



Choose Your Words Wisely

Stereotypes, Emotions, and Action Tendencies Toward Fled People as a Function of the Group Label

Patrick F. Kotzur, Nora Forsbach, and Ulrich Wagner

Department of Psychology, Philipps-Universität Marburg, Germany

Abstract: Differences in word connotations can have far-reaching consequences. We investigated the content, and emotional and behavioral consequences of the social perception of fled people as a function of their label (“refugees” vs. “asylum seekers”; “war refugees” vs. “economic refugees” vs. “refugees”) using a factorial survey ($n = 389$). Based on qualitative data on perceived intentions associated with the labels, we deducted predictions regarding differences in the Stereotype Content Model and Behavior from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes Map. Participants evaluated refugees and asylum seekers similarly. Economic refugees were evaluated more negatively than war refugees or refugees, while the profiles of war refugees and refugees matched. These findings suggest that the choice of words to refer to fled people has profound consequences.

Keywords: refugees, asylum seekers, stereotypes, labels, language, social perception

In 2015, 65 million people fled adverse life conditions within and across state borders worldwide (UNHCR, 2016). About one million of those reached Germany to apply for asylum, translating into a 135% increase compared to the previous year (Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge [BAMF], 2016). Individuals who came to Germany and Europe to avoid adverse life conditions are referred to with different terms, among them “asylum seekers” and “refugees.” Both labels are often used interchangeably in everyday language. In some instances, labels are used that insinuate flight motives, such as “war refugees” or “economic refugees.” Oftentimes, these terms are utilized without validation of the correctness of the assumed motives. In this study, we investigate commonalities and differences in the social perception of fled people¹ as a function of the group label from a majority members’ perspective in Germany. Host society members’ attitudes toward immigrant groups are crucial factors that determine the societal context of reception of immigrant groups, because they contribute to a welcoming (or unwelcoming) climate, which is likely to shape immigrant identities and relations with other groups (Christ, Asbrock, Dhont, Pettigrew, & Wagner, 2013; Fussell, 2014). Germany was – with more than a third of all first-time applications in Europe – arguably a major destination of fled people in 2015 (Eurostat, 2016). Given

the fact that, despite this circumstance, insights regarding factors influencing host society members’ perception of the newcomers are scarce, we attend to this issue in the present study.

Methodologically, we followed a twofold strategy to investigate the meanings associated with the labels used to describe fled people, as well as the further resulting cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences. Based on qualitative data on participants’ perceived flight motives and intentions associated with the labels, as well as associated capability perceptions to implement intentions, we deducted predictions regarding the social perception within the stereotype content model (SCM; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002) and Behavior of Intergroup Affect of Stereotype (BIAS)-Map framework (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2007). Both the qualitative and quantitative data allow us to investigate to what extent stereotype content, emotional reactions, and behavioral intentions overlap and differ as a function of the labels under investigation.

Language and Social Perception

Language is the tool we use to explain, share, and create meaning – including the content of stereotypes, prejudices,

¹ In this article, we refer to the social groups commonly referred to as “refugees” and “asylum seekers” with the more neutral terms “fled people/ individuals/persons.” With the attribute “fled,” we refer to those who have already concluded their migration, and those who are still in the process.

and behavioral intentions. According to the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis (Sapir, 1921), language plays a crucial role in shaping people's perception of the world, and thus has a major impact on the perception of social groups. Similarly, researchers have argued that changing public opinions about social groups have historically been reflected in changing terminologies (Stötzel & Wengeler, 1995; see also Porst & Jers, 2007). Empirical evidence for the connection between language and social perception of groups is provided by findings that stereotypes and prejudice toward the same social group can shift as a function of the label, both for the ingroup (e.g., "White" vs. "European American"; Morrison & Chung, 2011; see also Galinsky et al., 2013) and outgroup (e.g., "foreign workers" vs. "guest workers"; Schönbach, 1970; see also Hall, Phillips, & Townsend, 2015; Rios, 2013; Rios & Ingraffia, 2016).

A wide range of explanations for the emergence of differences in group evaluations as a function of labels have been suggested, such as perceived morality (Rios & Ingraffia, 2016), stigma, and power (Galinsky et al., 2013), as well as social class, and status (Hall et al., 2015). Influential theoretical frameworks of social perception that emphasize the role of perceived intentions and capacity to carry them out are the Stereotype Content Model (SCM; Fiske et al., 2002) and the Behavior of Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes (BIAS)-Map (Cuddy et al., 2007).

The SCM and BIAS-Map

According to the SCM, social groups are evaluated on two basic dimensions. The first, most fundamental stereotype content dimension, warmth, is linked to likability and trustworthiness, and concerns the evaluation to what extent a social group generally poses a threat to the goals of the ingroup (amicable vs. harmful intentions, translating in high vs. low warmth; Fiske et al., 2002). As such, warmth ratings are negatively associated with perceptions of competition and threat (Cuddy et al., 2009; Kervyn, Fiske, & Yzerbyt, 2015). The second dimension is competence. Competence is linked to efficacy and independence, and relates to the ability and capacity to act upon these intentions (capability vs. incapability translating in high vs. low competence; Cuddy et al., 2009). The combination of both dimensions is theorized to predict specific emotional and behavioral reactions toward groups (Cuddy et al., 2007). Social groups with high ratings on both warmth and competence represent ingroups and allies, triggering admiration. Admiration, a univalent upward assimilative emotion (Smith, 2000), is targeted at others with positive outcomes which do not infringe the self (Cuddy et al., 2007). Groups with low ratings on both warmth and competence are targets of contempt. Contempt is a univalent downward contrastive emotion (Smith, 2000), and is felt for groups whose

negative outcomes are perceived as onset controllable (Cuddy et al., 2007). Groups with high warmth and low competence ratings are typically pitied. Pity is an ambivalent emotion, combining compassion and sadness. Pity is felt when others' negative outcomes are perceived as uncontrollable (Cuddy et al., 2007; Weiner, 2005). Lastly, groups with low warmth and high competence ratings are envied. Envy contains respect, and is triggered when others are perceived to have an unjustified advantage and when a superior outcome is desired (Lange & Crusius, 2015). The BIAS-Map extends the SCM by including predictions regarding the primary emotions anger and fear as a function of warmth irrespective of competence ratings, as well as differential action tendencies toward outgroups depending on the attributed stereotype content dimension ratings (Cuddy et al., 2007). Whereas warmth (high vs. low) determines the valence of action tendencies (facilitation vs. harm, respectively), competence (high vs. low) determines the intensity of the behavior (passive vs. active, respectively; see Cuddy et al., 2007, p. 634 for a graphical depiction). Facilitation includes behaviors targeted at supporting the social group (actively, e.g., defending; passively, e.g., associating). Harm refers to behavior which aims at actively (e.g., insulting), or passively (e.g., hindering) weakening the group.

Converging evidence for these postulations has been provided within a number of correlational (e.g., Asbrock, 2010; Cuddy et al., 2007; Eckes, 2002; Fiske et al., 2002) and experimental studies (e.g., Caprariello, Cuddy, & Fiske, 2009). Although the relevant social groups and the specific stereotype contents vary from culture to culture, warmth and competence reliably organize the perception of social groups in over 30 countries along these dimensions (Cuddy et al., 2009; Durante et al., 2013).

The SCM, BIAS-Map, and Fled People

Asbrock (2010) and Eckes (2002) drew on the SCM to examine the perception of a wide range of social groups in Germany. Both studies reported comparatively low competence and warmth ratings for social groups that share features of fled persons, such as "foreigners" or "immigrants." Nationwide surveys reveal that the majority of Germans feel threatened by potential consequences associated with the immigration of fled people, such as increased crime rates, competition on the housing and job markets, and the influences of Islam (Infratest, 2016). Since warmth is negatively related to perceived threat and competition (Binggeli, Krings, & Sczesny, 2014; Kervyn et al., 2015), host society members' warmth ratings of fled groups should be rather low (Louis, Duck, Terry, Schuller, & Lalonde, 2007). As for competence, fled people should generally receive low scores as well, due to a perception of low

agency and little control over numerous aspects of their lives upon their arrival.

Evidence from the US context shows, however, that there may be variability in terms of warmth (i.e., intentions) and competence perception (i.e., capabilities to act upon intentions) depending on which immigrant group is specified, and which label is used (Lee & Fiske, 2006). However, we know very little about what intentions and motives majority members associate with particular labels.

"Refugees" and "asylum seekers"² are both the terms predominantly used in the public discourse to refer to people who have fled from adverse living conditions (Berry, Garcia-Blanco, & Moore, 2015). The Geneva Convention defines "refugees" as individuals who have been forced to leave their home countries due to a threat of persecution based on their ethnicity, religion, nationality, or political or social affiliations. "Asylum seekers" are individuals who are additionally in the process of applying for permission to stay in a particular foreign country. Thus, our first goal is to examine to what extent nonimmigrant majority members' perception and evaluation of fled individuals referred to with aforementioned labels match ("asylum seekers" vs. "refugees"), and whether differences in emotional and behavioral consequences emerge as a function of the group labels.

