. 2007. "The DHS Program - Country Main." Retrieved February 22, 2025 ([https://dhsprogram.com/Countries/Country-Main.cfm?ctry\\_id=230](https://dhsprogram.com/Countries/Country-Main.cfm?ctry_id=230)).
- Waldie, Paul. 2022. "Ukraine's Ban on Adult Men Leaving the Country Faces Growing Legal Challenges." *The Globe and Mail*, August 30.
- Walker, Nigel. 2023. *Conflict in Ukraine: A Timeline (2014 – Eve of 2022 Invasion)*. House of Commons, Library.
- Ware, John E., and Cathy Donald Sherbourne. 1992. "The MOS 36-Item Short-Form Health Survey (SF-36): I. Conceptual Framework and Item Selection." *Medical Care* 30(6):473–83.
- Willen, Sarah S. 2012. "How Is Health-Related 'Deservingness' Reckoned? Perspectives from Unauthorized Im/Migrants in Tel Aviv." *Social Science & Medicine* 74(6):812–21. doi: 10.1016/j.socscimed.2011.06.033.
- Wise, Amanda. 2010. "Sensuous Multiculturalism: Emotional Landscapes of Inter-Ethnic Living in Australian Suburbia." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 36(6):917–37. doi: 10.1080/13691831003643355.
- World Bank. 2023. *Social Cohesion and Forced Displacement: A Synthesis of New Research*. World Bank.
- Wright, Sarah. 2015. "More-than-Human, Emergent Belongings: A Weak Theory Approach." *Progress in Human Geography* 39(4):391–411. doi: 10.1177/0309132514537132.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira. 2006. "Belonging and the Politics of Belonging." *Patterns of Prejudice* 40(3):197–214. doi: 10.1080/00313220600769331.

# Appendix

## I. (Survey) Ukrainian Refugee Migration Decision Making and Health, Survey Questions with Consent Form

CONSENT FORM: Please read the following and provide your electronic signature if you consent to participating in this study:

DESCRIPTION: You are invited to participate in an anonymous survey about nature-based programs or organizations in Norway which have provided services to refugees. The aim of this survey is to learn more about the range of nature-based activities, challenges, experiences, and services for refugees in Norway.

TIME INVOLVEMENT: This 15-question survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes.

RISKS AND BENEFITS: There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study.

PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS: If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to discontinue participation at any time during the survey. Please only take this survey if you are 18 years of age or older.

DATA USE: Your survey responses cannot be withdrawn after submission and may be involved in secondary use, banking, and/or future sharing for research related to the topic of time/physical activity in nature.

QUESTIONS: If you have any questions, concerns or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks and benefits, contact Principal Investigator (PI):

Larisa Ozeryansky

University of Washington

Seattle, Washington 98105

lozeryan@uw.edu

### Survey Questions and Responses in English/Russian/Ukrainian

#### 1. Language Choice / Выбор языка / Вибір мови

**Question:** Please choose your language. / Пожалуйста, выберите язык. / Будь ласка, виберіть мову.

**Options:**

- English / Английский / Англійська
- русский язык / Russian / Російська мова
- Українська мова / Ukrainian / Українська мова

**Message after selection:** Thank you! You may now begin the survey. / Спасибо! Вы можете начать опрос. / Дякуємо! Ви можете розпочати опитування.

## **2. Consent / Согласие / Згода**

**Question:** Consent Form... / Бланк согласия... / Форма згоди...

**Response:** (Space for digital signature)

## **3. Current Location / Текущее местоположение / Поточне місцезнаходження**

**Question:** Are you currently in Ukraine? / Вы сейчас в Украине? / Ви зараз в Україні?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

## **4. Temporarily left Ukraine / Временный отъезд из Украины / Тимчасовий виїзд з України**

**Question:** Did you leave Ukraine temporarily and then return? / Вы временно уехали из Украины, а потом вернулись? / Ви тимчасово виїхали з України, а потім повернулись?

**Options:**

- Yes (Please explain in the box below) / Да (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Так (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- No / Нет / Ні

## **5. Reason for Staying in Ukraine / Причина пребывания в Украине / Причина залишення в Україні**

**Question:** Why did you stay in Ukraine? / Почему вы остались в Украине? / Чому ви залишилися в Україні?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

## **6. Last Day in Ukraine / Последний день в Украине / Останній день в Україні**

**Question:** When was the last day you were in Ukraine? (Month, Day, Year - e.g., March 1, 2022) / Когда вы в последний раз были в Украине? (Месяц, день года - например, 1 марта 2022 г.) / Коли ви останній день були в Україні? (Місяць, день Рік – напр. 1 березня 2022 р.)

**Response:** (Write-in text)

#### 7. Ukraine Lived With / С кем проживали в Украине / З ким ви жили в Україні

**Question:** In Ukraine, I lived... (Select all that apply) / В Украине я жил... (Выберите все подходящие варианты) / В Україні я жив... (Виберіть усе, що підходить)

**Options:**

- With a partner (wife/husband/partner) / С партнером (женой/мужем/партнером) / З партнером (дружиною/чоловіком/партнером)
- With a child/children / С ребенком/детьми / З дитиною/дітьми
- With elderly relatives (parents, grandparents, etc.) / С пожилыми родственниками (родители, бабушки, дедушки и т.д.) / З літніми родичами (батьками, дідусями, бабусями тощо)
- With disabled relatives / С родственниками-инвалидами / З родичами-інвалідами
- With other relatives (Please explain in the box below) / С другими родственниками (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / З іншими родичами (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- With non-relatives (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (не родственники) (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інші (не родичі) (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- Alone (single) / Один (одна) / Один (одна)
- With friend(s) / С другом или друзьями / З другом або друзями

#### 8. Caretaker in Ukraine / Опекун в Украине / Опікун в Україні

**Question:** In Ukraine, were you a caretaker for elderly or disabled relatives or other relatives? / В Украине вы ухаживали за пожилыми родственниками или инвалидами или другими родственниками? / В Україні ви доглядали за літніми, інвалідами чи іншими родичами?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні

- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

### 9. Caretaker Ukraine Post-Migration / Опекунство после миграции / Опікунство після міграції

**Question:** Did you leave Ukraine with the people you are caretaker for? / Вы покинули Украину с людьми, за которых вы ухаживаете? / Ви поїхали з України з тими людьми, за якими опікуєтесь?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

### 10. Ukraine Home Type / Тип жилья в Украине / Тип житла в Україні

**Question:** What was your living situation in Ukraine? / Какова была ваша жизненная ситуация в Украине? / Якою була ваша життєва ситуація в Україні?

**Options:**

- Rent - apartment / Аренда квартиры / Оренда - квартира
- Own - house / Свой дом / Власний - будинок
- Country House (Dacha) / Дача / Дача
- Dormitory / Общежитие / Гуртожиток
- Own - apartment / Своя квартира / Власна - квартира
- Rent - house / Аренда дома / Оренда - будинок
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

### 11. Ukraine Employment / Занятость в Украине / Робота в Україні

**Question:** What was your employment status in Ukraine? / Какой у вас был статус занятости в Украине? / Який був ваш статус роботи в Україні?

**Options:**

- Employed full time (one primary job) / Полная занятость (одна основная работа) / Повний робочий день (одна основна робота)
- Employed full time (more than one primary job) / Полная занятость (более одной работы) / Повний робочий день (більше однієї роботи)
- Employed part time / Работа на неполный рабочий день / Працевлаштований неповний робочий день

- Unemployed / Безработные / Безробітний
- Student / Ученик / Студент
- Retired / В отставке / На пенсії
- Homemaker / Домохозяйка / Домогосподарка
- Self-employed or entrepreneur / Самозанятый или предприниматель / Самозайнятий або підприємець
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

## 12. Information Sources / Источники информации / Джерела інформації

**Question:** How important were the following sources of information in informing your migration decisions? (0 = not important, 5 = somewhat important, 10 = very important. Please be specific and write what sources of information you used in the box below your answer choices; e.g., Social Media: Facebook) / Насколько важны были следующие источники информации для информирования о ваших решениях о миграции? (0 = не важно, 5 = несколько важно, 10 = очень важно). Пожалуйста, укажите конкретно, какие источники информации вы использовали, в поле под вариантами ответа; например, социальные сети: Facebook / Наскільки важливими були наведені нижче джерела інформації для прийняття рішень щодо міграції? (0 = не важливо, 5 = дещо важливо, 10 = дуже важливо). Будь ласка, укажіть, які джерела інформації ви використали у полі під вашими варіантами відповідей; наприклад, соціальні мережі: Facebook

### Options:

- Social Media / Социальные сети / Соц.медіа
- Local news / Местные новости / Місцеві новини
- International news / Международные новости / Міжнародні новини
- Recommendations of friends/family / Рекомендации друзей/родных / Рекомендації друзів/родини
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

## 13. Info Sources Used / Используемые источники информации / Використані джерела інформації

**Question:** What were your main sources of information which you used to make decisions about migrating out of Ukraine? Please be specific. / Каковы были ваши основные источники информации, которые вы использовали для принятия решения о выезде из Украины? Пожалуйста, будьте конкретны. / Якими були ваші основні джерела інформації, за допомогою яких ви приймали рішення про міграцію з України? Будь ласка, будьте конкретні.

