RESEARCH ARTICLE

Ugandan and British individuals' views of refugees in their countries: An exploratory mixed-methods comparison

Jens H. Hellmann[1] 🟢 | Lena Übergünne-Otte[1] | Steven Heimlich[2,3] | Juma Kalyegira[4] | Gerald Echterhoff[1] | Amina Memon[5] | Judith Knausenberger[1] | Pascal Schlechter[6]

[1]Department of Psychology, University of Münster, Münster, Germany

[2]German Academic Exchange Service, Kampala, Uganda

[3]University of Bremen, Bremen, Germany

[4]Jacobs University Bremen, Bremen, Germany

[5]Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, UK

[6]University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

Correspondence
Jens H. Hellmann, Department of Psychology, University of Münster, Fliednerstr. 21, Münster 48149, Germany.
Email: jens.hellmann@uni-muenster.de

Abstract

Using an exploratory mixed-methods approach, we examined thoughts concerning refugees reported by participants from a non-Western country, Uganda, and the United Kingdom (total $N = 113$). We explored whether, due to various sociocultural, political and geographic differences, critical features of refugee migration (e.g., migration forcedness and migration-related perils) would be viewed differently by Ugandan and UK participants. An inductive qualitative content analysis of responses in an online survey yielded 11 categories with 40 subcategories revealing several similarities between Ugandan and UK participants. For instance, similar proportions of participants from both countries acknowledged refugees' suffering *before* their migration and the *forced* nature of refugees' migration. However, we also found that more British than Ugandan participants referred to perils refugees suffer *during* their journeys, possibly resulting from differences in refugees' migration routes (e.g., crossing other countries, travelling by dilapidated boats, migration duration). Furthermore, Ugandan but not British participants took pride in international praise their country received for its forthcoming treatment of refugees. There were no differences

regarding the extent to which Ugandan and British individuals exhibited prejudice towards refugees or experienced threats from refugees. We discuss the theoretical and practical implications of our findings for refugee integration.

KEYWORDS
intergroup processes, receiving countries, refugees, Uganda, United Kingdom

1 | INTRODUCTION

While many refugees want to return to their home countries (Betts & Collier, 2017), they often need to stay in the receiving country for a long time (Ager & Strang, 2008). Identifying facilitating and impeding factors of successful refugee integration is therefore of prime importance. The model of *Psychological Antecedents of Refugee Integration* (PARI; Echterhoff et al., 2020) identifies psychological factors that are distinctly relevant to refugee integration and concern both refugees and residents of receiving societies. According to the PARI model, there are two critical features that characterize experiences of refugees and residents' perceptions of refugees: (a) *forcedness of migration*, which reflects the impact of external forces, push factors of migration, and *premigration perils* (e.g., violence, war, persecution, or other adverse conditions such as climate change), leaving little or no choice but to leave one's place of residence; (b) *perils during migration*, such as risks and harm from unsafe means and routes of travel, which result from the forced, often precipitous and unprepared departure from one's place of residence.

The PARI model adopts a dual perspective, that is, it addresses both refugees' experiences of forcedness and perils of migration and receiving-country residents' *perceptions* of migration forcedness and related perils faced by refugees. By focusing on the distinctive features of refugee migration (i.e., perceived forcedness and perils), the PARI framework provides new opportunities for researchers to examine residents' attitudes towards refugees and perceived threats from refugees. It is proposed that residents' perceptions of refugees' forcedness and perils are associated with various integration-relevant psychological processes such as feelings and attitudes towards refugees or perceived threat by refugees (Echterhoff et al., 2020). For instance, perceptions of refugees' perils and suffering can induce feelings of empathy, creating positive attitudes towards refugees. In contrast, thoughts about refugees' exposure to harmful and traumatizing events such as war and violence may elicit perceptions of refugees as unpredictable, desperate or dangerous by residents. According to the PARI model, all of these perceptions and responses can be affected by *context* factors such as cultural and political conditions, collective and historical representations, media and public discourse, or individualistic versus collectivistic orientations. For instance, collective representations of political violence and persecution in a receiving country can serve as comparison standards for judging of perils experienced by refugees (Pringle, 2019).

While a few existing findings are consistent with the PARI model (see Echterhoff et al., 2020), the key assumptions of the PARI model have not been examined empirically. Receiving country residents' attitudes towards refugees have been typically examined by quantitatively assessing constructs such as intergroup contact, threat perceptions, and prejudice (Esses, Hamilton, & Gaucher, 2017).

The first goal of the present study was to explore residents' thoughts about refugees and the extent to which they spontaneously mention refugees' migration forcedness and related perils. Using a mixed-method approach, we complemented established intergroup questionnaires with open-ended, free response questions. While rating-scale questions enable a reliable investigation of associations between constructs, this open format additionally allows for the spontaneous expression of thoughts and associations (Mayring, 2014). Relative to a quantitative rating-scale methodology, an open-response format reduces demand characteristics and priming (directed thought activation) with researchers' preformulated constructs. For instance, rating scales assessing perceived forcedness of migration can guide

respondents' thinking towards considering the construct of forcedness. Synthesizing these insights with subsequent rating-scale questions tapping into commonly used intergroup constructs (e.g., threat perceptions) qualifies a holistic perspective on thoughts about refugees.