In addition to the use of aforementioned terms to refer to fled people in general, fled persons have frequently been linguistically differentiated based on their assumed migration motives. A common distinction is made between so-called "economic refugees," supposedly fleeing due to economic hardship, and "war refugees,"³ supposedly fleeing due to (civil) war from their home countries (e.g., Bade, 2013; n-tv, 2016; Preuß, 2015; Stötzel & Wengeler, 1995; The UN Refugee Agency, 2016). Thus, our second goal is to examine differences in cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences for nonimmigrant majority members as a function of flight motive of the fled persons ("economic refugees" vs. "war refugees" vs. no specification, i.e., "refugees"). Considering that flight motives are in everyday language incorporated in the refugee label ("war refugees," "economic refugees"), but not in the asylum seeker label (i.e., "war asylum seekers" and "economic asylum seekers" do not exist, for instance), we focused our investigation on the former.

Previous work suggests that whereas the label "asylum seeker" has a neutral to negative connotation, the label

"refugee" is connoted positively to neutrally (Berry et al., 2015). This contention has, to our knowledge, not been tested empirically yet. These differences in connotation may emerge due to differences regarding intentions toward the ingroup (Fiske et al., 2002): Whereas the term "refugee" inherently emphasizes *leaving* one's home country due to threats to one's life in the country of origin, the term "asylum seeker" emphasizes the *application* for asylum. It may be speculated that the latter is more strongly associated with enhanced economic (e.g., transfer benefits) and symbolic (e.g., cultural) costs and threats (Stephan & Stephan, 2000), decreasing the perceived amicability of intentions. This, in turn, could lead to lower warmth perceptions, and associated consequences on emotions and behavioral intentions.

As for "war refugees" and "economic refugees," echoing contemporary German policy, studies on the perception of these two subgroups indicate that attitudes toward war refugees are rather benevolent, whereas only a minority approves of economic refugees (Ditlmann, Koopmans, Michalowski, Rink, & Veit, 2016; Infratest, 2016; Verkuyten, 2004). The differing evaluations in migration motives may again be a result of perceived differences in fled peoples' intentions and capacities (Fiske et al., 2002). Moreover, in what way "war refugees" and "economic refugees" implied intentions and capacities match with the social perception of "refugees" lacks empirical basis.

Based on these findings, we aim to carry on investigating majority members' perceived commonalities and differences in cognitions, emotional reactions, and behavioral intentions comparing (a) asylum seekers versus refugees, and (b) war refugees versus economic refugees versus refugees without a specified flight motive.

Method

All analyses are based on an autochthonous university student sample ($n = 389^4$; 66.1% female, 1.8% other; $M_{\text{age}} = 26.90$, $SD = 9.24$). Participants, recruited via a universitywide email list, took part in a factorial survey with one between-subject factor (four levels: asylum seekers = 1; refugees = 2; war refugees = 3; economic refugees = 4) in December 2015. With the exception of the group label, the survey was identical in all conditions. Allocation to

² In German: "Flüchtlinge" and "Asylbewerber," respectively.

³ In German: "Wirtschaftsflüchtlinge" and "Kriegsflüchtlinge," respectively.

⁴ The initial sample of $n = 485$ was reduced because participants with migration background ($n = 83$), participants with three or more univariate outliers ($|z| > 4$; $n = 8$), and participants with multivariate outliers (Mahalanobis distances with $p < .001$; $n = 5$) were excluded from the analysis. A chi-square test based on the initial sample showed that the drop of cases (0 = excluded case; 1 = included case) was not significantly related to condition ($p > .10$).

one of the conditions (asylum seekers $n = 98$; refugees $n = 115$; war refugees $n = 97$; economic refugees $n = 79$) occurred randomly. The students were offered to take part in a lottery as an incentive for their participation. After participants had completed the closed-ended part of survey, they were asked to provide their thoughts associated with the respective group label of their condition in an open-ended question format. We chose this order in the survey to avoid the potential risk that reflecting on the labels may bias participants' subsequent responses. Participants had the opportunity to fill in their answers at their own pace and withdraw from the study at any time. After completion, participants were thanked and fully debriefed.

Measures

Label-Specific Stereotypic Beliefs

To assess label-specific intentions and motivations, participants were asked: "When you hear the term [label], whom do you think of? Please write down everything that comes to your mind. Please also indicate where you think [label] come from and why they've come to Germany. To do so, please complete the following sentence: When I think of [label], I think of..." This question was based on questions frequently used in cognitive interviews by the Leibniz Institute for the Social Sciences (GESIS) to explore the definition of a social category. The question had an open-ended answering format without space or time restrictions.

Basic Stereotype Content Dimension Scales

To assess warmth and competence, we adapted the scales by Asbrock (2010) to ask for the personal perception of the respective group.⁵ In particular, we asked participants how they themselves as Germans would evaluate the respective group on a scale from 1 (= *not at all*) to 5 (= *very*), as warm, friendly, well intentioned (warmth; $\alpha = .84-.86$), and competent, capable, independent (competence; $\alpha = .65-.72$) in individually randomized order.

Emotions

To assess emotions, we used an adapted version of a scale used in Kotzur, Schäfer, and Wagner's (2017) research. This scale contains four to five items per BIAS-Map emotion in individually randomized order, based on adjectives used in Cuddy et al.'s (2007) study. On a scale from 1 (= *disagree completely*) to 5 (= *agree completely*), we asked to what extent participants, as Germans, felt pity (e.g., I feel pity towards [label]; $\alpha = .73-.88$), admiration (e.g., I'm impressed by [label]; $\alpha = .89-.90$), contempt (e.g., I dislike [label]; $\alpha = .60-.90^6$), envy (e.g., I think benefits should be cut for [label]; $\alpha = .56-.87^7$), anxiety (e.g., I'm afraid of [label]; $\alpha = .91-.94$), and anger (e.g., [Label] make me angry; $\alpha = .91-.94$).

Action Tendencies

To assess action tendencies, we used an adapted version of a scale used in Becker and Asbrock's (2012) research. Each of the four subscales contained three to four items that were presented in individually randomized order. We asked participants to rate to what extent they, as Germans, would actively facilitate (e.g., I would advocate [label's] rights; $\alpha = .84-.92$), passively facilitate (e.g., I would accept [label]; $\alpha = .62-.85$), actively harm (e.g., I would put obstacles in the way of [label]; $\alpha = .54-.86^8$), and passively harm (e.g., I would ignore [label]; $\alpha = .72-.88$) the respective group on a scale from 1 (= *disagree completely*) to 5 (= *agree completely*).

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Prior to our main analyses, we checked whether the random allocation to conditions had been successful. Results of a χ^2 test and a univariate analysis of variance suggested that gender and age were randomly distributed across conditions ($ps > .10$).

⁵ In accordance with Fiske and colleagues (2002), Asbrock (2010) asked participants how they believe that *others* of a reference group (e.g., German society) view the respective social group. However, because we were interested in how participants *themselves* rate the social groups on the above dimensions, we adapted this part of the scale.

⁶ The low α -score (.60) reported here emerged due to a floor effect in the war refugees condition. Means ($M_s = 1.00-1.28$) and variances ($SD_s = 0.00-0.69$) of the contempt items were particularly low in this condition, resulting in low covariations. The high α s in the remaining conditions convinced us of the usefulness of the subscale items. Thus, we kept all items of the contempt subscale for subsequent analyses.

⁷ Two items ("I envy [label]"; "I would like to have things that [label] have") performed particularly low in both the refugees and war refugees condition ($\alpha_s = .47-.49$) and were dropped. Dropping any further items would have resulted in worse α -scores in at least one of the four conditions, which is why the remaining items were kept despite a low α in the refugees condition ($\alpha = .56$). Results on this subscale should therefore be interpreted cautiously.

⁸ We dropped the item "I would act aggressively towards [label], if necessary" due to low performance in the war refugees condition. After dropping this item, the lowest reliability score ($\alpha = .56$) emerged in the war refugees condition, which was based on solely two variables, since the item "I would harm [label]" had zero variance and thus was not included in the computation. Since α -scores are dependent on scale length, .56 emerged as a reasonable score for a two-item scale (Nunnally, 1967). Due to good performance in the remaining conditions and due to its theoretical relevance to the underlying construct "active harm," we kept "I would harm [label]" for subscale computation.