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**14. Why Left (Time) / Почему уехали (время) / Чому залишили (час)**

**Question:** Why did you decide to leave Ukraine when you did? / Почему вы решили уехать из Украины, когда вы это сделали? / Чому ви вирішили залишити Україну, коли вирішили?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**15. Final Destination Decision / Выбор конечного пункта назначения / Вибір країни призначення**

**Question:** What influenced your decision in choosing your final destination country? / Что повлияло на ваше решение при выборе страны конечного назначения? / Що вплинуло на ваше рішення у виборі країни кінцевого призначення?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**16. Final Destination Travel Method / Способ передвижения в страну назначения / Метод подорожі в країну призначення**

**Question:** What influenced your decision in terms of how you traveled or what borders you crossed? / Что повлияло на ваше решение относительно того, как вы путешествовали или какие границы вы пересекали? / Що вплинуло на ваше рішення щодо того, як ви подорожували чи які кордони перетинали?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**17. Final Destination Human Influences / Влияние людей на выбор страны / Вплив людей на вибір країни**

**Question:** Did certain people influence your decision to leave Ukraine or choose a destination country? Which people (examples: husband, friends, etc.)? / Повлияли ли на ваше решение уехать из Украины или выбрать страну назначения определенные люди? Какие люди (примеры: муж, друзья и т. д.)? / Чи вплинули певні люди на ваше рішення покинути Україну чи вибрати країну призначення? Які люди (прикладі: чоловік, друзі тощо)?

**Options:**

- Friends / Друзья / Друзі
- Neighbors / Соседи / Сусіди
- Romantic partner / Вторая половинка / Друга половинка
- Other Relatives (Please explain in the box below) / Другие родственники (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інші родичі (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

- Personal Decision / Личное решение / Особисте рішення

### 18. Reasons for Leaving / Причины отъезда / Причини виїзду

**Question:** What were your reasons for leaving Ukraine? (Select all that apply) / По каким причинам вы уехали из Украины? (Выбрать все, что подходит) / Які були причини для того, щоб залишити Україну? (Виберіть усе, що підходить)

**Options:**

- Employment Opportunity / Возможность трудоустройства / Можливість працевлаштування
- Safety / Безопасность / Безпека
- Crime/Corruption / Преступность/Коррупция / Злочинність/Корупція
- War/Violence / Война/Насилие / Війна/насильство
- Education Opportunity / Образовательная возможность / Можливість освіти
- Social Reasons (family, friends, partner, etc.) (Please explain in the box below) / Социальные причины (друзья, семья, партнер и т. д.) (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Соціальні причини (друзі, сім'я, партнер тощо) (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- Health reasons (Please explain in the box below) / Состояние здоровья (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Причини здоров'я (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

### 19. How Left Ukraine / Как уехали из Украины / Як залишили Україну

**Question:** How did you leave Ukraine? / Как вы уехали из Украины? / Як ви залишили Україну?

**Options:**

- By foot / Пешком / Пішки
- By car / На машине / Автомобілем
- By bus / Автобусом / Автобусом
- By train / Поездом / Потягом
- By plane / Самолетом / Літаком
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

### 20. Why Transport / Почему выбрали транспорт / Чому обрали транспорт

**Question:** Why did you decide to take this form of transportation? / Почему вы решили воспользоваться этим видом транспорта? / Чому ви вирішили скористатися цим видом транспорту?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

## 21. Travel Challenges / Проблемы в пути / Проблеми в дорозі

**Question:** Did you encounter challenges on your way to the border (or airport)? / Сталкивались ли вы с трудностями на пути к границе (или в аэропорт)? / Чи стикалися ви з труднощами на шляху до кордону (або аеропорту)?

**Options:**

- Yes (Please explain in the box below) / Да (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Так (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- No / Нет / Ні

## 22. Border Challenges / Проблемы на границе / Проблеми на кордоні

**Question:** Did you encounter challenges at the border (or in the airport)? / Сталкивались ли вы с проблемами на границе (или в аэропорту)? / Чи стикалися ви з труднощами на кордоні (чи в аеропорту)?

**Options:**

- Yes (Please explain in the box below) / Да (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Так (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- No / Нет / Ні

## 23. Border Crossing / Пересечение границы / Перетин кордону

**Question:** What border did you cross when leaving Ukraine? / Какую границу вы пересекали при выезде из Украины? / Який кордон ви перетнули, виїжджаючи з України?

**Options:**

- Poland/Ukraine / Польша/Украина / Польща/Україна
- Belarus/Ukraine / Беларусь/Украина / Білорусь/Україна
- Russia/Ukraine / Россия/Украина / Росія/Україна
- Moldova/Ukraine / Молдова/Украина / Молдова/Україна
- Romania/Ukraine / Румыния/Украина / Румунія/Україна
- Slovakia/Ukraine / Словакия/Украина / Словаччина/Україна
- Hungary/Ukraine / Венгрия/Украина / Угорщина/Україна
- I left Ukraine by plane (Please type your destination country in the box below) / Я вылетел/а из Украины на самолете (пожалуйста, укажите страну назначения)

в поле нижче) / Я вилетів/вилетіла з України літаком (будь ласка, введіть країну призначення у полі нижче)

- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

#### 24. Stay or Go On (1) / Остаться или поехать дальше (1) / Залишитися чи їхати далі (1)

**Question:** Did you stay in the first country you went to from Ukraine, or did you go to a second country? / Вы остались в первой стране, в которую вы отправились из Украины, или вы поехали во вторую страну? / Ви залишилися в першій країні, куди поїхали з України, чи поїхали в другу країну?

##### Options:

- I stayed in the first country I traveled to from Ukraine / Я остався/оставася в первой стране, в которую поехал из Украины / Я залишився/залишилася в першій країні, куди поїхав з України
- I went to a second country / Я уехал/а во вторую страну / Я поїхав/поїхала до другої країни

#### 25. Stay or Go On (1), Why (2)? / Почему поехали дальше (2)? / Чому поїхали далі (2)?

**Question:** Why did you travel to a second country? / Почему вы поехали во вторую страну? / Чому ви поїхали до другої країни?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

#### 26. Where (2) / Вторая страна / Друга країна

**Question:** What was the second country you traveled to? / В какой второй стране вы побывали? / Якою другою країною ви побували?

##### Options:

- Poland / Польша / Польща
- Belarus / Беларусь / Білорусь
- Russia / Россия / Росія
- Moldova / Молдова / Молдова
- Romania / Румыния / Румунія
- Slovakia / Словакия / Словаччина
- Hungary / Венгрия / Угорщина
- The U.K. / Великобритания / Великобританія
- The U.S. / США / США
- Germany / Германия / Німеччина

- France / Франция / Франція
- Canada / Канада / Канада
- Italy / Италия / Італія
- Spain / Испания / Іспанія
- Czech Republic / Чешская Республика / Чеська Республіка
- Turkey / Турция / Туреччина
- Norway / Норвегия / Норвегія
- Portugal / Португалия / Португалія
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**27. Stay or Go On (2) / Остаться или поехать дальше (2) / Залишитися чи їхати далі (2)**

**Question:** Did you stay in the second country you went to, or did you go to a third country? / Вы остались во второй стране, в которую поехали из Украины, или поехали в третью страну? / Ви залишилися в другій країні, куди поїхали з України, чи поїхали в третю країну?