The second goal of the present study was to compare residents' perceptions of, and responses to, refugee migration between two countries differing substantially on political, cultural, historical and geographical dimensions, namely, Uganda and the United Kingdom (UK). Thus, we intended to explore the role of a highly important context factor, as posited by the PARI model.

Most studies on receiving country residents' attitudes towards refugees were conducted in Western, educated, industrialized, rich, and democratic (WEIRD) countries of the global North (for an exception, see Yitmen & Verkuyten, 2018). Importantly, WEIRD countries do not represent a global majority (Henrich, Heine, & Norenzayan, 2010), and they are not host or home countries for the majority of global refugees (UNHCR, 2020a). Such data are thus prone to ethnocentric bias and the underlying theoretical suppositions are 'more applicable to refugees in wealthier countries (e.g., those in North America, the EU, or Australia and New Zealand) than in disadvantaged, poorer countries (e.g., Bangladesh or Sudan)' (Echterhoff et al., 2020, p. 857). To advance our understanding of the psychology behind refugee integration across diverse backgrounds, the applicability of any such model needs to be examined in disadvantaged, developing countries.

In this regard, the context of refugees in Africa is currently understudied (see Pringle, 2019). One country of particular interest is Uganda. First, among others, Uganda shares borders with South Sudan, the Democratic Republic of Congo, and Rwanda, all of which are countries with large numbers of former inhabitants who have become refugees in recent years and decades (UNHCR, 2020b). Thus, Uganda is geographically closer to regions of extreme violence than most countries of the global North. Second, its own recent violent history with, for instance, the brutal regime of Idi Amin and the war led by the Lord's Resistance Army in Northern Uganda has affected the Ugandan population itself (Bohnet & Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019; Pfeiffer & Elbert, 2011; Pringle, 2019).

These considerations suggest that many Ugandans sympathize with those forced to migrate. With almost 1.4 million refugees and asylum seekers, Uganda currently hosts the largest number of refugees in Africa (UNHCR, 2020b). Uganda has been coined a 'refugee paradise' because of its progressive approach in the extent and means with which it provides shelter and care for refugees (Unger, 2018). At the same time, a more recent analysis of the refugees' situation in Uganda has been more critical of its approach to refugees (Bohnet & Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019).

2 | THE PRESENT STUDY

We explored Ugandan residents' attitudes towards refugees and compared them to the ones of United Kingdom (UK) residents (as a WEIRD country). We applied an exploratory mixed-method approach including a comparison with UK residents to unravel differences in potential categories researchers may not yet be aware of. To this end, we (a) asked residents to describe their attitudes in free written format, and (b) quantitatively assessed levels of intergroup contact, threat perceptions, prejudices, social dominance orientation and just world beliefs, which represent constructs that are commonly applied in intergroup research (Esses et al., 2017). This exploratory parallel design (see Shorten & Smith, 2017) enables us to link findings from the qualitative and the quantitative parts from a holistic perspective.

3 | METHOD

3.1 | Participants

The final sample consisted of $N = 113$ respondents. Of these, $n = 51$ were residents of Uganda ($M_{age} = 31.88$, $SD = 9.85$), and $n = 62$ were UK residents ($M_{age} = 32.44$, $SD = 10.12$). In the Ugandan sample, 27 participants

identified as female (24 male), in the UK sample, 42 identified as female (19 male, 1 unidentified). Data from UK residents were collected using the platform prolific academic with a small monetary compensation of £ 0.50. At the time of data collection, this platform only contained one potential participant residing in Uganda. For practical reasons, we thus used a mailing list from one of the authors affiliated at the time with Makerere University, Kampala, for data collection in Uganda. Following recommendations from local scholars, we only assessed a limited range of demographic information (i.e., gender, age and nationality) so as to not raise any doubts about anonymity.

3.2 | Procedure

Participants filled out an online survey via soscisurvey.de (Leiner, 2014), mainly because face-to-face interviews were not feasible during the COVID-19 pandemic. Questionnaires were designed to address the situation in their respective country (Uganda/UK). For both subsamples, the survey was conducted in English. Participants were informed about the voluntary nature, anonymity and privacy and provided informed consent by starting the questionnaire. A list of all scales is included in the Supplemental Online Material (https://osf.io/ky2cn/).

First qualitative response. Participants were asked to describe what they think about refugees in their country, in a free text format: 'When you think about refugees in [Uganda/the UK], what comes to your mind? We are interested in your attitudes towards refugees. Your response could refer to who refugees are in [Uganda / the UK], the legal background, and the like'. Participants were encouraged to respond in complete sentences.

Attitudes towards refugees and contact experiences with refugees. On the subsequent page, participants were presented with four statements assessing attitudes towards refugees quantitatively. The items were adapted from Asbrock, Lemmer, Becker, Koller, and Wagner (2014) to the present context. The exact wording of the four items as they were used in the present study was 'There are too many refugees in [Uganda/the UK]', 'Refugees should be sent back to their home countries in case resources become scarce', 'Refugees living in [Uganda / the UK] are a burden to the social welfare net'. and 'A large number of refugee children in the schools has a negative effect on the high-quality education of [Ugandan/British] children'. Participants indicated their agreement with each of the statements on a Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 6 = *strongly agree*. The overall internal consistency was acceptable, Cronbach's $\alpha = .75$.