Motivations and Intentions of Asylum Seekers, Refugees, War Refugees, and Economic Refugees

To explore the perceived label-specific motivations and intentions, we conducted a quantitative content analysis of the open-ended answers. Only $n = 2$ in the war refugees condition left this item blank. We developed a coding scheme on the social groups' motivations and intentions inductively following Mayring's (2010) procedure, which was applied to the data by two independent coders (inter-coder reliability = 95.2% correspondence). We also coded key demographic characteristics participants associated with the respective label, such as gender/familial group, education background, perceived diversity of group composition, and the country or area of origin,⁹ which may provide further hints to the perceived nature of intentions and implementation capacity. Discrepancies in codings were resolved by discussion. Unit of analysis was a text chunk of any size, representative of a single category, coded once per participant. On average, we coded $M = 3.11$, $SD = 1.84$ categories per participant in the war refugees condition (range: 0–9), $M = 1.81$, $SD = 1.19$ in the economic refugees condition (range: 0–5), $M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.77$ in the refugees condition (range: 0–8), and $M = 2.39$, $SD = 1.61$ in the asylum seekers condition (range: 0–9). A detailed description of the categories, as well as examples of units assigned to each of the categories, is provided in Table 1. To test whether the frequency, and thus the implied salience of the coding categories, differed significantly between groups ("refugees" vs. "asylum seekers," and "refugees" vs. "war refugees," vs. "economic refugees"), we conducted a series of χ^2 tests (Condition \times Coding category mentioned, yes = 1, no = 0). The results are summarized in Table 2.

Comparing Refugees and Asylum Seekers

We only report significant associations between frequency of being mentioned (no = 0, yes = 1) and condition. Significant differences arose between the refugees and asylum seekers condition when it comes to first-mentioned, and thus most strongly associated areas or countries of origin: A significantly larger share in the refugees condition mentioned Syria (39.1%) first, compared to 19.4% in the asylum seekers condition.

Fleeing due to war and security issues was an intention that was more often associated with refugees (69.6%) than with asylum seekers (49.0%). Moreover, participants in the refugees condition mentioned the intention to escape

from persecution more frequently than those in the asylum seekers condition (29.6% and 14.3%, respectively). The opposite was the case for freeloading intentions (1.7% and 8.2%, respectively).

Comparing Refugees, War Refugees, and Economic Refugees

Whereas the results for war refugees largely echoed the results for refugees, a different pattern emerged for economic refugees. War refugees were significantly more frequently associated with more vulnerable groups than economic refugees. Economic refugees were categorized significantly more frequently as well educated (5.1%) compared to refugees (0.0%; war refugees: 1.1%), although overall frequency levels were low. As country of origin, mostly Syria (35.8%) was mentioned in the war refugees condition, matching the pattern of the refugees condition (39.1%). This stands in stark and significant contrast to the economic refugees condition, where Syria was not once referred to first. The reversed pattern emerged for South/East Europe as a region of origin, which was mentioned first in 8.9% of the cases in the economic refugees condition, and not once in both the war refugees and refugees condition. Lastly, the Balkans were mentioned significantly more often in the economic refugees condition (6.3%) than in the war refugees condition (0.0%; refugees: 0.9%).

Notable differences between conditions also emerged for perceived intentions and motivations: The share of participants who assumed war and security issues differed significantly in all three conditions, with 69.6% in the refugees condition, 51.6% in the war refugees condition, and 2.5% in the economic refugees condition. Additionally, all three conditions differed significantly from one another in terms of the frequency in which economic reasons (economic refugees: 49.4%; refugees: 31.3%; war refugees: 14.7%) and persecution (refugees: 29.6%, war refugees: 14.7%, economic refugees: 2.5%) were mentioned.

As for capability perceptions, the need and worthiness of assistance and cooperation were mentioned in the war refugees and refugees condition with similar frequency (30.5% and 20.0%, respectively). This stands in stark and significant contrast to the extent to which these features were ascribed to economic refugees (7.6%). A similar pattern emerged for the experience of loss (war refugees: 28.4%, refugees: 17.4%, economic refugees: 6.3%). Compared to the economic refugees condition (0.0%), the experience of trauma was mentioned significantly more often in the war refugees condition (11.6%, refugees: 3.5%).

⁹ We focused on the first-mentioned country and area of origin, since previous research suggests that the first-mentioned location is most closely associated with the respective category (Schwarz, 1998; cf. Asbrock, Lemmer, Becker, Koller, & Wagner, 2014, for a similar approach).

Table 1. Description of categories and examples of category content

Category	Description of category content	Examples ¹
Demographic group characteristics		
Gender/familial group		
Children		/
Males		/
Females		/
Families		/
Educational background		
Well-educated	Mostly well educated and/or qualified; schooled	<p>“Meiner Meinung nach sind das zum Teil sehr intelligente und nette, ganz normale Leute” [In my opinion, these are partially very intelligent and kind, quite normal people]</p> <p>“Flüchtlinge, [...] die gut gebildet sind” [refugees (...) who are well educated]</p>
Uneducated	Mostly insufficient education and/or unqualified; lack of education	<p>“Je nach Herkunft schlecht ausgebildet, billige Arbeitskräfte” [depending on the country of origin, badly educated, cheap workforce]</p> <p>“+ - 25% gut ausgebildet” [+ - 25% well educated]</p>
Group composition		
Heterogeneous	Explicit mentioning of group variability and/or differences within the group; refusal to describe a social group as a whole	<p>“Nicht an eine homogene Gruppe von Menschen! (sodass verallgemeinernde Fragen schwer zu beantworten sind)” [Not as a homogeneous group of people! (thus, generalizing questions are difficult to answer)]</p> <p>“Wenn ich an Wirtschaftsflüchtlinge denke, denke ich an die unterschiedlichsten Menschen und Bevölkerungsgruppen.” [When thinking of economic refugees, I think of different people and ethnic groups]</p>
Subgrouping/subtyping	Explicit distinction between different kinds of refugees, such as good vs. bad, real vs. bogus, and/or economic vs. war	<p>“Die Unterscheidung zwischen Wirtschaftsflüchtlingen und Bürgerkriegsflüchtlingen” [the differentiation between economic refugees and civil war refugees]</p> <p>“Möglich ist bei der Anzahl an Flüchtlingen aber auch, dass einige darunter sind, die nicht direkt bedroht sind aber zumindest bessere Umstände erhoffen” [Given the number of refugees it is also possible that some are not directly threatened but hope for better conditions]</p>
Country of origin	First country of origin listed	
Region of origin	First region of origin listed	
Intentions and Motivations		
Flight intentions		
War and security	Fleeing from war, terrorism, and violence; fleeing with the intention to seek security	<p>“Menschen, die einer Kriegssituation oder kriegsähnlichen Zuständen in ihrem Heimatland entfliehen...” [people who flee from a war or war-like situation in their home country...]</p> <p>“Wenn ich an Flüchtlinge denke, denke ich an Menschen, die darauf hoffen, endlich zur Ruhe zu kommen, ihre Kinder in Frieden groß zu ziehen, (...) und sich endlich ausleben dürfen.” [When thinking of refugees, I think of people who hope for finally calming down, raising their children in peace, (...) and who are finally allowed to live out]</p>
General hardship/better life	Fleeing hardship; fleeing with the intention to improve and/or restore humane living conditions	<p>“Menschen die aus Notsituationen stammen und daher geflüchtet sind, sie erhoffen sich hier ein besseres Leben.” [People originating from emergency situations and thus have fled, they hope for a better life here]</p> <p>“Sie alle hoffen auf ein besseres (...) Leben, das sie hier leider nicht immer finden.” [They all hope for a better (...) life, which unfortunately they don't always find here]</p>

(Continued on next page)

Table 1. (Continued)