**Options:**

- I stayed in the second country / Я остался/осталась во второй стране / Я залишився/залишилася в другій країні
- I traveled to a third country / Я уехал/а в третью страну / Я поїхав/поїхала у третю країну

**28. Stay or Go On (2), Why (3)? / Почему поехали дальше (3)? / Чому поїхали далі (3)?**

**Question:** Why did you travel to a third country? / Почему вы поехали в третью страну? / Чому ви поїхали в третю країну?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**29. Where (3) / Третья страна / Третя країна**

**Question:** What was the third country you traveled to? / В какой третьей стране вы побывали? / Яку третю країну ви подорожували?

**Options:**

- Poland / Польша / Польща
- Belarus / Беларусь / Білорусь
- Russia / Россия / Росія
- Moldova / Молдова / Молдова

- Romania / Румыния / Румунія
- Slovakia / Словакия / Словаччина
- Hungary / Венгрия / Угорщина
- The U.K. / Великобритания / Великобританія
- The U.S. / США / США
- Germany / Германия / Німеччина
- France / Франция / Франція
- Canada / Канада / Канада
- Italy / Италия / Італія
- Spain / Испания / Іспанія
- Czech Republic / Чешская Республика / Чеська Республіка
- Turkey / Турция / Туреччина
- Norway / Норвегия / Норвегія
- Portugal / Португалия / Португалія
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**30. Stay or Go On (3) / Остаться или поехать дальше (3) / Залишитися чи їхати далі (3)**

**Question:** Did you stay in the third country you went to, or did you go to a fourth country? / Вы остались в третьей стране, в которую вы отправились из Украины, или вы уехали в четвертую страну? / Ви залишилися в третій країні, куди поїхали з України, чи поїхали в четверту країну?

**Options:**

- I stayed in the third country / Я остался/осталась в третьей стране / Я залишився/залишилася в третій країні
- I traveled to a fourth country / Я уехал/а в четвертую страну / Я поїхав/поїхала у четверту країну

**31. Stay or Go On (3), Why (4)? / Почему поехали дальше (4)? / Чому поїхали далі (4)?**

**Question:** Why did you travel to a fourth country? / Почему вы поехали в четвертую страну? / Чому ви поїхали в четверту країну?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**32. Where (4) / Четвертая страна / Четверта країна**

**Question:** What was the fourth country you traveled to? / В какую четвертую страну вы поехали? / Яку четверту країну ви побували?

**Options:**

- Poland / Польша / Польща
- Belarus / Беларусь / Білорусь
- Russia / Россия / Росія
- Moldova / Молдова / Молдова
- Romania / Румыния / Румунія
- Slovakia / Словакия / Словаччина
- Hungary / Венгрия / Угорщина
- The U.K. / Великобритания / Великобританія
- The U.S. / США / США
- Germany / Германия / Німеччина
- France / Франция / Франція
- Canada / Канада / Канада
- Italy / Италия / Італія
- Spain / Испания / Іспанія
- Czech Republic / Чешская Республика / Чеська Республіка
- Turkey / Турция / Туреччина
- Norway / Норвегия / Норвегія
- Portugal / Португалия / Португалія
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**33. Stay or Go On (4) / Остаться или поехать дальше (4) / Залишитися чи їхати далі (4)**

**Question:** Did you stay in the fourth country, or did you travel to a fifth country? / Вы остались в четвертой стране, в которую вы отправились из Украины, или вы поехали в пятую страну? / Ви залишилися в четвертій країні, куди поїхали з України, чи поїхали в п'яту країну?

**Options:**

- I stayed in the fourth country / Я остался/осталась в четвертой стране / Я залишився/залишилася в четвертій країні

- I traveled to a fifth country / Я уехал/а в пятую страну / Я поїхав/поїхала у п'яту країну

### 34. Five Countries or More / Пять стран и больше / П'ять країн і більше

**Question:** Please provide more information in the box below about your journey (why did you travel through so many countries, where else did you go and why?). / Пожалуйста, предоставьте в поле ниже дополнительную информацию о своем путешествии (почему вы путешествовали по стольким странам, где еще вы побывали и почему?). / Будь ласка, надайте більше інформації у полі нижче про вашу подорож (чому ви подорожували через стільки країн, куди ще побували і чому?).

**Response:** (Write-in text)

### 35. Current Location / Текущее местоположение / Поточне місцезнаходження

**Question:** Where are you now (please enter the city or town name in the box below the country you select)? / В какой стране вы сейчас? пожалуйста, введите название города или поселка в поле под выбранной вами страной / В якій країні ви зараз? будь ласка, введіть назву міста або міста у полі під вибраною країною.

#### Options:

- Poland / Польша / Польща
- Belarus / Беларусь / Білорусь
- Russia / Россия / Росія
- Moldova / Молдова / Молдова
- Romania / Румыния / Румунія
- Slovakia / Словакия / Словаччина
- Hungary / Венгрия / Угорщина
- The U.K. / Великобритания / Великобританія
- The U.S. / США / США
- Germany / Германия / Німеччина
- France / Франция / Франція
- Canada / Канада / Канада
- Italy / Италия / Італія
- Spain / Испания / Іспанія
- Czech Republic / Чешская Республика / Чеська Республіка
- Turkey / Турция / Туреччина

- Norway / Норвегия / Норвегія
- Portugal / Португалия / Португалія
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

### 36. Plans to Move / Планы на переезд / Плани на переїзд

**Question:** Are you planning on moving again within the next 3 months? / Планируете ли вы снова переехать в течение следующих 3 месяцев? / Плануєте ви знову переїхати впродовж наступних 3 місяців?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Not Sure / Не знаю / Не знаю

### 37. Current Living Situation / Текущее место проживания / Поточне місце проживання

**Question:** Who do you currently live with? (Select all that apply) / С кем вы сейчас живете? (Выбрать все, что подходит) / З ким ви зараз живете? (Виберіть усе, що підходить)

**Options:**

- With a partner (wife/husband/partner) / С партнером (женой/мужем/партнером) / З партнером (дружиною/чоловіком/партнером)
- With child/children (no partner) / С ребенком/детьми / З дитиною/дітьми
- With elderly relatives (parents, grandparents, etc.) / С пожилыми родственниками (родители, бабушки, дедушки и т.д.) / З літніми родичами (батьками, дідусями, бабусями тощо)
- With disabled relatives / С родственниками-инвалидами / З родичами-інвалідами
- With other relatives (Please explain in the box below) / С другими родственниками (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / З іншими родичами (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- Alone (single) / Один (одна) / Один (одна)
- With friend(s) / С другом или друзьями / З другом або друзями
- Other (non-relatives) (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (не родственники) (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (не родичі) (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

### 38. Current Home Type / Текущая Жилищная Ситуация / Поточна Житлова Ситуація

**Question:** What is your current living situation? / Какова ваша нынешняя жизненная ситуация? / Яка ваша нинішня життєва ситуація?

**Options:**

- Rent - apartment / Аренда квартиры / Оренда - квартири
- Own - house / Свой дом / Власний - будинок
- Country House (Dacha) / Дача / Дача
- Dormitory / Общежитие / Гуртожиток
- Own - apartment / Своя квартира / Власна - квартира
- Rent - house / Аренда дома / Оренда - будинку
- Center for Refugees (Please explain in the box below) / Центр для беженцев (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Центр для біженців (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- Staying with relatives / Проживание у родственников / Перебування у родичів
- Staying with other people (non-relatives) (Please explain in the box below) / Пребывание с другими людьми (не родственниками) / Перебування з іншими людьми (не родичами)
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**39. Current Employment / Текущий Статус Занятости / Поточний Статус Роботи**

**Question:** What is your current employment status? / Каков ваш текущий статус занятости? / Який ваш статус роботи зараз?