We assessed how much positive and negative contact respondents recently had with refugees, on six-point scales from 1 = *none at all* to 6 = *very much*. The correlations for the frequency of positive and negative contact experiences were not significant overall, $r(111) = .13$, $p = .160$, or in either sub-sample, $r(49) = .06$, $p = .690$, for the Ugandan sample and $r(60) = .22$, $p = .083$, for the sample from the United Kingdom, respectively.

Second qualitative response. To mirror good practice approaches from face-to-face interviews for qualitative content analysis (Mayring, 2014), participants could add thoughts to their previously assessed opinion about refugees in their country. The instructions read: 'Before, we had asked you what you think about refugees in [Uganda/the UK]. Is there anything else you would like to share that you might have forgotten to tell us when we first asked?' Participants were informed that they could simply enter 'no' to proceed. In total, 33 participants made use of the opportunity to add aspects to their previous responses. There were no substantial deviations or differences to the results whether the responses of this second qualitative assessment were considered or not. Correlations between considering versus not considering the second qualitative assessment were high for each of the samples, $rs > .985$. We thus integrated responses from both assessments.

Threat perceptions. With eight items, we measured perceived realistic physical threat (Hellmann et al., In press). While the original scale was constructed to assess realistic physical threats from *migrants* in general, we adapted the scale to fit the present context with refugees. The response range for this scale was from 1 = *completely disagree* to 5 = *completely agree*. An example item reads 'Due to refugees, the risk of being attacked in [Uganda/the UK] has increased'. In the present study, the internal consistency was Cronbach's $\alpha = .95$.

Additionally, we included scales on symbolic and realistic (economic) threats with three items each, all measured on scales, ranging from $1 = not\ at\ all$ to $5 = completely$ (Landmann, Gaschler, & Rohmann, 2019). Cronbach's αs ranged between .77 and .96.

Social dominance orientation and just world beliefs. We assessed social dominance orientation with four items from the short social dominance orientation scale (SSDO; Pratto et al., 2013). Response options ranged from $1 = extremely\ oppose$ to $10 = extremely\ favour$. The internal consistency was Cronbach's $\alpha = .81$.

Seven items measured respondents' tendency to believe in a just world (Reich & Wang, 2015) on a seven-point scale, ranging from $1 = disagree\ strongly$ to $7 = agree\ strongly$. Cronbach's α was .89.

Internal and external locus of control. Finally, four items assessed locus of control (Kovaleva, 2012) on a five-point scale, ranging from $1 = does\ not\ apply\ at\ all$ to $5 = applies\ completely$. Two items measured internal locus of control, and two items measured external locus of control. Correlations for the two items measuring internal locus of control was $r(111) = .48$, $p < .001$, and for the two items measuring external locus of control, $r(111) = .46$, $p < .001$, respectively.

3.3 | Coding strategy for qualitative content analyses

The present study employed an explorative design. We followed common recommendations and used an *inductive* approach for the analysis of the qualitative content of the responses (Mayring, 2014). However, the PARI model has informed the identification and helped with the naming of certain categories like migration forcedness, and premigration and migration perils. We used the open access coding software tool *QCAmap* for our qualitative content analysis (see qcamap.org). Two coders, both highly proficient in English, developed categories while going through the response protocols, and continuously refined the coding manual including superordinate and subordinate categories. Both coders rated all of the responses. There were only very few disagreements between the coders, which were resolved through discussion, resulting in two double-coded context units. Formal agreement was thus near perfect, $r_H = .99$, for each of the British and Ugandan subsamples and the full sample (Holsti, 1969). Whenever one category was assigned to a protocol of an individual participant, it was thereafter not assigned again for a similar passage within the same protocol. The final full coding manual with 11 superordinate categories and 40 subcategories that also includes examples of responses for each of the categories can be found in Table 1.

4 | RESULTS

4.1 | Results from qualitative analyses

The categories that resulted from the inductive qualitative analysis of the protocols in part correspond to different segments of the migration experience, namely, premigration perils (Category 1), migration forcedness (Category 2) and migration perils (Category 4). As described above, these dimensions are also highlighted in the PARI model (Echterhoff et al., 2020). In this section, we present selected results from our qualitative analysis (for all results see Table 1).

Premigration perils (*Category 1*). Approximately one third of participants from both subsamples named war as a premigration peril that motivates individuals to flee their country. While more than a third of Ugandan respondents mentioned political instabilities in refugees' home countries, only one respondent from the UK did so. Participants from Uganda named more and a wider variety of premigration perils than did participants from the United Kingdom.

Migration forcedness (*Category 2*). In both subsamples, almost half of the respondents raised the point of refugees being forced to migrate. The statement that (most) refugees migrate voluntarily only appeared once in a protocol from a UK resident.