Category	Description of category content	Examples ¹
Economy	Fleeing from economic hardship, such as poverty and/or hunger; fleeing due to economic prospects; fleeing with the intention to improve employment and education	<p>“Flüchtlinge, die aus ökonomischen Gründen nach Deutschland kommen...” [refugees coming to Germany for economic reasons...]</p> <p>“... erwarten sich in Deutschland bessere Sozialleistungen oder Job- und Bildungschancen” [...expecting in Germany better social benefits or job- and educational opportunities]</p>
Persecution	Fleeing with the intention to escape political, racial, cultural, religious, sexual, and/or other forms of persecution; fleeing from discrimination and/or corruption	<p>“Des Weiteren gibt es natürlich auch politisch verfolgte Flüchtlinge.” [Furthermore, there are of course also politically persecuted refugees]</p> <p>“Der Begriff Flüchtling im Allgemeinen meint für mich einen Menschen, der - wie oben beschrieben - wegen (...) Verfolgung aus politischen und/oder religiösen Gründen um sein Leben oder zumindest seine Verheertheit fürchten muss” [The term refugee in general for me refers to a person who - as described above - has to fear for his live or at least his well-being due to persecution for political and/or religious reasons]</p>
Freeloading	Fleeing with the intention to freeload	<p>“Schmarotzer. (...) Bekommen so viel in die Arschlöcher geschoben und wollen trotzdem mehr.” [Freeloaders (...) receive so much stuck up their asses and still want more]</p> <p>“(...) Allerdings denke ich auch an konkrete Menschen meines Wohnortes, die das Sozialsystem in Deutschland ausnutzen. Der Wille Arbeiten zu gehen und sich das Geld zum Leben zu verdienen ist nicht vorhanden und dennoch geht es ihnen besser, als anderen engagierten Arbeitslosen, die tatsächlich arbeiten wollen.” [(...), however, I think of concrete people in my hometown that exploit the social system in Germany. The will to work and to earn money to make a living is not given and still they are better off than other dedicated unemployed that really want to work]</p>
Germany	Fleeing with the intention to come to Germany as an attractive flight destination, e.g., due to its wealth, social security, and/or openness	<p>“Dass Deutschland eine bevorzugte Wahl als sicheres Land ist, kann ich durchaus verstehen.” [I can totally understand that Germany is the preferred choice as secure country]</p> <p>“Ich denke, diese Flüchtlinge kommen nach Deutschland, weil sie sich hier (...) erwarten, die in anderen - vielleicht näher gelegenen Ländern - durch dort herrschende Instabilität nicht gegeben sind.” [I think these refugees come to Germany because here (...) they expect that in other - maybe more proximate countries - it's not given due to the local instability]</p>
Climate	Fleeing with the intention to escape natural hazards and climate catastrophes	<p>“Die Gründe (sind viele, z.B. ...), ökologischer Art” [The reasons (are manifold, e.g., ...) of the ecologic kind]</p> <p>“Flüchtlinge lassen immer einen Grund für ihre Flucht in Form einer (...) natürlich gearteten Katastrophe vermuten.” [refugees always leave a reason for their flight in form of a naturally occurring catastrophe to be expected]</p>
Lack of prospect	Fleeing with the motivation to overcome a lack of prospects	<p>“Perspektivlosigkeit im Heimatland” [Lack of prospects in the home country]</p>

(Continued on next page)

Table 1. (Continued)

Category	Description of category content	Examples ¹
Acculturation strategy		“Oder sie kommen aus Afrika, haben dort auf Grund von Misswirtschaft und politischem Chaos keine Zukunft” [or they come from Africa, where due to mismanagement and political chaos they have no future]
Willing to integrate	Assumed willingness to integrate	“Wollen sich in Deutschland integrieren und mithelfen” [want to integrate into Germany and assist] “Die Kinder scheinen sich schnell anzupassen und glücklich hier zu sein.” [The children seem to adapt quickly and seem to be happy here]
Unwilling to integrate	Assumed unwillingness to integrate	“Haben kein Interesse Deutsch zu lernen oder sich zu integrieren.” [Have no interest in learning German or integrating themselves] “Passen sich nicht an.” [Do not adapt themselves]
Capability perceptions to carry out intentions		
In need of/worthy of help	In need of and/or worthy of help, protection, and/or care; group members' inability to help themselves; natives ought to protect, help, and/or care	“(..) Und damit müssen wir ihnen helfen, dass sie wieder ein normales Leben anfangen können.” [(..) and therefore, we have to help them in order for them to start leading a normal life again]
Experience of loss	Loss of and/or leaving behind valuable things and/or persons, such as home country, life, loved ones, and/or family	“Viel Not und Leid während der Flucht, dem man mit Hilfe im Ankunftsland antworten muss” [A lot of poverty and hardship during the flight, to which one has to respond with support in the receiving country] “Die meisten haben meiner Meinung nach einen schweren Weg hinter sich und mussten viel aufgeben oder haben viel verloren.” [In my opinion, most of them have a difficult journey behind them and had to abandon a lot or lost a lot]
Experience of trauma	Traumatization due to life events	“Verlust von Familie, Freunden, vertrauter Heimat.” [Loss of family, friends, and familiar home] “Menschen die viel schlimmes erlebt haben und dringend psychologische Betreuung bräuchten” [people that have experienced evil and are urgently in need for psychological support]
Strong-mindedness	Strong character, will, and/or determination	“Wenn ich an Flüchtlinge denke, denke ich an Menschen die sich auf der Flucht befinden und traumatische Erfahrungen machen mussten.” [When thinking of refugees, I think of people which are currently fleeing and were forced to make traumatic experiences] “Diejenigen, die es bis hier her geschafft haben, sind sehr starke Menschen, anderenfalls hätten sie es nicht geschafft, den gefährlichen und beschwerlichen Weg auf sich zu nehmen und bis zur Ankunft in Deutschland oder in einem anderen Land durchzuhalten.” [Those that have made it until here are very strong people, otherwise they would not have made the dangerous and exhausting way and would not have hold out until their arrival in Germany or another country] “Ich denke an Angst, Verzweiflung, Hilflosigkeit und gleichzeitig auch an Stärke, Durchhaltevermögen, Kraft, dem Leidensdruck standhalten und Mut zur Veränderung haben” [I think of anxiety, despair, helplessness and at the same time of strength, endurance, power to withstand the psychological strain and to have courage for change]

Note. ¹Examples are provided in German, with own English translations in brackets.

Table 2. Absolute counts and percentages of demographic group characteristics, intentions and motivations, and capability to carry out intentions for asylum seekers, refugees, war refugees, and economic refugees

Category	Refugees ¹ (n = 115)	Asylum seekers (n = 98)	χ^2 (1, n = 213)	War refugees (n = 95)	Economic refugees (n = 79)	Refugees ¹ (n = 115)	χ^2 (2, n = 298)
Demographic group characteristics							
Gender/familiar group							
Children	10 (8.7%)	4 (4.1%)	1.83	12 _a (12.6%)	1 _b (1.3%)	10 _{ab} (8.7%)	7.75*
Males	4 (3.5%)	6 (6.1%)	0.83	11 (11.6%)	3 (3.8%)	4 (3.5%)	6.95* ²
Females	2 (1.7%)	2 (2.0%)	0.03	8 _a (8.4%)	0 _b	2 _{ab} (1.7%)	10.85*
Families	2 (1.7%)	2 (2.0%)	0.03	7 (7.4%)	2 (2.5%)	2 (1.7%)	4.99
Educational background							
Well-educated	0	3 (3.1%)	3.57	1 _{ab} (1.1%)	4 _b (5.1%)	0 _a	7.44*
Uneducated	0	2 (2.0%)	2.37	0	0	0	/
Group composition							
Subgrouping/subtyping	15 (13.0%)	14 (14.3%)	0.07	8 (8.4%)	9 (11.4%)	15 (13.0%)	1.14
Heterogeneous	8 (7.0%)	8 (8.2%)	0.11	4 (4.2%)	3 (3.8%)	8 (7.0%)	1.23
Country of origin ²							
Afghanistan	2 (1.7%)	1 (1.0%)	0.20	2 (2.1%)	0	2 (2.1%)	1.58
Albania	0	0	/	0	2 (2.5%)	0	5.35
Bulgaria	0	0	/	0	1 (1.3%)	0	2.67
Eritrea	3 (2.6%)	0	2.59	1 (1.1%)	0	3 (2.6%)	2.45
Greece	0	0	/	0	1 (1.3%)	0	2.67
Iraq	0	0	/	1 (1.1%)	0	0	2.05
Kosovo	0	0	/	0	3 (3.8%)	0	8.06* ³
Pakistan	1 (0.9%)	0	0.86	1 (1.1%)	0	1 (0.9%)	0.78
Poland	0	0	/	0	1 (1.3%)	0	2.67
Spain	0	0	/	0	1 (1.3%)	0	2.67
Sudan	1 (0.9%)	0	0.86	0	0	1 (0.9%)	1.52
Syria	45 _a (39.1%)	19 _b (19.4%)	9.81*	34 _a (35.8%)	0 _b	45 _a (39.1%)	41.19*
Area of origin ⁴							
Africa	3 (2.6%)	4 (4.1%)	0.36	1 (1.1%)	5 (6.3%)	3 (2.6%)	4.14
Arabia	1 (0.9%)	2 (2.0%)	0.52	0	0	1 (0.9%)	1.52
Asia	1 (0.9%)	1 (1.0%)	0.01	0	1 (81.3%)	1 (0.9%)	1.09
Balkans	1 (0.9%)	1 (1.0%)	0.01	0 _a	5 _b (6.3%)	1 _{ab} (0.9%)	9.87*
Middle East	0	1 (1.0%)	1.18	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.3%)	0	1.36
Southern/Eastern Europe	0	0	/	0 _a	7 _b (8.9%)	0 _a	19.07*
Intentions and motivations							
Flight intentions							
War and security	80 (69.6%)	48 (49.0%)	9.35*	49 _a (51.6%)	2 _b (2.5%)	80 _c (69.6%)	87.14*
General hardship/better life	41 (35.7%)	25 (25.5%)	2.55	32 (33.7%)	31 (39.2%)	41 (35.7%)	0.59
Economy	36 (31.3%)	24 (24.5%)	1.21	14 _a (14.7%)	39 _b (49.4%)	36 _c (31.3%)	24.29*
Persecution	34 _a (29.6%)	14 _b (14.3%)	7.08*	14 _a (14.7%)	2 _b (2.5%)	34 _c (29.6%)	24.57*
Lack of prospect	14 (12.2%)	8 (8.2%)	0.92	13 (13.7%)	13 (16.5%)	14 (12.2%)	0.72
Freeloading	2 _a (1.7%)	8 _b (8.2%)	4.88*	3 (3.2%)	7 (8.9%)	2 (1.7%)	6.32* ²
Germany	8 (7.0%)	7 (7.1%)	<0.01	11 (11.6%)	7 (8.9%)	8 (7.0%)	1.36
Climate	5 (4.3%)	1 (1.0%)	2.14	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.3%)	5 (4.3%)	1.88
Acculturation intentions							
Willing to integrate	6 (5.2%)	4 (4.0%)	0.15	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.3%)	6 (5.2%)	2.90
Unwilling to integrate	5 (4.3%)	2 (2.0%)	0.89	1 (1.1%)	4 (5.1%)	5 (4.3%)	2.53
Capability perceptions to carry out intentions							
In need of/worthy of help and cooperation	23 (20.0%)	11 (11.2%)	3.04	29 _a (30.5%)	6 _b (7.6%)	23 _{ab} (20.0%)	14.14*