**Options:**

- Employed full-time (one primary job) / Полная занятость (одна основная работа) / Повний робочий день (одна основна робота)
- Employed full-time (more than one job) / Полная занятость (более одной работы) / Повний робочий день (більше однієї роботи)
- Unemployed / Без работы / Без роботи
- Student / Ученик / Студент
- Retired / В отставке / На пенсії
- Homemaker / Домохозяйка / Домогосподарка
- Self-employed or entrepreneur / Самозанятый или предприниматель / Самозайнятий або підприємець
- Employed part-time / Неполный рабочий день / Неповний робочий день

- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

#### 40. Financial Assistance / Финансовая Помощь / Фінансова Допомога

**Question:** Are you receiving any form of financial assistance? / Получаете ли вы финансовую помощь? / Чи отримуєте ви будь-яку фінансову допомогу?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні

#### 41. Type of Financial Assistance / Вид Финансовой Помощи / Вид Фінансової Допомоги

**Question:** What kind of financial assistance are you receiving? (Select all that apply and put the amount and currency per month below each selection) / Какую финансовую помощь вы получаете? (Выберите все подходящие варианты и укажите сумму и валюту в месяц под каждым выбором) / Яку фінансову допомогу ви отримуєте? (Виберіть усе, що підходить, і поставте суму та валюту на місяць під кожним вибором)

**Options:**

- Living stipends from the government in my current country / Стипендии от правительства в моей нынешней стране / Стипендії на проживання від уряду в моїй нинішній країні
- Financial assistance from relatives / Материальная помощь от родственников / Матеріальна допомога від родичів
- Financial assistance from social contacts (non-relatives) / Финансовая помощь от социальных контактов (не родственников) / Матеріальна допомога від соціальних контактів (не родичів)
- Housing stipends from the government in my current country / Жилищные субсидии от правительства в моей нынешней стране / Житлові стипендії від уряду в моїй нинішній країні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

#### 42. Current Challenges General / Текущие Проблемы / Поточні Проблеми

**Question:** What, if any, of the following challenges are you currently experiencing? (Select all that apply; please explain more in the boxes below your answer choices) / С какими из следующих проблем вы сталкиваетесь в настоящее время, если таковые имеются? (Выберите все подходящие варианты; пожалуйста, объясните больше в полях под вашими вариантами ответов) / З якими проблемами ви зараз стикаєтеся, якщо такі є? (Виберіть усе, що підходить; поясніть, будь ласка, докладніше в полях під вашими варіантами відповідей)

**Options:**

- Local language / Местный язык / Місцева мова
- Registration or other administration relevant to migration (ex. visas, other paperwork) / Регистрация или другое администрирование, имеющее отношение к миграции (например, визы, другие документы) / Реєстрація або інше управління, пов'язане з міграцією (наприклад, візи, інші документи)
- Issues related to my children's schooling / Проблемы, связанные с обучением моих детей в школе / Питання, пов'язані з навчанням моїх дітей
- Issues related to employment / Вопросы, связанные с трудоустройством / Питання, пов'язані з працевлаштуванням
- Finding a place to live / Вопросы, связанные с моей жилищной ситуацией / Питання, що стосуються моєї житлової ситуації
- Integrating into the local community (ex. making friends) / Интеграция в местное сообщество (например, завести друзей, найти социальную поддержку) / Інтеграція в місцеву спільноту (наприклад, знайти друзів, знайти соціальну підтримку)
- Accessing healthcare services / Доступ к медицинским услугам / Доступ до медичних послуг
- I am not experiencing any challenges / Я не испытываю никаких проблем / Я не відчуваю жодних труднощів
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (объясните, пожалуйста, в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**43. Gender / Пол / Стать**

**Question:** What is your gender? / Какого Вы пола? / Яка ваша стать?

**Options:**

- Male / Мужской / Чоловіча
- Female / Женский / Жіноча
- Other (please explain in the box below) / Другое (пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**44. Self-Rated Health / Самооценка Здоровья / Самооцінка Здоров'я**

**Question:** How would you rate your health (0 = very poor, 10 = excellent) / Как бы вы оценили свое здоровье (0 = очень плохое, 10 = отличное) / Як би ви оцінили своє здоров'я (0 = дуже погане, 10 = відмінне)

**Response:** (Choice by number)

#### 45. Self-Rated Activity / Самооценка Физической Активности / Самооцінка Фізичної Активності

**Question:** How would you rate your current level of physical activity? (0 - almost never leave the house, 5 - some exercise, regular walking, 10 - very active, moving throughout the day) / Как бы вы оценили свой нынешний уровень физической активности? (0 - почти не выхожу из дома, 5 - немного занимаюсь спортом, регулярные прогулки, 10 - очень активная жизнь, двигаюсь в течение дня) / Як би ви оцінили свій поточний рівень фізичної активності? (0 - майже ніколи не виходжу з дому, 5 - фізичні вправи, регулярні прогулянки, 10 - дуже активне життя, рух протягом дня)

**Response:** (Choice by number)

#### 46. Tobacco Use / Употребление Табака / Вживання Тютюну

**Question:** Do you smoke (use tobacco products) more, less, or the same now, as compared to when you lived in Ukraine? / Курите ли Вы (употребляете табачные изделия) больше, меньше или столько же сейчас, по сравнению с тем, когда жили в Украине? / Чи курите ви (вживаєте тютюнові вироби) більше, менше чи так само зараз, ніж коли ви жили в Україні?

**Options:**

- More / Больше / Більше
- Less / Меньше / Менше
- Same / Столько же / Так само
- I am a non-smoker / Я не курю / Я не курю

#### 47. Alcohol Use Amount / Употребление Алкоголя / Вживання Алкоголю

**Question:** How much alcohol (beer, liquor, wine, etc.) do you drink? (0 - never; 5 - two or three drinks per week; 10 - three or more drinks per day) / Сколько алкоголя (пиво, спиртные напитки, вино и т. д.) вы пьете? (0 – никогда; 5 – два-три напитка в неделю; 10 – три и более напитка в день) / Скільки алкоголю (пива, алкогольних напоїв, вина тощо) ви вживаєте? (0 - ніколи; 5 - два або три напої на тиждень; 10 - три або більше напоїв на день)

**Response:** (Choice by number)

#### 48. Alcohol Use Comparative / Употребление Алкоголя (Сравнение) / Вживання Алкоголю (Порівняння)

**Question:** Do you drink more, less, or the same amount of alcohol now (as compared to when you lived in Ukraine)? / Вы пьете больше, меньше или такое же количество алкоголя сейчас (по сравнению с тем, когда вы жили в Украине)? / Ви п'єте більше, менше або таке ж кількість алкоголю зараз (порівняно з тим, коли ви жили в Україні)?

**Options:**

- More / Больше / Більше
- Less / Меньше / Менше
- Same / Такое же / Так само
- I do not drink alcohol now and I did not drink when I lived in Ukraine / Я не пью / Я не вживаю

**49. Pregnant Y-N / Беременна ли Вы? / Ви вагітна?**

**Question:** Are you pregnant? / Вы беременна? / Ви вагітна?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**50. Pregnancy Experience / Опыт Беременности / Досвід Вагітності**

**Question:** How has your pregnancy experience been during migration and resettlement? / Каким был ваш опыт беременности во время миграции и переселения? / Яким був ваш досвід вагітності під час міграції та переселення?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**51. Breastfeeding Y-N / Кормление Грудью / Грудне Вигодовування**

**Question:** Are you breastfeeding? / Вы кормите грудью? / Ви годуєте грудьми?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**52. Breastfeeding Experience / Опыт Грудного Вскармливания / Досвід Грудного Вигодовування**

**Question:** How has your breastfeeding experience been during migration and resettlement? / Каким был ваш опыт грудного вскармливания во время миграции и переселения? / Яким був ваш досвід грудного вигодовування під час міграції та переселення?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**53. Chronic Illness Y-N / Хронические Заболевания / Хронічні Захворювання**

**Question:** Do you experience any difficulties or limitations in your daily life due to chronic illness, disability, handicap, physical weakness, or mental problems? If so, to a large extent or to some extent? (Please explain in the box below) / Испытываете ли Вы какие-либо затруднения или ограничения в повседневной жизни из-за хронического заболевания, инвалидности, физических недостатков, физической слабости или проблем с психикой? Если да, то в значительной или в некоторой степени? (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже ваш вариант ответа) / Чи відчуваєте Ви якісь труднощі чи обмеження у повсякденному житті через хронічне захворювання, інвалідність, фізичні недоліки, фізичну слабкість або проблеми із психікою? Якщо так, то значною чи певною мірою? (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі під вашим варіантом відповіді)

**Options:**

- Yes, to a large extent / Да, в значительной степени / Так, значною мірою
- Yes, to a small extent / Да, в некоторой степени / Так, певною мірою
- No / Нет / Ні

**54. Chronic Health Issues Y-N / Хронические Проблемы со Здоровьем / Хронічні Проблеми зі Здоров'ям**

**Question:** Do you have any ongoing or chronic health issues? / Есть ли у вас постоянные или хронические проблемы со здоровьем? / Чи є у вас тривалі чи хронічні проблеми зі здоров'ям?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні

**55. Chronic Illness Type / Тип Хронических Заболеваний / Тип Хронічних Захворювань**

**Question:** What ongoing or chronic health issues do you have? (Select all that apply; please explain more in the box below your choice) / Какие текущие хронические проблемы со здоровьем у вас есть? Выберите все подходящие варианты; пожалуйста, объясните больше в поле под вашим выбором. / Які у вас хронічні проблеми зі здоров'ям? Виберіть усе, що підходить; будь ласка, поясніть більше у полі під вашим вибором.