TABLE 1 Coding guidelines and examples from the protocols

Number	Superordinate categories Subordinate categories		Definition/coding rules	Example	Prevalence (%) UG	UK
1	Premigration perils/hardship		Potentially traumatizing events, reasons to migrate; conditions in the home countries			
	1.1	War	Including civil wars in home countries	War torn countries such as Syria (UK, 20)	16 (31.4)	21 (33.9)
	1.2	Genocide	Explicit reference to a genocide or ethnic cleansing	The Rwandese who fled from Rwanda due to the genocide (UG, 9)	2 (3.9)	0 (0.0)
	1.3	Political instability	References to political instability in refugees' home countries	People who have escaped from their home countries due to political instability (UG, 36)	18 (35.3)	1 (1.6)
	1.4	Social inequality	Including (personal) persecution	People who have been disadvantaged socially (UG, 1) Refugees are people escaping persecution (UK, 61)	7 (13.7)	3 (4.8)
	1.5	(Infectious) diseases	Reference to diseases in home country (cf. threats in receiving country)	[...] people displaced from other places due to various reasons including [...] diseases (UG, 20)	4 (7.8)	0 (0.0)
	1.6	Environmental disaster/climate change	References to environmental reasons to forcibly migrate	People who seek refuge/ protection from natural calamities (UG, 30)	5 (9.8)	1 (1.6)
	1.7	Hunger	References to hunger or famine	People who are fleeing [...] or famine (UK, 62)	5 (9.8)	2 (3.2)
	1.8	Economic hardship	Reference to economic loss, hardship, or instability	Due to economic instabilities (UG, 17)	5 (9.8)	3 (4.8)
2	Forcedness of migration		Explicit reference to forcedness or voluntariness of (refugee) migration			
	2.1	Forcedness	People have to flee/no alternative to migration	In desperate need to escape their country and would not want to do so for no good reason (UK, 20)	24 (47.1)	30 (48.4)
	2.2	Voluntariness	(Most) refugees migrate voluntarily	Mostly economic migrants in reality and should be sent back to where they came from (UK, 13)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.6)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Number	Superordinate categories Subordinate categories		Definition/coding rules	Example	Prevalence (%) UG	UK
3	Differentiations between refugee groups					
	3.1	Naming several home countries	(Mostly) neutral listing of different home countries	People from neighbouring countries like South Sudan, DRC and Somalia (UG, 26)	11 (21.6)	0 (0.0)
	3.2	Differentiating between refugees from different home countries		Negative attitudes towards some refugees from some areas like South Sudan (UG, 20)	4 (7.8)	0 (0.0)
	3.3	Differentiation: Genuineness	Ambivalence of migration motives: Some are genuine refugees, others are not Including differentiations legal/illegal migrants	Genuine refugees should be aided (UK, 38)	2 (3.9)	14 (22.6)
4	Migration perils					
	4.1	Risks at journey	Migration perils	Their journey to the UK is harrowing and dangerous and they reach by boat or smuggled in crowded trucks (UK, 48)	1 (2.0)	7 (11.3)
5	Support in the receiving country					
	5.1	Neediness and deservingness	Description or mention of refugees' neediness of support and/or description or mention of refugees' deservingness of support/enjoying freedom and safety	Are in need of help, for example, food, shelter, jobs (UK, 42) Deserve to have a peaceful life after all they have been through (UG, 2)	18 (35.3)	6 (9.7)
	5.2	Praise for the receiving country and hospitality of the receiving country	Praise/pride, including an explicit mention or description of the receiving country's hospitality	I am proud of my country for the fact that it opened its doors to them (UG, 9) Uganda has hospitable rules/policies for refugees (UG, 21)	15 (29.4)	0 (0.0)
	5.3	Provision of means for basic needs, including security, food, education, and health in receiving country	Including shelter and freedom, including mental health	Provision of education, health services, water, fundamental basic human needs and security (UG, 32)	8 (15.7)	0 (0.0)