(Continued on next page)

Table 2. (Continued)

Category	Refugees (<i>n</i> = 115)	Asylum seeker (<i>n</i> = 98)	χ^2 (1, <i>n</i> = 213)	War refugee (<i>n</i> = 95)	Economic refugee (<i>n</i> = 79)	Refugees (<i>n</i> = 115)	χ^2 (2, <i>n</i> = 298)
Experience of loss ³	20 (17.4%)	28 (28.6%)	3.79	27 _a (28.4%)	5 _b (6.3%)	20 _{ab} (17.4%)	14.31*
Experience of trauma ³	4 (3.5%)	5 (5.1%)	0.35	11 _a (11.6%)	0 _b	4 _{ab} (3.5%)	12.89*
Strong-mindedness	4 (3.5%)	4 (4.1%)	0.53	8 (8.4%)	1 (1.3%)	4 (3.5%)	5.60

Notes. ¹The data on refugees were submitted to two separate analyses (asylum seekers vs. refugees; war refugees vs. economic refugees vs. refugees). Thus, the refugees column is reproduced twice in the present table. ²Only the first-mentioned countries/areas were included. ³Although the comparison of frequencies produced a significant χ^2 statistic on the .05-level, the contingency table indicated no significant differences between cells. This may be due to a high share (more than 20%) of cells with lower frequencies than 5. Thus, these results should be interpreted cautiously. In all these cases, we contained the null-hypothesis of no significant association between cells. ⁴Experience of trauma and loss was subsumed under the broader category of capability to carry out intentions, since they were interpreted as capability-reducing factors. All values are percentages out of the total *n* in the respective condition, with absolute *n* in parentheses. Interrater reliability = 95.2% correspondence. Different subscripts indicate statistically significant differences ($p < .05$) between cells.

Deducting Hypotheses Regarding Stereotype Content Dimensions, Emotions, and Action Tendencies

Asylum Seekers Versus Refugees

The qualitative profiles of refugees and asylum seekers largely match in terms of capability perceptions and assumed demographic features. Thus, competence should not differ significantly between groups.

The more prominent association with Syria as a country of origin for refugees was also reflected in the higher associations with intentions to seek security and escape from persecution. A higher association of asylum seekers with the intention to freeloader suggests that asylum seekers' intentions may be viewed as less amicable, matching previous work suggesting that asylum seekers are connoted more negatively than refugees (Berry et al., 2015). Refugees can thus be expected to be perceived as warmer than asylum seekers. Consequently, refugees should be associated with lower levels of anxiety and anger. Based on the assumption that overall levels of competence for fled groups are low, and the higher association of refugees with uncontrollable negative outcomes (e.g., persecution), refugees should elicit higher pity levels (low competence, high warmth emotion; Cuddy et al., 2007; Weiner, 2005), and lower envy levels (high competence, low warmth emotion) than asylum seekers, respectively. With closer proximity to the ingroup quadrant, refugees should also elicit higher admiration levels (high warmth, high competence emotion), and lower contempt levels (low warmth, low competence emotion). Due to higher warmth levels for refugees, this label should also be associated with more active facilitative and less active harmful behavioral tendencies. In accordance with the predictions of the BIAS-Map, no differences for passive behavioral tendencies were expected.

War Refugees Versus Economic Refugees Versus Refugees

The qualitative profiles of war refugees and economic refugees differed vastly in terms of assumed demographics,

intentions and motivations, and capacity to implement intentions. Economic refugees were less associated with vulnerable groups. They were more strongly associated with less benevolent intentions, such as improving one's economic status, which is likely to be related to a higher salience of perceived economic threat originating from this social group (Infratest, 2016). Accordingly, we expected that, compared to war refugees, economic refugees should score lower on warmth, and higher on the associated emotions anxiety and anger.

With economic refugees being less associated with categories indicating low capability to implement intentions (e.g., the need of help, experiences of loss and trauma), and more frequently perceived as well educated than war refugees, we expected economic refugees to score higher on competence perceptions. Accordingly, economic refugees should be associated with higher levels of envy (high competence, low warmth emotion) and lower levels of pity (low competence, high warmth emotion). Since we expected differences in both warmth and competence, with no capacity to predict the exact relative location in the SCM and BIAS-Map, changes in the high warmth, high competence emotion admiration, and the low warmth, low competence emotion contempt remained an exploratory endeavor.

War refugees should also be associated with more active facilitative behavioral intentions, and less active harmful behavioral intentions than economic refugees. Lastly, economic refugees should elicit higher levels of passive facilitative, and less passive harmful behavioral intentions than war refugees.

Considering the relatively large overlap of refugees with war refugees in terms of demographic characteristics (e.g., Syria as main country of origin), intentions and motivations (e.g., mostly fleeing war and seeking security), and capability to implement intentions (e.g., needing more help), we expected the SCM and BIAS-Map profiles of refugees to overlap more with war refugees than the profile of economic refugees.

Table 3. Means, standard deviations, and results of *t*-tests for equality of means of dependent variables for refugees and asylum seekers

	Refugees (<i>n</i> = 115)	Asylum seekers (<i>n</i> = 98)	<i>t</i> -test statistics	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Warmth	3.60 (0.72)	3.51 (0.70)	<i>t</i> (211) = 0.92	.127
Competence	3.14 (0.65)	3.11 (0.70)	<i>t</i> (211) = 0.32	.044
Pity	4.02 (0.72)	3.79 (0.79)	<i>t</i> (211) = 2.17*	.304
Admiration	3.40 (0.98)	3.12 (0.93)	<i>t</i> (211) = 2.08*	.293
Contempt	1.21 (0.46)	1.34 (0.54)	<i>t</i> (192.49) = -1.96 ¹	.259
Envy	1.73 (0.87)	1.82 (0.96)	<i>t</i> (211) = -0.74	.098
Anxiety	1.68 (0.80)	1.89 (0.91)	<i>t</i> (194.97) = -1.77 ¹	.245
Anger	1.45 (0.68)	1.68 (0.94)	<i>t</i> (173.60) = -1.99* ¹	.280
Active facilitation	3.78 (0.86)	3.44 (0.89)	<i>t</i> (211) = 2.89*	.389
Active harm	1.15 (0.44)	1.25 (0.57)	<i>t</i> (211) = -1.42	.200
Passive facilitation	4.39 (0.68)	4.16 (0.76)	<i>t</i> (211) = 2.41*	.320
Passive harm	1.76 (0.85)	1.93 (0.89)	<i>t</i> (211) = -1.42	.200

Notes. All scale means range from 1 (= lowest) to 5 (= highest). ¹Adjusted *t*-value reported due to the violation of the homogeneity of variance assumption. **p* ≤ .05.

Comparing Stereotype Content Dimensions, Emotions, and Action Tendencies

First, we ran a series of independent *t*-tests to test for systematic differences between basic stereotype dimensions and resulting consequences for the asylum seekers and refugees group. Next, we ran a series of analyses of variance to test our predictions regarding systematic differences between the social perception of war and economic refugees, and to test to what degree these perceptions deviated from the social perception of refugees without specified flight motive. For all analyses, we applied the $p_{\text{two-tailed}} \leq .05$ criterion. Dependent variables were the basic stereotype content dimension scales (warmth, competence), emotion scales (pity, admiration, envy, contempt, anxiety, anger), as well as action tendency scales (active facilitation, passive facilitation, active harm, passive harm). Whenever the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, we report adjusted scores.

Comparing Refugees and Asylum Seekers

Means and standard deviations submitted to the *t*-tests of equality of means analyses between refugees and asylum seekers are summarized in Table 3.