**Options:**

- Dental / Стоматологические / Стоматологічні
- Psychological / Психологические / Психологічні
- Cardiovascular / Сердечно-сосудистые / Серцево-судинні
- Respiratory / Респираторные / Дихальна система

- Diabetes and/or kidney function / Диабет и/или функция почек / Діабет та/або функція нирок
- Cancer / Рак / Рак
- Sexually Transmitted Infection or HIV / Инфекция, передающаяся половым путем, или ВИЧ / Інфекція, що передається статевим шляхом, або ВІЛ
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**56. Chronic Illness Care / Получение Медицинской Помощи / Отримання Медичної Допомоги**

**Question:** Are you getting care for these problem(s)? How? (Please explain in the box below your answer choice) / Вы получаете помощь в решении этих проблем? Как? (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже ваш вариант ответа) / Чи отримуєте ви допомогу щодо цих проблем? Як? (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі під вашим варіантом відповіді)

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**57. New Health Issues Y-N / Новые Проблемы со Здоровьем / Нові Проблеми зі Здоров'ям**

**Question:** Have you experienced any new health issues since you left Ukraine? / Были ли у вас новые проблемы со здоровьем после того, как вы покинули Украину? / Чи виникли у вас якісь нові проблеми зі здоров'ям після того, як ви залишили Україну?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні

**58. New Health Issues Type / Тип Новых Проблем со Здоровьем / Тип Нових Проблем зі Здоров'ям**

**Question:** What new health issues are you experiencing (health issues which started after you left Ukraine)? (Select all that apply and please explain more in the box below your choice) / Какие новые проблемы со здоровьем вы испытываете? (проблемы со здоровьем, которые начались после вашего отъезда из Украины) Выберите все подходящие варианты и объясните подробнее в поле под вашим выбором. / Які нові проблеми зі здоров'ям у вас виникли? (проблеми зі здоров'ям, які почалися після того, як ви залишили Україну) Виберіть усе, що підходить, і поясніть, будь ласка, більше у полі під вашим вибором.

**Options:**

- Dental / Стоматологические / Стоматологічні
- Mental / Психологические / Психологічні
- Cardiovascular / Сердечно-сосудистые / Серцево-судинні
- Respiratory / Респираторные / Дихальна система
- Diabetes and/or kidney function / Диабет и/или функция почек / Діабет та/або функція нирок
- Cancer / Рак / Рак
- Sexually Transmitted Infection or HIV / Инфекция, передающаяся половым путем, или ВИЧ / Інфекція, що передається статевим шляхом, або ВІЛ
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**59. Medical Attention / Доступ к Медицинской Помощи / Доступ до Медичної Допомоги**

**Question:** Do you know how to get medical attention if you need it? / Знаєте ли вы, как получить медицинскую помощь, если она вам понадобится? / Чи знаєте ви, як отримати медичну допомогу, якщо вона вам потрібна?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**60. Emotional Support / Эмоциональная Поддержка / Емоційна Підтримка**

**Question:** How often are you able to find the following types of emotional/informational support? / Как часто вы можете найти следующие виды эмоциональной/информационной поддержки? / Як часто ви можете знайти такі види емоційної/інформаційної підтримки?

**Emotional Support (I) / Эмоциональная Поддержка (I) / Емоційна Підтримка (I)**

**Question:** Someone you can count on to listen to you when you need to talk / Кто-то, на кого вы можете рассчитывать, что он выслушает вас, когда вам нужно поговорить / Хтось, на кого ви можете розраховувати, щоб вислухати вас, коли вам потрібно поговорити

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу

- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Emotional Support (II) / Эмоциональная Поддержка (II) / Емоційна Підтримка (II)**

**Question:** Someone to give you information to help you understand a situation / Кто-то, кто предоставит вам информацию, которая поможет вам понять ситуацию / Хтось надасть вам інформацію, яка допоможе вам зрозуміти ситуацію

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Emotional Support (III) / Эмоциональная Поддержка (III) / Емоційна Підтримка (III)**

**Question:** Someone to give you good advice about a crisis / Кто-то, чтобы дать вам хороший совет о кризисе / Хтось дасть вам слушну пораду щодо кризи

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Emotional Support (IV) / Эмоциональная Поддержка (IV) / Емоційна Підтримка (IV)**

**Question:** Someone to confide in or talk to about yourself or your problems / Кто-то, кому можно довериться или поговорить о себе или своих проблемах / Комусь довіритися чи поговорити про себе чи свої проблеми

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**61. Tangible Support / Ощутимая Поддержка / Відчутна Підтримка**

**Question:** How often are you able to find tangible support? / Как часто вы можете получить ощутимую поддержку? / Як часто ви можете отримати відчутну підтримку?

**Tangible Support (I) / Ощутимая Поддержка (I) / Відчутна Підтримка (I)**

**Question:** Someone to help you if you were confined to bed / Кто-то, кто поможет вам, если вы были прикованы к постели / Хтось допоможе вам, якщо ви прикуті до ліжка

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Tangible Support (II) / Ощутимая Поддержка (II) / Відчутна Підтримка (II)**

**Question:** Someone to take you to the doctor if you needed it / Кто-то, кто отвезет вас к врачу, если вам это нужно / Хтось відвезе вас до лікаря, якщо вам це потрібно

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Tangible Support (III) / Ощутимая Поддержка (III) / Відчутна Підтримка (III)**

**Question:** Someone to prepare your meals if you were unable to do it yourself / Кто-то, кто готовит вам еду, если вы не можете сделать это сами / Хтось, хто приготує вам їжу, якщо ви не можете зробити це самостійно

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Tangible Support (IV) / Ощутимая Поддержка (IV) / Відчутна Підтримка (IV)**

**Question:** Someone to help with daily chores if you were sick / Кто-то, кто поможет с повседневными делами, если вы заболели / Хтось, хто допоможе з щоденними справами, якщо ви захворіли

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

## **62. Affectionate Support / Ласковая Поддержка / Ніжна Підтримка**

**Question:** How often are you able to find affectionate support? / Как часто вы можете найти ласковую поддержку? / Як часто ви можете знайти ніжну підтримку?

**Affectionate Support (I) / Ласковая Поддержка (I) / Ніжна Підтримка (I)**

**Question:** Someone who shows you love and affection / Кто-то, кто показывает вам любовь и привязанность / Хтось, хто виявляє вам любов і прихильність

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Affectionate Support (II) / Ласковая Поддержка (II) / Ніжна Підтримка (II)**

**Question:** Someone to love and make you feel wanted / Кто-то, чтобы любить и заставить вас чувствовать себя желанным / Когось, кого можна любити і змушувати вас відчувати себе бажаним

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Affectionate Support (III) / Ласковая Поддержка (III) / Ніжна Підтримка (III)**

**Question:** Someone who hugs you / Кто-то, кто обнимает тебя / Хтось, хто тебе обіймає

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**63. Social Interaction / Социальное Взаимодействие / Соціальна Взаємодія**

**Question:** How often are you able to find positive social interaction? / Как часто вы можете найти положительное социальное взаимодействие? / Як часто ви можете знайти позитивну соціальну взаємодію?