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Number	Superordinate categories Subordinate categories		Definition/coding rules	Example	Prevalence (%)	
					UG	UK
6	Threats *from* refugees in the receiving country					
	6.1	General competition for resources and refugees' hostility	Competition with local residents, including general conflicts	Pose a serious burden on the limited natural resources (UG, 14)	13 (25.5)	3 (4.8)
	6.2	Economic threats	Realistic economic threats, mostly for the society	They can put a strain on the United Kingdom in terms of being housed, receiving benefit payments (UK, 45)	4 (7.8)	10 (16.1)
	6.3	Physical threats	Threats due to physical assaults from refugees (including general security concerns)	They exhibit violent and aggressive behaviours (UG, 20) Lead to a route into the United Kingdom for terrorists (UK, 20)	5 (9.8)	2 (3.2)
	6.4	Symbolic threats	Including cultural threats and language barriers	i worry about our culture and traditions being lost (UK, 16) People without understanding and speaking English (UK, 18)	1 (2.0)	6 (9.7)
	6.5	Health threats	Threats due to infectious diseases	Some refugees escape from disease struck countries hence affecting us too (UG, 4)	4 (7.8)	0 (0.0)
	6.6	Environmental threats	Threats to the environment of the receiving country	Am only concerned about the environmental degradation (UG, 7)	3 (5.9)	0 (0.0)
	6.7	Fraudulent behaviours	Explicit reference to cheating or the like	I feel some may not be as desperate as they make out (UK, 54)	2 (3.9)	1 (1.6)
7	Threats *due to* refugees' presence in the receiving country					
	7.1	Perceptions of injustice due to priority treatment of refugees	Threats not directly attributable to refugees themselves	Refugees receive more attention and support than the hosts (UG, 14)	5 (9.8)	0 (0.0)
8	Threats *towards*/hardship for refugees in the receiving country					
	8.1	Altruistic threats	The receiving country cannot provide what is necessary for refugees (defined by Landmann et al., 2019)	Sometimes Uganda is not able to avail all what is needed to build a life and career for them (UG, 34)	4 (7.8)	0 (0.0)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Number	Superordinate categories Subordinate categories		Definition/coding rules	Example	Prevalence (%)	
					UG	UK
	8.2	Discrimination	Including revelation of categories as 'reasons' for discrimination	There is also a race factor as refugees will not be white European (UK, 5)	2 (3.9)	3 (4.8)
	8.3	Economic threats *towards* refugees	Including unemployment	Poverty and the fact that they aren't allowed to work while their application is being processed (UK, 5)	7 (13.7)	5 (8.1)
	8.4	Consequences of trauma	Including depression/PTSD	They are usually vulnerable people (UK, 34) The despair they may feel (UG, 35) Depressed (UG, 43)	4 (7.8)	4 (6.5)
	8.5	Dependency/bureaucracy in receiving country	Including restrictions in freedom	Application process (UK, 5)	4 (7.8)	3 (4.8)
	8.6	Bad living conditions	Including housing/hygiene	Often stay in poor quality housing (UK, 5)	7 (13.7)	5 (8.1)
9	Demands/calls for assistance					
	9.1	From the own government	Including local authorities	UK should take in refugees (UK, 20)	9 (17.7)	11 (17.7)
	9.2	From fellow residents	Including contributions to successful refugee integration	[...] role as a host community is to understand who they are (UG, 43)	3 (5.9)	2 (3.2)
	9.3	From refugees	Including demands for economic contributions in the receiving country	They should benefit our economy in some way (UK, 58)	3 (5.9)	5 (8.1)
	9.4	From international organizations	Including other countries	Call upon other countries and organizations such as UNO to assist Ugandan government (UG, 1)	4 (7.8)	1 (1.6)
10	Benefits for receiving country					
	10.1	Economic contributions from international community	Reference to contributions from other countries and/or international organizations to help with the refugee situation	The government also receives significant support from the international community on this account (UG, 21)	3 (5.9)	0 (0.0)

(Continues)

TABLE 1 (Continued)

	Superordinate categories			Prevalence (%)	
Number	Subordinate categories	Definition/coding rules	Example	UG	UK
	10.2 Economic contributions from refugees	Including refugees' independence	Some are offering their expertise in a field of work or to study (UK, 35)	4 (7.8)	7 (11.3)
	10.3 Cultural contributions from refugees	Reference to contributions to a multi-cultural society	They [m]ake the country more cultural (UK, 24)	1 (2.0)	3 (4.8)
11	Other				
	11.1 Views of others	Description of others' (often negative) views	Refugees are always seen in the worst light (UK, 7)	2 (3.9)	11 (17.7)
	11.2 No opinion		I have no strong opinion (UK, 9)	0 (0.0)	3 (4.8)

Note: Total N = 113. Ratings based on n = 51 Ugandans' and n = 62 Britons' responses to the question of what they think about refugees in their respective countries. Percentages refer to numbers in respective subsample and are rounded to the first decimal.

Abbreviations: UG, Uganda; UK, United Kingdom.

Differentiation between refugee groups (*Category 3*). While only Ugandans named several home countries and some few Ugandans also differentiated in their attitudes towards refugees from different home countries, remarkably more UK than Uganda residents suggested that some refugees are genuine, while others are not. This subcategory (*genuineness*) also includes references to differentiations regarding the legal presence in the receiving country.

Migration perils (*Category 4*). While only one Ugandan mentioned hardships during refugees' migration, approximately 11% of the UK residents did so.

Support in the receiving country (*Category 5*). More Ugandans than Britons referred to each of the different subcategories in this superordinate category (see Table 1). Only Ugandans (almost one third of them) uttered how their country's hospitality towards refugees results in praise for their country and is a source of their national pride. Also, exclusively Ugandans referred to how their country provides means for basic needs. Approximately 15% of Ugandan respondents mentioned statements that fell into this subcategory.

Threats from *refugees in the receiving country* (*Category 6*). The protocols included only few references to threats from refugees to the home country. The most commonly named threat types were a general competition for resources with and refugees' general hostility towards members of the receiving society for Ugandans and realistic economic threats for Britons.

Threats due to *refugees' presence in the receiving country* (*Category 7*). This category comprised perceptions of injustice because refugees allegedly receive a priority treatment compared to members of the host society. Approximately 10% of Ugandan participants mentioned this type of threat, no UK participant did.

Threats towards refugees in the receiving country (*Category 8*). A wide variety of threats towards refugees were specified in both samples. Still, only Ugandans (but less than 8% of them) referred to altruistic threats (Landmann et al., 2019). Each of the subcategories received relatively few mentions.

Demands from different groups (*Category 9*). Overall, Ugandans and UK residents demanded engagement in support for the refugee situation in their countries in comparable proportions from their own governments, fellow residents, refugees, international organizations, and other countries.