The means of the two stereotype content scales did not differ significantly between the two groups. As expected, refugees scored significantly higher on pity, whereas the reverse was the case for anger. Moreover, refugees scored higher on admiration than asylum seekers. Comparing both groups on the action tendency scales, refugees received, as expected, significantly higher scores on active facilitation, and unexpectedly higher levels of passive facilitation as well.

Comparing Refugees, War Refugees, and Economic Refugees

Next, we ran a series of analyses of variance (ANOVAs) to test our predictions regarding systematic differences between the perception of war and economic refugees, and to test to what degree the social perception of both war and economic refugees deviated from the social perception of refugees without a specified flight motive. Whenever the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, we report Welch's adjusted *F*-test scores. Means and standard deviations are summarized in Table 4.

All analyses, except the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of the dependent variable anxiety, produced significant omnibus test results (see Table 4), which we followed up using post hoc tests with Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons. Economic refugees were expectedly rated significantly lower on warmth than both war refugees and refugees. A significant omnibus test notwithstanding, the post hoc test produced no significant result for competence ratings. As expected, economic refugees received significantly lower scores on the pity scale than both war refugees and refugees. Additionally, war refugees received significantly higher pity scores than refugees. Economic refugees scored significantly lower on admiration than war refugees and refugees, the difference between war refugees and refugees was however nonsignificant. A similar pattern emerged for contempt, envy, and anger. The analysis of the action tendency scales revealed that the above-mentioned patterns emerged as well for active facilitation, passive facilitation, and active harm. As for passive harm, economic refugees received significantly higher scores than war refugees.

Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and results of *F*-tests for equality of means of the dependent variables for refugees, war refugees, and economic refugees

	Refugees (<i>n</i> = 115)	War refugees (<i>n</i> = 97)	Economic refugees (<i>n</i> = 79)	<i>F</i> -test statistics	η^2
Warmth	3.60 _a (0.72)	3.66 _a (0.67)	3.22 _b (0.72)	<i>F</i> (2, 288) = 9.84*	.068
Competence	3.14 _a (0.65)	3.36 _a (0.71)	3.12 _a (0.72)	<i>F</i> (2, 288) = 3.57*	.024
Pity	4.02 _a (0.72)	4.29 _b (0.58)	3.42 _c (0.89)	<i>F</i> (2, 173.12) = 28.57* ¹	.224
Admiration	3.40 _a (0.98)	3.59 _a (0.84)	2.55 _b (0.91)	<i>F</i> (2, 288) = 31.37*	.218
Contempt	1.21 _a (0.46)	1.10 _a (0.23)	1.44 _b (0.68)	<i>F</i> (2, 153.77) = 10.17* ¹	.078
Envy	1.73 _a (0.87)	1.48 _a (0.75)	2.06 _b (1.08)	<i>F</i> (2, 173.87) = 8.45* ¹	.063
Anxiety	1.68 _a (0.80)	1.55 _a (0.69)	1.67 _a (0.88)	<i>F</i> (2, 288) = 0.80	.006
Anger	1.45 _{ab} (0.68)	1.36 _a (0.50)	1.70 _b (0.99)	<i>F</i> (2, 166.54) = 4.11* ¹	.036
Active facilitation	3.78 _a (0.86)	3.93 _a (0.70)	2.88 _b (1.01)	<i>F</i> (2, 174.74) = 31.59* ¹	.262
Active harm	1.15 _a (0.44)	1.03 _a (0.12)	1.30 _b (0.53)	<i>F</i> (2, 137.45) = 12.46* ¹	.066
Passive facilitation	4.39 _a (0.68)	4.48 _a (0.48)	3.86 _b (0.86)	<i>F</i> (2, 169.05) = 16.97* ¹	.149
Passive harm	1.76 _{ab} (0.85)	1.62 _a (0.68)	1.94 _b (1.01)	<i>F</i> (2, 174.02) = 3.06* ¹	.022

Notes. All scale means range from 1 (= lowest) to 5 (= highest). Nonsignificant differences between means are marked with the same subscripts; significant differences between means are marked with different subscripts. $p \leq .05$ with Bonferroni correction. The means and standard deviations of the refugee column are the same as in Table 1. ¹Welch's *F*-value reported due to the violation of the homogeneity of variance assumption. * $p \leq .05$.

Discussion

Although Germany was a major destination for fled people in 2015 (Eurostat, 2016), knowledge about the perception of the newcomers by long-time residents is scarce. This study was conducted to investigate commonalities and differences in the social perception of fled individuals as a function of the group label used in everyday language. Building on the label (e.g., Hall et al., 2015; Porst & Jers, 2007; Rios, 2013; Rios & Ingrassia, 2016; Sapir, 1921; Stötzel & Wengeler, 1995) and SCM/BIAS-Map literature (Cuddy et al., 2007; Fiske et al., 2002), we suggested and found, based on content analyses of qualitative open-ended text data, that majority members in Germany associate certain intentions with specific (sub-)group labels more strongly, while other intentions were of similar salience for more than one group. The varying salience of intentions toward the ingroup, as well as competence perceptions, was used for hypothesis generating regarding differences in SCM and BIAS-Map, which we put to test.

Comparisons of Asylum Seekers with Refugees

Based on differences in salience of motivations and intentions in the qualitative part of the study (e.g., war and security, and persecution more closely associated with refugees, freeloading more closely associated with asylum seekers), we hypothesized that warmth perceptions should differ between asylum seekers and refugees. Results indicated, however, that participants held similar stereotypes toward both groups in the SCM framework. Contrary to

the theoretical predictions of the BIAS-Map, emotional reactions and action tendencies did nonetheless differ significantly as a function of the labels, in a way that refugees were more positively connoted than asylum seekers. In line with our hypotheses, refugees provoked higher levels of the emotions pity, theoretically associated with higher warmth and lower competence evaluations, as well as admiration, a high warmth, and high competence emotion.

The results of the behavioral intentions were in line with the findings on affective outcomes. Participants demonstrated more active, but also unexpectedly passive supportive behavioral intentions toward refugees than toward asylum seekers. It can be speculated that the amicability of intentions and capability to harm, reflected in the warmth and competence ratings, were indeed judged as similar across groups. However, other factors may have had an impact on emotional reactions and action tendencies, such as the label-specific intentions themselves. For example, seeking security and fleeing persecution were more dominant flight intentions and motivations in the refugees condition. Freeloading, on the other hand, was more strongly associated with asylum seekers. This may have had an impact on emotional reactions and behavioral intentions, despite similarities in terms of amicability and implementation capability perceptions. An alternative explanation of the findings may be that the warmth and competence items that we have used, and that have served their purpose in multiple other studies in Germany (e.g., Asbrock, 2010; Kotzur et al., 2017; Kotzur & Wagner, 2017), were not sensitive enough to slight variations of warmth and competence perceptions. Relatedly, there is an ongoing debate as to what extent the assumption of a two-dimensional structure of basic stereotype content

dimensions holds, or may be better represented by alternative structures, such as distinct sub-dimensions (Stanciu, 2015; Szymkow, Chandler, IJzerman, Parzuchowski, & Wojciszke, 2013), or additional dimensions of social perception (Koch, Imhoff, Dotsch, Unkelbach, & Alves, 2016; Leach, Ellemers, & Barreto, 2007). In light of our findings, we encourage further research to examine to what extent other factors, currently not under scrutiny in the SCM and BIAS-Map, may have an impact on the constructs at stake.

Overall, based on the evidence of the quantitative and qualitative part of the analysis, our results suggest that there is a large overlap in terms of ascribed demographic characteristics, flight intentions, and capability to carry out intentions. Although we find, in line with previous analyses, that asylum seekers seem to be connoted more negatively (Berry et al., 2015). For some, “refugees” and “asylum seekers” may be used interchangeably, illustrated by the two quotes below:

“[...] It makes me angry that the majority of refugees are economic refugees and now share our wealth, and will not give anything back to the state in the future” (asylum seekers condition, own translation).¹⁰

“[...] Especially Sinti and Roma people make up a large share of economic refugees, that are being discriminated against, yet not being officially recognized as refugees, or asylum seekers” (economic refugees condition, own translation).¹¹

Lastly, the qualitative analysis revealed that for about one out of eight participants, it was important to explicitly distinguish between subgroups of the fled, such as between economic and war refugees, confirming the importance of investigating the social perception of both subgroups separately.