**Social Interaction (I) / Социальное Взаимодействие (I) / Соціальна Взаємодія (I)**

**Question:** Someone to have a good time with / С кем хорошо провести время / З кимось добре провести час

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час

- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**Social Interaction (II) / Социальное Взаимодействие (II) / Соціальна Взаємодія (II)**

**Question:** Someone to get together with for relaxation / С кем собраться для отдыха / З ким можна зібратися для відпочинку

**Options:**

- None of the time / Ни разу / Жодного разу
- Some of the time / Некоторое время / Деякий час
- All of the time / Все время / Весь час

**64. Current Challenges Health Write-in / Текущие Проблемы Здоровья (Открытый Вопрос) / Поточні Проблеми Здоров'я (Відкрите Питання)**

**Question:** What other health, emotional, social, or other challenges are you facing in your life right now? / С какими еще медицинскими, эмоциональными, социальными или другими проблемами вы сталкиваетесь в своей жизни прямо сейчас? / З якими ще проблемами зі здоров'ям, емоційними, соціальними чи іншими проблемами ви зараз стикаєтесь у своєму житті?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**65. Health Experiences Write-in / Опыты Здравоохранения (Открытый Вопрос) / Досвід Охорони Здоров'я (Відкрите Питання)**

**Question:** If there is anything else you would like to share about your health experiences, particularly related to your migration journey, please include it in the box below. / Если есть что-то еще, что вы хотели бы рассказать о своем опыте в области здравоохранения, особенно в связи с миграцией, пожалуйста, укажите это в поле ниже. / Якщо є ще щось, чим ви хотіли б поділитися з приводу свого здоров'я, зокрема, пов'язаного з вашою міграційною мандрівкою, будь ласка, додайте це в поле нижче.

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**66. Birth Year / Год рождения / Рік народження**

**Question:** What year were you born? / В каком году вы родились? / У якому році ти народився?

**Response:** (Choices by year)

**67. Ethnicity / Этническая принадлежность / Етнічна приналежність**

**Question:** How would you describe yourself? (Select all that apply) / Как бы вы себя описали? (Выбрать все, что подходит) / Як би Ви описали себе? (Виберіть усе, що підходить)

**Options:**

- Ukrainian / Українець / Українець
- Bulgarian / Болгар / Болгар
- Crimean Tatar / Крымский Татарин / Кримський Татарин
- German / Немец / Німець
- Hungarian / Мадьяр/Венгер / Мадяри/Венгерець
- Jewish / Еврей / Єврей
- Moldovan / Молдован / Молдован
- Polish / Поляк / Поляк
- Russian / Русский / Росіянин
- Romanian / Румын / Румун
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**68. Language / Язык / Мова**

**Question:** What language(s) do you speak at home? (Select all that apply) / На каком языке Вы чаще всего говорите дома? / На якій мові Ви частіше всього говорите вдома?

**Options:**

- Ukrainian / На украинском / Українською мовою
- Russian / На русском / Російською мовою
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / На другом (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**69. Mother Birthplace / Место рождения матери / Місце народження матері**

**Question:** Where was your mother born? / Где родилась ваша мать? / Де народилася ваша мати?

**Options:**

- Ukraine / Украина / Україна
- Bulgaria / Болгария / Болгарія
- Germany / Германия / Німеччина
- Hungary / Венгрия / Венгрія
- Moldova / Молдавия / Молдова
- Poland / Польша / Польща
- Russia / Россия / Росія
- Romania / Румыния / Румунія
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- I don't know / Я не знаю / Не знаю

**70. Father Birthplace / Место рождения отца / Місце народження батька**

**Question:** Where was your father born? / Где родился ваш отец? / Де народився ваш тато?

**Options:**

- Ukraine / Украина / Україна
- Bulgaria / Болгария / Болгарія
- Germany / Германия / Німеччина
- Hungary / Венгрия / Венгрія
- Moldova / Молдавия / Молдова
- Poland / Польша / Польща
- Russia / Россия / Росія
- Romania / Румыния / Румунія
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- I don't know / Я не знаю / Не знаю

**71. Respondent Birthplace / Место рождения респондента / Місце народження респондента**

**Question:** Where were you born? / Где вы родились? / Де ви народились?

**Options:**

- Ukraine / Украина / Україна
- Bulgaria / Болгария / Болгарія
- Germany / Германия / Німеччина
- Hungary / Венгрия / Венгрія
- Moldova / Молдавия / Молдова
- Poland / Польша / Польща
- Russia / Россия / Росія
- Romania / Румыния / Румунія
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- I don't know / Я не знаю / Не знаю

**72. If Born Elsewhere / Если Родились в Другой Стране / Якщо Народилися в Іншій Країні**

**Question:** When and why did you move to Ukraine? / Когда и почему вы переехали в Украину? / Коли і чому ви переїхали в Україну?

**Response:** (Write-in text)

**73. Creed Y-N / Вероисповедание Да-Нет / Віровизнання Так-Ні**

**Question:** Do you identify yourself with any religion or creed? / Относили ли Вы себя когда-нибудь к какой-либо религии или вероисповеданию? / Чи відносили Ви себе колись до якоїсь релігії чи віросповідання?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні

- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

#### 74. Which Creed / Какое Вероисповедание / Яке Віровизнання

**Question:** Which one exactly? / К какой именно? / До якої саме?

**Options:**

- The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Moscow Patriarchate / Украинская православная церковь Московского патриархата / Українська православна церква Московського патріархату
- The Ukrainian Autocephalous Church / Украинская автокефальная церковь / Українська автокефальна церква
- The Greek Catholic Church / Греко-католическая церковь / Греко-католицька церква
- Another Orthodox Church (Please explain in the box below) / Другая православная церковь (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інша православна церква (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- The Roman Catholic Church / Римско-католическая церковь / Римсько-католицька церква
- Another Christian Church (Please explain in the box below) / Другая христианская церковь (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інша християнська церква (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- The Protestant Church / Протестантская церковь / Протестантська церква
- The Ukrainian Orthodox Church of the Kyivan Patriarchate / Украинская православная церковь Киевского патриархата / Українська православна церква Київського патріархату
- The Muslim Faith / Мусульманская вера / Мусульманська віра
- The Jewish Faith / Иудейская вера / Юдейська віра
- One of the Eastern Religions (Please explain in the box below) / Одна из восточных религий (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Одна зі східних релігій (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)
- Another Non-Christian Religion (Please explain in the box below) / Другая нехристианская религия (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інша нехристиянська релігія (Поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

#### 75. Education / Образование / Освіта

**Question:** What is the highest degree or level of school you have completed? / Какой самый высокий уровень образования, который Вы получили? / Який найвищий рівень освіти, який Ви здобули?

**Options:**

- Incomplete primary education (less than 4 years of secondary school) / Неполное начальное образование (меньше 4-х классов средней школы) / Неповна початкова освіта (менше 4-х класів середньої школи)
- Primary education (grades 4-7 of secondary school) / Начальное образование (4-7 классов средней школы) / Початкова освіта (4-7 класів середньої школи)
- Incomplete secondary education (certificate for grades 8-9 of secondary school) / Неполное среднее образование (аттестат за 8-9 классов средней школы) / Неповна середня освіта (аттестат за 8-9 класів середньої школи)
- Vocational school on the basis of incomplete secondary education / ПТУ на базе неполного среднего образования / ПТУ на базі неповної середньої освіти
- Incomplete higher education (junior specialist - diploma of a technical school, college) / Неполное высшее образование (младший специалист – диплом техникума, училища, колледжа) / Неповна вища освіта (молодший спеціаліст – диплом технікуму, училища, коледжу)
- Complete higher education (Specialist) / Полное высшее образование (специалист) / Повна вища освіта (спеціаліст)
- Complete higher education (Master) / Полное высшее образование (магистр) / Повна вища освіта (магістр)
- Postgraduate degree / Аспирантура, ученая степень / Аспірантура, науковий ступінь
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**76. Marital Status / Семейное Положение / Сімейний Стан**

**Question:** What is your marital status? / Каково ваше семейное положение? / Який ваш сімейний стан?

**Options:**

- Single (never married) / Не женат / Не замужем / Неодружений / незаміжня
- Married / Женат / Замужем / Одружений / Заміжня
- Widowed / Вдова / Вдовец / Вдова / Вдівець
- Divorced / В разводе / Розлучений / Розлучена
- Separated / Живем раздельно / Живемо окремо
- Common Law Marriage/Partnership / Гражданский брак / Цивільний шлюб
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**77. Children Y-N / Дети Да-Нет / Діти Так-Ні**

**Question:** Do you have children? / У вас есть дети? / У вас є діти?

**Options:**

- Yes / Да / Так
- No / Нет / Ні
- Other (Please explain in the box below) / Другое (Пожалуйста, объясните в поле ниже) / Інше (поясніть, будь ласка, у полі нижче)

**78. Number of Children / Количество Детей / Кількість Дітей**

**Question:** How many children do you have? / Сколько у вас детей? / Скільки у вас дітей?

**Response:** (Choices by number)

**79. Ages of Children / Возраст Детей / Вік Дітей**

**Question:** What ages are your children? (Select all that apply) / Какого возраста ваши дети? (Выбрать все, что подходит) / Якого віку ваші діти? (Виберіть усе, що підходить)

**Options:**

- 0-2 / 0-3 / 0-4
- 3-5 / 3-6 / 3-7
- 6-10 / 6-11 / 6-12
- 11-2 / 11-3 / 11-4
- 13-15 / 13-16 / 13-17
- 16-18 / 16-19 / 16-20
- 19 or older / 19 или старше / 19 або старше

**II. (Interview) Ukrainian Refugee Migration Decision Making and Health, Interview Questions and Consent Form**

**Introduction:**

Hello! My name is \_\_\_\_\_, I am a student at the University of Washington studying health and migration.