Benefits for the receiving country (*Category 10*). There were some references to different types of benefits from respective receiving countries regarding refugee migration, but only Ugandans (approximately 6% of them)

TABLE 2 Quantitative comparisons between Ugandan ($n = 51$) and UK ($n = 62$) residents

| Construct | Country | | | | | | |
| | Uganda | | UK | | | | |
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p	Hedges's g
Prejudice against refugees	3.20	1.04	2.89	1.40	1.37	.174	0.246
PRPT	1.96	0.92	1.99	1.02	−0.17	.863	−0.031
ST	2.52	1.32	2.41	1.20	0.48	.634	0.087
RT	2.87	1.19	2.77	1.30	0.43	.566	0.079
SDO	2.15	2.34	3.30	1.84	−2.86	.005	−0.549
JWB	2.54	2.02	3.27	1.09	−2.32	.023	−0.459
Internal LOC	3.25	2.18	3.19	0.92	0.21	.832	0.037
External LOC	2.29	1.99	2.52	0.87	−0.74	.462	−0.154
Positive contact	3.02	1.44	2.84	1.74	0.61	.546	0.111
Negative contact	1.78	1.97	2.03	1.41	−0.75	.454	0.147

Note: We did not adjust p-values for multiple tests.
Abbreviations: JWB, just world beliefs; LOC, locus of control; PRPT, perceived realistic physical threat; RT, realistic (economic) threat; SDO, social dominance orientation; ST, symbolic threat.

acknowledged economic contributions from the international community. Economic contributions from refugees to the receiving country were, in low numbers, recognized by residents of both countries.

Other (*Category 11*). Almost every fifth protocol from the UK included a reference to the (often negative) views regarding refugees held by fellow residents. There were noticeably fewer references to others' views concerning refugees in the protocols from Ugandan participants.

4.2 | Quantitative analyses

Contact experiences. Both samples reported more positive than negative contact experiences. This difference was significant for the Ugandan, $t(50) = 3.72$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d_z = 0.521$, and the UK sample, $t(61) = 3.20$, $p = .002$, Cohen's $d_z = 0.406$. In the Ugandan sample, only positive contact correlated significantly negatively with prejudice towards refugees, $r(49) = −.399$, $p = .004$, while negative contact experiences did not, $r(49) = −.015$, $p = .917$. The difference between the two latter correlations in itself was significant, $z = 2.03$, $p = .021$.

In the UK sample, both forms of contact correlated significantly with prejudice towards refugees, $r(60) = −.362$, $p = .004$, for positive contact, and $r(60) = .344$, $p = .006$, for negative contact, respectively. The absolute values of the two latter correlations did not differ significantly, $z = 0.12$, $p = .451$.

Further exploratory quantitative comparisons. We also explored potential differences between both sub-samples from Uganda and the UK regarding the quantitative scales and measures we have employed (Table 2). Significant differences between both sub-samples were revealed exclusively for SDO and just world belief (JWB), with Britons reporting higher values.

5 | DISCUSSION

Using a mixed-method approach (Mayring, 2014), we explored qualitative responses to the question of what Ugandan individuals think about refugees in 'their' country from a psychological perspective and compared them to

responses from UK citizens. Findings from our exploratory parallel design study support central assumptions by the PARI model (Echterhoff et al., 2020), but also point to the necessity of considering associations between the cultural contexts of refugees' home countries and receiving countries. These considerations are so far integrated only implicitly as potential moderator or mediator variables in terms of person factors and context factors within the PARI model framework.

In both subgroups, almost half of the respondents spontaneously mentioned migration forcedness, in line with the PARI model that migration forcedness is the central defining feature of who is a refugee (Echterhoff et al., 2020). Concerning premigration perils outlined in the PARI model, similar proportions of both subgroups mentioned (civil) wars as major reasons why refugees would migrate. The finding that political instability in the refugees' home countries was mentioned as premigration peril substantially more often by Ugandans compared to UK residents may be explained by perceptions and knowledge of the political situation in the neighbouring and nearby countries, especially South Sudan, Burundi, and the Democratic Republic of Congo (Pringle, 2019; UNHCR, 2020b). This finding may inform future psychological theory building in that geographical proximity of receiving countries to refugees' home countries may contribute more than previously considered to perceptions of different premigration perils.

Migration perils were mentioned more often by respondents from the United Kingdom, but only one Ugandan brought up the risks and potentially traumatizing events during the refugee migration experience. It is relatively difficult for refugees to enter the United Kingdom (as an island) from the outside, which may therefore require a lot of effort and can result in dangerous migration routes (UNHCR, 2019). Uganda shares direct international borders on land with five other countries that may not be as difficult to cross. Accordingly, Uganda's international borders have also been described as 'porous' (Moro, 2004, p. 421). This result underlines the point that certain theoretical considerations regarding the perception of migration perils might hold true for one receiving society but not for another (Echterhoff et al., 2020).

The diversity of refugees' home countries was exclusively mentioned by Ugandan residents. It is important to consider that there is also a wide ethnic diversity even within African nationalities (Moro, 2004), that is, within refugee subpopulations and also within the population of receiving countries in Africa. This may also contribute to the perception of severe competition for resources (Moro, 2004), which was more often mentioned by Ugandan than by UK participants. Tensions arising from such perceived competition between refugees and Ugandans from local communities have also been described in a recent investigation of intergroup relationships in Uganda (Bohnet & Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019).