Comparisons of War Refugees, Economic Refugees, and Refugees Without Specified Flight Motive

Based on differences in the qualitative profiles between war and economic refugees, manifesting itself in perceived demographic characteristics, intentions, and capacity to implement intentions, we hypothesized that war refugees

should be perceived as warmer, and less competent than economic refugees. We also hypothesized, based on the qualitative results, that the SCM and BIAS-Map profiles of refugees and war refugees would have more commonalities than the profiles of refugees and economic refugees. The results largely matched our hypotheses and were in line with previous work (e.g., Dittmann et al., 2016; Infratest, 2016). First, we found that economic refugees received the lowest warmth ratings. The expectation that economic refugees would receive higher competence scores, however, had to be rejected. Thus, it seems, participants ascribed similar agency to war refugees, economic refugees, and refugees without specified flight motive. This may be related to the dominant focus on early-stage fled individuals, who generally have little control over numerous aspects of their lives. German policies, which disadvantage newcomers' entrance into the labor market, may be a further contributing factor in reducing the implementation capability perceptions of the group's dominantly perceived intentions, that is, economic improvement.

Second, our hypothesis regarding differences between war and economic refugees with respect to anxiety and anger as emotions linked to the perception of warmth could only partially be upheld: Anger, an emotion related to harmful behavioral intentions (Wagner & Christ, 2007), was indeed highest in the economic refugees condition. Anxiety levels, related to avoidance intentions (Mackie, Devos, & Smith, 2000), however, did not differ significantly across the three labels.

Third, based on our previous assumptions of differences in warmth and competence perceptions, we had expected economic refugees to be associated with higher levels of envy (high competence, low warmth emotion), lower levels of pity (low competence, high warmth emotion). Despite no significant differences in competence perceptions, these hypotheses could be confirmed. Additionally, war refugees scored significantly higher on admiration, and significantly lower on contempt compared to economic refugees. Similar reasons as discussed above could account for these findings.

We also expected that economic refugees were associated with more active harmful and more passive facilitative action tendencies than war refugees. In congruence with the findings on anger, these hypotheses could be confirmed. Contrary to our hypotheses, the same pattern emerged for passively harmful and facilitative action tendencies. Thus, overall, economic refugees were evaluated

¹⁰ In German: „Es macht mich sauer, dass die Mehrheit der Flüchtlinge Wirtschaftsflüchtlinge sind und nun an unserem Wohlstand teilhaben, ohne dem Staat in Zukunft etwas zurück zugeben.“

¹¹ In German: „Vor allem Sinti und Roma stellen einen großen Teil an Wirtschaftsflüchtlinge dar, die zwar diskriminiert werden, aber offiziell nicht als Flüchtling [sic] bzw. als Asylsuchende anerkannt werden.“

less favorably than war refugees, and elicited more harming than supportive behavioral intentions.

Examining the relations between war refugees and refugees, both SCM and BIAS-Map score profiles match (almost) perfectly. The only exception to this pattern is pity, where war refugees elicit higher scores than refugees. This is in line with the qualitative findings, which demonstrate that participants ascribed similar group characteristics, intentions and motivations, as well as capabilities to both groups.

When comparing economic refugees with refugees, economic refugees received less favorable scores than refugees on the warmth scale, all emotional scales but anxiety and anger, and all action tendency scales but passive harm. Based on the qualitative and quantitative evidence, we conclude that the labels war refugees and refugees overlap to a great extent, while economic refugees represent a label reserved for a distinct, less appreciated social subgroup.

Limitations and Future Research

Our findings are in line with those of previous studies on this topic (e.g., Dittmann et al., 2016; Verkuyten, 2004). Nonetheless, our findings should be generalized to other contexts with caution, considering that we based our study on a convenience sample of undergraduate students of a medium-sized university in Western Germany. For example, West and East Germans associate different national groups with the term “foreigner,” which partially accounts for different levels of prejudice (Asbrock et al., 2014). Comparing Asbrock’s (2010) and Eckes’ (2002) results reveals that warmth and competence perceptions of some social groups differ between West and East Germany. Thus, a replication of our study in other contexts, such as East Germany, could consequently prove fruitful for future research.

Furthermore, we used a cross-sectional design. Thus, in contrast to longitudinal research, for instance, we cannot draw any conclusions regarding the stability of our findings across time. Moreover, contrary to our expectations, we found overall less bias against the labels than expected, reflected in relatively high warmth and competence means across all conditions. One explanation for the high means might be that all constructs were measured explicitly, leading to socially desirable answers. Future research may explore possibilities to measure these constructs with implicit methods. Additionally, we used an open-ended format to delve into the intentions and motivations, capability perceptions to implement the intentions, as well as general group characteristics associated with each label. We deemed this method the most appropriate, given the fact that this field of research is still in its infancy. While this strategy has its advantages, such as providing participants a platform to

freely express their thoughts, it certainly has its disadvantages: Errors may arise both on the side of the participants (e.g., retrieval errors) and researchers (e.g., coding errors). We aimed to minimize the latter source of error, which was under our control, by employing two independent coders who largely agreed with their interpretation and resolved the remaining disagreement by discussion. Relatedly, in some instances, more than 20% of cells of the coding categories were mentioned less than five times per condition, leading to unstable results. In all of these cases, we retained the null-hypothesis that no significant difference between conditions existed. Future research may consider increasing the sample size to avoid this issue, or using our findings for a development of quantitative scales.

Additionally, some of the scale reliabilities in the quantitative part were higher in some conditions than in others. For instance, it seemed that statements like “I envy [group]” were always unacceptable whenever referring to refugees or war refugees, resulting in a lack of variance and thus low Cronbach’s alpha scores. Nonetheless, we believe that we have struck a balance between empirical and conceptual demands. Lastly, we deemed the labels submitted to analyses the most relevant in the present context. However, future research could expand the investigation to further labels. For example, when investigating the content and effects of labels, the less politically laden term “fled people” (in German: “Geflüchtete”) may be of interest in future studies. Likewise, when studying stereotypes associated with flight motives, “climate refugees” (in German: “Klimaflüchtlinge”) may be a term gaining importance in the years to come.

Conclusion

In light of findings that suggest far-reaching consequences for differences in connotations, we investigated cognitive, emotional, and behavioral consequences for fleeing individuals as a function of the label (“asylum seekers” vs. “refugees,” and “war refugees” vs. “economic refugees” vs. “refugees”) in the SCM and BIAS-Map framework. Furthermore, we utilized qualitative data to generate hypotheses regarding differences in evaluations on these constructs, and at the same time explored to what extent perceived intentions and motivations, capability of implementing them, as well as group characteristics overlapped or differed. Our results demonstrate that the used terminology to refer to people who flee from adverse living conditions does make a difference, and that the choice of the term should not be taken lightly. Thus, we encourage a conscious and well-informed choice of words in the present-day asylum discourse.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Frank Eckerle for his assistance with coding qualitative data, as well as Maria Therese Wiemer, Leonie Schmidt, and Frank Eckerle for comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript.