I will be conducting this interview with you today - there are 18 questions and this should take around one hour of your time. You can choose to not answer any of the questions and you can stop the survey at any time.

The goal of this study is to understand the decision-making and the health and well-being of people who were living in Ukraine during the Russian military invasion on February 24, 2022.

To be clear, during this interview we will use the phrase “February 2022” to refer to the date of the Russian invasion which occurred on February 24, 2022.

We hope that we will learn from your experience and contribute to a more supportive and healthy world.

At the end of the interview we will send you the \$25 incentive gift card by email. Can I verify your email address? \_\_\_\_\_. And what country are you in now? \_\_\_\_\_. Okay. You will receive the email with the gift card in a few days, and in that email will also be a link to a second survey. You can take this survey and please give this link to people you know from Ukraine. This will really help our research project!

Would you mind if we recorded the audio of this interview? it will be confidential and only used internally.

Do you have any questions?

Okay, let's get started.

#	Questions	Probes/Notes
1.	<p>Warm-up question (goal: to get people thinking about the current state of their lives)</p> <p>A. Please tell me a little about you as a person, can you describe yourself?</p> <p>B. What is your life like now?</p>	<p>A. Where were you born? What are your interests or hobbies?</p> <p>B. How do you spend your time? Who do you spend your time with?</p>
2.	<p><i>Topic: Survey follow-up - Cognitive Interviewing</i></p> <p>You signed up for this interview after doing a survey online about Ukrainian Refugee Health and Migration Decision-Making during the Summer 2022. While your answers were anonymous, I'd like to ask you a few questions about your experience with the survey in general:</p> <p>A. <b>NON-RESPONSES:</b> There were many questions that people left unanswered, such as gender or current location. Why do you think a person would choose not to answer those or other questions in the survey?</p> <p>B. <b>PREFERENCE FOR WRITE-IN RESPONSE:</b> When respondents did answer questions, many chose to select the "other" category when it was available, and wrote long responses. Why do you think respondents seemed to prefer to write their own, long answers over choosing one of the options?</p>	<p>2. examples from the survey:</p> <p>Ex. In response to a question that asked "What were your reasons for leaving Ukraine" one of the options was "war," but several respondents did not select that option, and instead selected "other" and wrote details about the war.</p> <p>Ex. In response to the question "Do you know how to get medical attention if you need it?" With options Yes, No, or Other, respondents chose "other" and wrote "Наверное знаю" (I believe I know).</p>

<p>3</p>	<p><i>Topic: Current Location</i></p> <p>Where are you now (city, country)?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. When did you arrive there?</li> <li>B. How did you get there - by what route?</li> <li>C. Why did you decide to go to your current location? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Did you know what the situation was like there for refugees coming from Ukraine?</li> <li>b. Did you know anyone there personally?</li> <li>c. Did you have any connections to support services, before you arrived?</li> <li>d. Did you work with anyone to help you travel?</li> </ul> </li> <li>D. What is your current legal status in the country that you are in?</li> <li>E. What was/is the process like in applying for legal status in the country you are in? Was/is this challenging - why or why not?</li> </ul>	<p>If they answer that they are currently in Ukraine, go directly to Question 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Were there other countries between Ukraine and your current location - which ones and why did you go to them and then leave them?</li> <li>2. What borders did you cross?</li> <li>2.d. an organization? anyone giving you advice or support?</li> </ul>
<p>4</p>	<p><i>Topic: Decision to Stay</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A. If currently in Ukraine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>01. Why did you decide to stay in/ return to Ukraine?</li> <li>02. How did you decide when and where to go within Ukraine after February 24, 2022?</li> </ul> </li> <li>B. If currently NOT in Ukraine: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>01. How long after February 24, 2022 did you stay in Ukraine? Why didn't you leave until then?</li> <li>02. Did you move within Ukraine after February 24, 2022 - before you left the country? How did you decide when and where to go within Ukraine?</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><i>Note: This question aims to understand the interviewee's decision-making about remaining in Ukraine while they were there - whether that was for one week after February 2022, 6 months, if they came and returned several times, or if they never left. We want to know why they stayed - for however long they did.</i></p>

<p>5</p>	<p><i>Topic: Decisions to Leave</i></p> <p>Please walk me through your decision to leave Ukraine?</p> <p>For example, at what point did you decide to leave Ukraine? How did you decide where to go, when, and with whom? And what did you do to prepare?</p>	<p>Note: skip this question if interviewee has never left Ukraine</p> <p>What influenced your decision to leave or method of leaving Ukraine?</p>
<p>6</p>	<p><i>Topic: Future Plans for Location and Decisions to Leave/Stay</i></p> <p>Do you have plans to move (again) soon or in the future? Why/ why not?</p>	<p>When? Why then?</p> <p>Where? Why there?</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>Topic: Support</p> <p>The following sections are about support from organizations, governments or other institutions.</p> <p>What kinds of <b>financial or other support</b> have you received since February 2022?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How did you receive this support?</li> <li>2. Did you interact with certain people, organizations, or governments? How did they affect your journey?</li> <li>3. How would you evaluate the support you have received?</li> <li>4. Is there any type of support that is missing or not enough? What kind? Why?</li> </ol>	<p>If they say they are receiving <b>NO</b> support, ask -</p> <p>Financial:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How are you financially supporting yourself? (2) is the way you financially support yourself now different from before February 2022 - how so?</li> </ol>

<p>8</p>	<p>Topic: Support</p> <p>The following questions are about social or emotional support from people who are close or far.</p> <p>8A. have you received financial or other material support from people you know since February 2022? What kind?</p> <p>8B. What other aspects of your life do you find supportive?</p> <p>8C Please explain the way that the people in your life now (in person or by distance) affect the way you feel?</p> <p>8D. Do you have pets, have you moved with them, why/why not?</p> <p>If so, what does your pet mean to you?</p> <p>IF THE PET IS WITH HIM NOW: how do you feel about the fact that your pet is with you now?</p> <p>IF THE PET IS NOT WITH HIM NOW: how do you feel about the fact that your pet is not with you now?</p>	<p>If they say they are receiving <b>NO</b> support, ask -</p> <p>Financial:</p> <p>2. How are you financially supporting yourself? (2) is the way you financially support yourself now different from before February 2022 - how so?</p> <p>Social/Emotional:</p> <p>1. How has your social/emotional support changed since February 2022?</p> <p>8B. Let the interviewee determine for themselves what “support” means. If they ask for guidance, just ask them what they consider to be supportive or to provide support. No right or wrong answers!</p> <p>8C. Who are those people? How do you know them? If they are long-distance: how often do you communicate, how (ex. viber, whatsapp)?</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>Topic: Health - General</p> <p>A. Please explain the status of your physical health status now?</p> <p>B. Please explain the status of your mental health status now?</p> <p>C. Are you experiencing any health concerns in your life today?</p> <p>01. If yes: What are they? Are these concerns new, since February 2022?</p> <p>02. If no: How would you compare your health now to before February 2022?</p>	