UK residents mentioned the *genuineness* of refugees and expressed doubts about some refugees' migration motives more frequently than Ugandan participants did. In this regard, Western residents often evaluate *genuine* and *war* refugees more favourably than, for example, economic refugees who are seen as undeserving support (Kotzur, Forsbach, & Wagner, 2017). This is also in line with the quantitative differences in SDO and JWB (see below).

A substantial number of Ugandan respondents reported that the way their government and society welcome and treat refugees is a source of praise for their country and one they take pride in. This finding may have important implications not only for Uganda but also for other developing countries. Since national pride may be especially important in developing countries for the maintenance of political stability in these countries, the identification of sources for national pride may have special merits there (Wimmer, 2017). No UK respondent commented on feelings of pride or praised their government's treatment of refugees. This result may too be further reflected in the differences in SDO and JWB as UK residents may rather see providing shelter for refugees as a necessity for individuals who genuinely deserve it, but do not necessarily take as much pride in helping refugees as Ugandans do.

Various distinct threats appeared in protocols from both subsamples, but only few of these threats were mentioned more often than occasionally. While the levels of quantitatively indicated perceived threats from refugees did not differ statistically, there were some qualitative differences between these subsamples: most frequently mentioned were perceived threats from refugees, namely, a competition for resources and refugees' hostility in the Ugandan subsample and (classic) realistic economic threats in the UK subsample. Both types of threats mostly refer to economic threats, either against (groups of) individuals or the complete society (Landmann et al., 2019). Although

pointed out by a few Ugandans only, it is notable that residents can perceive injustice due to priority treatment of refugees (Bohnet & Schmitz-Pranghe, 2019), another result from this study that has not received much attention in extant theorizing. Such perceptions may provoke negative sentiments against refugees, but also against the own authorities. These results suggest that governments of developing countries openly communicate their support for both groups, residents *and* refugees. The low numbers of freely generated references to threats correspond to the overall relatively low mean values on the different threat scales.

Some Ugandan participants also stated that external economic contributions, for example, from the international community, were a benefit for taking in refugees and treating them well. This finding is in contrast to actual financial discrepancies: only about 9% of what the Ugandan government and communities need for providing basic supplies for refugees is funded by international organizations (UNHCR, 2020b). Existing conceptualizations have not yet included these kinds of (perceived) benefits for receiving countries, which may contribute to attitudes towards refugees.

In both subsamples, there were some demands and calls for assistance from different actors, namely the own government, from fellow residents, from refugees, and from international organizations and other countries' governments. Most demands were directed at the own government in each of the subsamples, respectively. Thus, it seems respondents in both subsamples call for their voices being heard as in political participation, but also that they want their governments to make informed decisions. In this regard, this result may also have important implications for maintaining a peaceful society and favourable attitudes towards refugees.

Positive contact experiences were more frequent than negative contact experiences in both subsamples, which is consistent with most previous studies on intergroup contact (Graf, Paolini, & Rubin, 2014). Typically, self-reported frequency of negative contact experiences correlates more strongly with attitudes towards the respective outgroup than positive contact experiences do (Barlow et al., 2012). In both subsamples studied here, this was not the case. In the UK subsample, positive contact experiences correlated negatively to a comparable extent with prejudice against refugees as did negative contact experiences (to a positive extent, respectively). In the Ugandan subsample, only positive, but not negative contact experiences correlated significantly with prejudice against refugees. As more studies on intergroup contact from non-WEIRD samples emerge it appears likely that there are systematic differences between WEIRD and non-WEIRD populations (Ioannu & Panagiotou, 2020). To pinpoint differential effects of contact experiences in predicting attitudes towards refugees, it is desirable for future studies to assess contact experiences across a broad range of different contexts.

5.1 | Limitations

Generalizability is limited by our convenience samples, the present samples were not representative and sample sizes were too small to obtain stable correlations. The present study also did not assess additional demographic information that might help contextualize the present findings. Future studies should assess information about residents' living conditions like residency in an urban versus rural environment, or their socio-economic background like level of education and monthly income.

Apart from SDO and JWB, no differences on the quantitatively assessed scales were revealed, which could, at least in part, be attributable to a lack of cross-cultural validation of these scales developed in Western contexts. Given the scarcity of culturally sensitive validation studies, it remains unknown whether the psychometric properties of the scales apply cross-culturally. For instance, participants from outside the global North could ascribe a different meaning to items (i.e., non-invariant item functioning), important categories may be not addressed (i.e., lack of content validity), or prognostic associations may differ in their magnitude (i.e., differential predictive validity). Therefore, the meaning of our null results remains open, and qualitative study attempts are highly warranted to inform large validation studies about potential categories and subtleties that need to be captured by assessment tools.

6 | CONCLUSIONS AND OUTLOOK

Our systematic comparative exploration of Ugandan and British residents' attitudes towards refugees may initiate theoretical advancements concerning refugee integration beyond the range of advantaged, wealthier countries (Echterhoff et al., 2020). The results further have the potential to initiate intervention studies and to inform policy makers about residents' attitudes towards refugee integration.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

Quantitative data are available via the Open Science Framework https://osf.io/ky2cn/.