References

- Asbrock, F. (2010). Stereotypes of social groups in Germany in terms of warmth and competence. *Social Psychology*, 41, 76–81. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000011
- Asbrock, F., Lemmer, G., Becker, J. C., 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. doi: 10.1177/2158244014532819
- Bade, K. J. (2013, October 14). Wirtschaftsflüchtlinge: Die Angst vor den Armen [Economic refugees: The fear of the poor]. In *Zeit Online*. Retrieved from <http://www.zeit.de/politik/deutschland/2013-10/armutsfluechtlinge>
- Becker, J. C., & Asbrock, F. (2012). What triggers helping versus harming of ambivalent groups? Effects of the relative salience of warmth versus competence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 48, 19–27. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2011.06.015
- Berry, M., Garcia-Blanco, I., & Moore, K. (2015). *Press coverage of the refugee and migrant crisis in the EU: A content analysis of five European countries*. [Project Report]. Geneva, Switzerland: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/56bb369c9.html>
- Binggeli, S., Krings, F., & Sczesny, S. (2014). Perceived competition explains regional differences in the stereotype content of immigrant groups. *Social Psychology*, 45, 62–70. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000160
- Bundesamt für Migration und Flüchtlinge (BAMF). (2016). *Das Bundesamt in Zahlen 2015 – Modul Asyl* [The federal office in numbers 2015 – Modul asylum]. Retrieved from http://www.bamf.de/SharedDocs/Anlagen/DE/Publikationen/Broschueren/bundesamt-in-zahlen-2015-asyl.pdf?__blob=publicationFile
- Caprariello, P. A., Cuddy, A. J., & Fiske, S. T. (2009). Social structure shapes cultural stereotypes and emotions: A causal test of the stereotype content model. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12, 147–155. doi: 10.1177/1368430208101053
- Christ, O., Asbrock, F., Dhont, K., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wagner, U. (2013). The effects of intergroup climate on immigrants' acculturation preferences. *Zeitschrift für Psychologie*, 221, 252–257. doi: 10.1027/2151-2604/a000155
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., & Glick, P. (2007). The BIAS map: Behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 92, 631–648. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.4.631
- Cuddy, A. J., Fiske, S. T., Kwan, V. S., Glick, P., Demoulin, S., Leyens, J. P., ... Ziegler, R. (2009). Stereotype content model across cultures: Towards universal similarities and some differences. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48, 1–33. doi: 10.1348/014466608X314935
- Ditlmann, R., Koopmans, R., Michalowski, I., Rink, A., & Veit, S. (2016). Verfolgung vor Armut: Ausschlaggebend für die Offenheit der Deutschen ist der Fluchtgrund [Persecution for poverty: Decisive for the openness of Germans is the reason for flight]. *WZB Mitteilungen*, 151, 1–27. Retrieved from https://www.wzb.eu/sites/default/files/publikationen/wzb_mitteilungen/veits24-27151-webpdf-2.pdf
- Durante, F., Fiske, S. T., Kervyn, N., Cuddy, A. J., Akande, A. D., Adetoun, B. E., ... Barlow, F. K. (2013). Nations' income inequality predicts ambivalence in stereotype content: How societies mind the gap. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52, 726–746. doi: 10.1111/bjso.12005
- Eckes, T. (2002). Paternalistic and envious gender stereotypes: Testing predictions from the stereotype content model. *Sex Roles*, 47, 99–114. doi: 10.1023/A:1021020920715
- Eurostat. (2016). *Asyl in den EU-Mitgliedsstaaten – Rekordzahl von über 1,2 Millionen registrierten erstmaligen Asylbewerbern im Jahr 2015* [Asylum in EU member states – Record number of more than 1.2 million registered first-time asylum seekers in 2015]. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/documents/2995521/7203837/3-04032016-AP-DE.pdf/9fcd72adc249-4f85-8c6d-e9fc2614af1b>
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 878–902. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878
- Fussell, E. (2014). Warmth of the welcome: Attitude toward immigrants and immigration policy in the United States. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 479–498. doi: 10.1146/annurev-soc-071913-043325
- Galinsky, A. D., Wang, C. S., Whitson, J. A., Anicich, E. M., Hugenberg, K., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2013). The reappropriation of stigmatizing labels: The reciprocal relationship between power and self-labeling. *Psychological Science*, 24, 2020–2029. doi: 10.1177/0956797613482943
- Hall, E. V., Phillips, K. W., & Townsend, S. S. (2015). A rose by any other name? The consequences of subtyping "African-Americans" from "Blacks". *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 56, 183–190. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2014.10.004
- Infratest. (2016). *Sorgen über die Folgen der Flüchtlingszuwanderung nach Deutschland* [Worries about the consequences of refugee immigration to Germany]. Berlin, Germany: Infratest dimap. Retrieved from <http://www.infratest-dimap.de/umfragen-analysen/bundesweit/ard-deutschlandtrend/2016/maerz/>
- Kervyn, N., Fiske, S. T., & Yzerbyt, V. (2015). Forecasting the primary dimension of social perception. *Social Psychology*, 46, 36–45. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000219
- Koch, A., Imhoff, R., Dotsch, R., Unkelbach, C., & Alves, H. (2016). The ABC of stereotypes about groups: Agency/socioeconomic success, conservative – progressive beliefs, and communion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110, 675–709. doi: 10.1037/pspa0000046
- Kotzur, P. F., Schäfer, S., & Wagner, U. (2017). *Meeting Abdelrahim, the nice asylum seeker: Intergroup contact changes stereotype content perceptions and associated emotional prejudices*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Kotzur, P. F., & Wagner, U. (2017). *Does contact make good neighbors? Changes of contact and attitudes towards asylum seekers in the neighborhood of a recently set up initial reception center during the "migration crisis"*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Lange, J., & Crusius, J. (2015). The tango of two deadly sins: The social-functional relation of envy and pride. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109, 453–472. doi: 10.1037/pspi0000026
- Leach, C. W., Ellemers, N., & Barreto, M. (2007). Group virtue: The importance of morality (vs. competence and sociability) in the positive evaluation of in-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 234–249. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.234

- Lee, T. L., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Not an outgroup, not yet an ingroup: Immigrants in the stereotype content model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 30, 751–768. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.06.005
- Louis, W. R., Duck, J. M., Terry, D. J., Schuller, R. A., & Lalonde, R. N. (2007). Why do citizens want to keep refugees out? Threats, fairness and hostile norms in the treatment of asylum seekers. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 53–73. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.329
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 602–616. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.79.4.602
- Mayring, P. (2010). Qualitative Inhaltsanalyse [Qualitative content analysis]. In G. Mey & K. Mruć (Eds.), *Handbuch qualitative Forschung in der Psychologie* [Handbook of qualitative research in Psychology] (pp. 601–613). Wiesbaden, Germany: Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.
- Morrison, K. R., & Chung, A. H. (2011). “White” or “European American”? Self-identifying labels influence majority group members’ interethnic attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47, 165–170. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2010.07.019
- n-tv. (2016, March 04). *Athen: Kaum noch Kriegsflüchtlinge* [Athens: Hardly any war refugees anymore]. Retrieved from <http://www.n-tv.de/politik/Athen-Kaum-noch-Kriegsfluechtlinge-article17144711.html>
- Nunnally, J. (1967). *Psychometric methods*. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
- Porst, R., & Jers, C. (2007). Die Allbus-Gastarbeiter-Frage. Zur Geschichte eines Standard-Instruments in der Allgemeinen Bevölkerungsumfrage der Sozialwissenschaften (ALLBUS) [The Allbus-Guest-Workers-Question. History of a standard instrument in the General Population Survey of the Social Sciences]. *Soziale Welt*, 58, 145–161.
- Preuß, R. (2015, February 01). Debatte über Flüchtlinge: Die Mär vom großen Missbrauch [Debate about refugees: The fairy tale of the large abuse]. *Süddeutsche Zeitung*. Retrieved from <http://www.sueddeutsche.de/politik/debatte-ueber-fluechtlinge-die-maer-vom-grossen-missbrauch-1.2325553>
- Rios, K. (2013). Right-wing authoritarianism predicts prejudice against “homosexuals” but not “gay men and lesbians”. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49, 1177–1183. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2013.05.013
- Rios, K., & Ingraffia, Z. A. (2016). Judging the actions of “whistle-blowers” versus “leakers”: Labels influence perceptions of dissenters who expose group misconduct. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 19, 553–569. doi: 10.1177/1368430216638537
- Sapir, E. (1921). *Language*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and World.
- Schönbach, P. (1970). *Sprache und Attitüden: Über den Einfluß der Bezeichnungen Fremdarbeiter und Gastarbeiter auf Einstellungen gegenüber ausländischen Arbeitern* [Language and attitudes: About the influence of the designations alien workers and guest workers on attitudes towards foreign workers]. Bern, Switzerland: Hans Huber Verlag.
- Schwarz, N. (1998). Accessible content and accessibility experiences: The interplay of declarative and experiential information in judgment. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 87–99.
- Smith, R. H. (2000). Assimilative and contrastive emotional reactions to upward and downward social comparisons. In J. Suls & L. Wheeler (Eds.), *Handbook of social comparison: Theory and research* (pp. 173–200). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
- Stanciu, A. (2015). Four sub-dimension of stereotype content: Explanatory evidence from Romania. *International Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 14–20.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23–46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Stötzel, G., & Wengeler, M. (1995). *Kontroverse Begriffe: Geschichte des öffentlichen Sprachgebrauchs in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (Vol. 4) [Controversial terms: History of public linguistic usage in Germany (Vol. 4)]. Berlin, Germany: Walter de Gruyter.
- Szymkow, A., Chandler, J., IJzerman, H., Parzuchowski, M., & Wojciszke, B. (2013). Warmer hearts, warmer rooms: How positive communal traits increase estimates of ambient temperature. *Social Psychology*, 44, 167–176. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000147
- The UN Refugee Agency. (2016). *Fragen und Antworten: Flüchtlinge* [Questions and answers: Refugees]. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.de/questions-und-answers/fluechtling.html>
- UNHCR. (2016). *Global trends – Forced displacement in 2015*. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.org/statistics/unhcrstats/576408cd7/unhcr-global-trends-2015.html>
- Verkuyten, M. (2004). Emotional reactions to and support for immigrant policies: Attributed responsibilities to categories of asylum seekers. *Social Justice Research*, 17, 293–314. doi: 10.1023/B:SORE.0000041295.83611.dc
- Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2007). Intergroup aggression and emotions: A framework and first data. In M. Gollwitzer & G. Steffen (Eds.), *Emotions and aggressive behavior* (pp. 133–148). Göttingen, Germany: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Weiner, B. (2005). Motivation from an attributional perspective and the social psychology of perceived competence. In A. J. Elliot & C. S. Dweck (Eds.), *Handbook of competence and motivation* (pp. 73–84). New York, NY: Guilford Publications.

Received November 14, 2016

Revision received May 29, 2017

Accepted May 29, 2017

Published online September 5, 2017

Patrick F. Kotzur

Department of Psychology
Philipps-Universität Marburg
Gutenbergstr. 18
35032 Marburg
Germany
kotzur@uni-marburg.de