<p>10</p>	<p>Topic: Health - Medication</p> <p>10A. Did you take medication on a regular basis when you lived in Ukraine before February 24, 2022?</p> <p>01. If yes: If you are comfortable, can you please explain what the medication was for?</p> <p>10B. Do you take medication on a regular basis now?</p> <p>01. If yes: If you are comfortable, can you please explain what the medication is for? If yes: How is obtaining your medication now different than before February 24, 2022?</p> <p>02. <b>If they were taking medication in Ukraine before February 2022, and now they are not:</b> Why do you not take this medication anymore? How has that affected your life?</p>	
<p>11</p>	<p>Theme: Healthcare access</p> <p>11A Please tell me about the last time you saw a doctor or accessed medical care?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● If YES receiving support/healthcare services, etc. - <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Was/is this support specific for Ukrainian refugees?</li> <li>○ How do you find the quality of this support?</li> <li>○ How do you find the language or cultural style is comfortable for you?</li> </ul> </li> <li>● <i>IF INTERVIEWEE IS IN UKRAINE:</i> has the way you access medical care changed since February 2022, if so, how?</li> <li>● <i>IF THE INTERVIEWEE is NOT in Ukraine:</i> How do you access healthcare? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Please compare how you access healthcare now to how you accessed it when you were in Ukraine?</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>11B. Have you talked about your stress or mental health with a medical professional or another person?</p> <p>11C. How do you pay for healthcare services?</p> <p>11D. How do you find the quality of these services and experience?</p>	<p>11A. Where did you find information about health services or support?</p> <p>11C.</p> <p>01. Are they free in your current country?</p> <p>02. Do you have health insurance?</p>

<p>12</p>	<p>12A. If you have moved at all (within or outside of Ukraine) since February 2022, how do/did you feel about your place in the new society?</p> <p>12B. How do you feel in terms of “belonging” in the society you live in now?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● <i>If they DON'T feel part of their society:</i> Is there something that would change that?</li> </ul>	<p>Explaining “belonging”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Do you have friends or a social life?</li> <li>● Do you have someone you can go to for help if you need it?</li> <li>● Do you have someone you feel you can talk to about personal or private matters?</li> <li>● Do you feel people have sympathy for your situation (especially related to Ukraine)?</li> <li>● Do you feel like people you see regularly (neighbors, colleagues, others) care about you?</li> </ul>
<p>13</p>	<p>13A. Many people are exposed to a disturbing or traumatic event at some point in their lives.</p> <p>Have you experienced such an event?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>13B. Are you affected by seeing the situation of Ukraine in the media?</p>	<p>Traumatic events could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● natural disasters</li> <li>● accidents</li> <li>● sexual assault</li> <li>● physical assaults</li> <li>● combat</li> <li>● childhood sexual abuse</li> <li>● torture</li> <li>● or life-threatening illness.</li> </ul> <p>These experiences can happen in any of the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Directly experiencing the event</li> <li>● Witnessing the event</li> <li>● Learning that the event happened to a close family member or close friend</li> <li>● or</li> <li>● Experiencing repeated or intense exposure to distressing details of the event.</li> </ul>

<p>14</p>	<p>How would you compare the possibilities in your life from before February 24, 2022 to now?</p>	<p>Are there challenges in your life now that were not present in your life before February 24, 2022? Which kind?</p> <p>Are there opportunities in your life now that were not present in your life before February 24, 2022? Which kind?</p> <p>What/who contributed to those opportunities?</p> <p>What/Who did hinder possible opportunities to happen?</p> <p><i>If they say that their lives are the same now as they were before February 2022, then you can remind them about something they said earlier in the interview that made it seem like their life had changed.</i></p>
<p>15</p>	<p><b>15A. How would you compare your personal traits from before February 24, 2022 and now?</b></p> <p>Personal traits could include your <b>personality, physicality, or emotions, or the way you interact with other people.</b></p> <p>15B. How would you compare the way you think about yourself, the world, and others, now, as compared to before February 24, 2022?</p>	<p>If they report changes - ask what they think may have contributed to those changes.</p> <p>Do you perceive these changes as negative, positive, or neutral? (can ask for each change they reference)</p>

16	<p>How would you compare <b>your relationships</b> with family and friends from before February 24, 2022 and now?</p>	<p>Do you feel closer to some people? Or more distant? Why? How so?</p>
17	<p>How would you compare your values and perspective on life from before February 24, 2022 and now?</p>	<p>Has your spirituality been affected? And how?</p>
18	<p><i>Topic: Survey follow-up: Identity/Demographics</i></p> <p>Please tell me about yourself -</p> <p>18A. What is your age?</p> <p>18B. What is your gender?</p> <p>18C. How do you identify yourself?</p> <p>18D. What is your marital and family status? What is the highest level of education you received? What was your field of work before February 2022 and what is it now?</p>	<p>Family status: children? other people living in the homelet them define family... (let them define 'family')</p> <p>18C. How do you identify yourself? - - - - - what groups do you consider yourself a part of?</p> <p>18.D. Educational levels (taken from original survey):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Incomplete primary education (less than 4 years of secondary school)</li> <li>● Primary education (grades 4-7 of secondary school)</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Incomplete secondary education (certificate for grades 8-9 of secondary school)</li> <li>● Vocational school on the basis of incomplete secondary education</li> <li>● Incomplete higher education (junior specialist - diploma of a technical school, college)</li> <li>● Complete higher education (Specialist)</li> <li>● Complete higher education (Master)</li> <li>● Postgraduate degree</li> <li>● Other (Please explain in the box below)</li> <li>● Complete secondary education (certificate of complete secondary education for grades 10-11)</li> <li>● Graduated from vocational school on the basis of incomplete secondary education (certificate for grades 8-9 of secondary)</li> <li>● Additional training based on complete secondary education (professional, general education courses, etc.)</li> <li>● Vocational school on the basis of complete secondary education</li> <li>● Basic higher education (bachelor)</li> </ul>
--	--	---

### III. (Survey) Norwegian *friluftsliv* Service Providers, Survey Questions and Consent Form

#### Consent Form

Please read the following and provide your electronic signature if you consent to participating in this study:

**DESCRIPTION:** You are invited to participate in an anonymous survey about nature-based programs or organizations in Norway which have provided services to refugees. The aim of this survey is to learn more about the range of nature-based activities, challenges, experiences, and services for refugees in Norway.

**TIME INVOLVEMENT:** This 15-question survey will take approximately 10-15 minutes.

**RISKS AND BENEFITS:** There are no foreseeable risks associated with this study.

**PARTICIPANT'S RIGHTS:** If you have read this form and have decided to participate in this project, please understand your participation is voluntary and you have the right to discontinue participation at any time during the survey. Please only take this survey if you are 18 years of age or older.

**Data Use:**

Your survey responses cannot be withdrawn after submission and may be involved in secondary use, banking, and/or future sharing for research related to the topic of time/physical activity in nature.

**Questions:**

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about this research, its procedures, risks, and benefits, contact Principal Investigator (PI):

**Larisa Ozeryansky**

University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98105  
lozeryan@uw.edu

**Survey Questions (all write-in response)**

1. What is the name of the organization or program you work for, related to nature-based programs for refugees?
2. What kind of nature-based programs or services have been offered to refugees by your organization?
3. How long did your/your organization support the nature-based programs which provided services to refugees?
4. How did refugee participants learn about the programs/services you offered?
5. How many refugees participated in the programs/services you offered?
6. Please describe the demographics of refugee groups who participated in the programs/services you offered (age, gender, country of origin, etc.):
7. Please explain the funding that supported/s the nature-based programs/services for refugees offered by your organization?
8. What is/was your role at your organization regarding nature-based programs/services for refugees?
9. What (if any) challenges did you/your organization encounter in providing services/programs to refugees?
10. Are the services/programs for refugees by your organization ongoing, or did they (or some part) stop? Please explain.

11. What did you see as benefits or positive effects of your organization's nature-based services/programs on the refugees who participated?
12. What role do you find "friluftsliv" or other Norwegian cultural values play in your organization's work?
13. Please describe the way refugees have engaged with your organization's services/programs in terms of "friluftsliv" or other Norwegian cultural values.
14. Please share one or more meaningful anecdote(s) here regarding refugee participation in your organization's nature-based programming/services.
15. Are there any online, public records (website, publication, etc.) of your organization's initiatives specifically regarding refugees in nature? Please paste one or more links here.
16. **OPTIONAL:** Are you interested in being contacted in the future to provide more information regarding your experience with nature-based programs/services for refugees? If so, please provide your contact information here. (Note: All provided information will remain anonymous for study records.)