ORCID

Jens H. Hellmann https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8646-9963

REFERENCES

Ager, A., & Strang, A. (2008). Understanding integration: A conceptual framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *21*(2), 166–191. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen016

Asbrock, F., Lemmer, G., Becker, J., Koller, J., & Wagner, U. (2014). "Who are these foreigners anyway?" The content of the term *foreigner* and its impact on prejudice. *SAGE Open*, *4*, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244014532819

Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M., Harwood, J., ... Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(12), 1629–1643. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212457953

Betts, A., & Collier, P. (2017). *Refuge: Transforming a broken refugee system*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bohnet, H., & Schmitz-Pranghe, C. (2019). Uganda: A role model for refugee integration? BICC Working Paper series: 2/19. BICC. Retrieved from https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-62871-2

Echterhoff, G., Hellmann, J. H., Back, M., Kärtner, J., Morina, N., & Hertel, G. (2020). Psychological antecedents of refugee integration (PARI). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(4), 856–879. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619898838

Esses, V. M., Hamilton, L. K., & Gaucher, D. (2017). The global refugee crisis: Empirical evidence and policy implications for improving public attitudes and facilitating refugee resettlement. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, *11*(1), 78–123. https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12028

Graf, S., Paolini, S., & Rubin, M. (2014). Negative intergroup contact is more influential, but positive intergroup contact is more common: Assessing contact prominence and contact prevalence in five Central European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*(6), 536–547. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2052

Hellmann, J. H., Schlechter, P., Knausenberger, J., Bollwerk, M., Geukes, K., & Back, M. D. (In press). Measuring perceived realistic physical threat by migrants: Scale development and validation. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment*.

Henrich, J., Heine, S. J., & Norenzayan, A. (2010). Most people are not WEIRD. *Nature*, *466*(7302), 29. https://doi.org/10.1038/466029a

Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content analysis for the social sciences and humanities*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ioannu, M., & Panagiotou, E. (2020). Opening the black box of contact: Unravelling the ways through which positive contact is imagined in a post-conflict context. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *30*(6), 660–672. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2465

Kotzur, P. F., Forsbach, N., & Wagner, U. (2017). Choose your words wisely. *Social Psychology*, *48*(4), 226–241. https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000312

Kovaleva, A. (2012). *The IE-4: Construction and validation of a short scale for the assessment of locus of control*. Köln: GESIS—Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften.

Landmann, H., Gaschler, R., & Rohmann, A. (2019). What is threatening about refugees? Identifying different types of threat and their association with emotional responses and attitudes towards refugee migration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *49*(7), 1401–1420. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2593

Leiner, D. J. (2014). SoSci survey (version 2.5.00-i) [Computer software]. Retrieved from https://www.soscisurvey.de

Mayring, P. (2014). Qualitative content analysis: Theoretical foundation, basic procedures and software solution. Retrieved from http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173

Moro, L. N. (2004). Interethnic relations in exile: The politics of ethnicity among Sudanese refugees in Uganda and Egypt. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *17*(4), 420–436. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/17.4.420

Pfeiffer, A., & Elbert, T. (2011). PTSD, depression and anxiety among former abductees in northern Uganda. *Conflict and Health*, *5*, 14. https://doi.org/10.1186/1752-1505-5-14

Pratto, F., Çidam, A., Stewart, A. L., Zeineddine, F. B., Aranda, M., Aiello, A., ... Henkel, K. E. (2013). Social dominance in context and in individuals: Contextual moderation of robust effects of social dominance orientation in 15 languages and 20 countries. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, *4*(5), 587–599. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612473663

Pringle, Y. (2019). *Psychiatry and decolonisation in Uganda*. London: Pelgrave Macmillan.

Reich, B., & Wang, X. (2015). And justice for all: Revisiting the global belief in a just world scale. *Personality and Individuals Differences*, *78*, 68–76. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.01.031

Shorten, A., & Smith, J. (2017). Mixed methods research: Expanding the evidence base. *Evidence Based Nursing*, *20*(3), 74–75. https://doi.org/10.1136/eb-2017-102699

Unger, M. (2018). Uganda: A refugee paradise. TV documentary. Available at (as of April 3rd, 2021). Retrieved from https://www.arte.tv/en/videos/082624-000-A/uganda-refugee-paradise/

UNHCR. (2019). Desperate journeys: Refugees and migrants arriving in Europe and at Europe's borders. Retrieved from https://data2.unhcr.org/en/documents/download/67712#_ga=2.50456864.822659656.1597059681-138906804.1597059681

UNHCR. (2020a). Refugee facts. Retrieved from https://www.unrefugees.org/refugee-facts/what-is-a-refugee/

UNHCR. (2020b). Uganda fact sheet. Retrieved from https://reporting.unhcr.org/sites/default/files/UNHCR%20Uganda%20Fact%20Sheet%20-%20January%202020_0.pdf

Wimmer, A. (2017). Power and pride: National identity and ethnopolitical inequality around the world. *World Politics*, *69*, 605–639. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0043887117000120

Yitmen, S., & Verkuyten, M. (2018). Positive and negative behavioural intentions towards refugees in Turkey: The roles of national identification, threat, and humanitarian concern. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *28*, 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2354