Does perceived labor market competition increase prejudice between refugees and their local hosts?
Evidence from Uganda and Ethiopia*

ONLINE APPENDIX

Julie Bousquet[†], Anna Gasten[‡], Mark Marvin Kadigo [§], Jean-François Maystadt [¶], and Colette Salemi [‖]

March 30, 2025

*The proposed study is part of the project "Global Questions on Forced Displacement and Jobs: The impact of forced displacement on labor markets in host communities" (project supported by the World Bank). The study was pre-registered with the AEA RCT registry on January 29th 2022 (Bousquet et al., 2022). We uploaded the pre-analysis plan to the registry on June 27th 2022, before the data collection on the project ended. Data access was first granted by the World Bank in September 2022. As part of a larger project, the data was collected and used for an analysis that appears in the published World Bank book referenced as "von der Goltz, Jan; Schuettler, Kirsten; Bousquet, Julie; Kebede, Tewodros Aragie. 2024. The Labor Market Impact of Forced Displacement: Jobs in Host Communities in Colombia, Ethiopia, Jordan, and Uganda. Washington, DC: World Bank. http://hdl.handle.net/10986/40701 License: CC BY 3.0 IGO." As such, the data, including the data from the experiment, are now publicly available in the microdata library at World Bank Microdata library and can be found here for Ethiopia and for Uganda. The study team would like to thank the Job Group at the World Bank and Fafo Foundation for their support in implementing the survey and the proposed experiment. Anna Gasten acknowledges funding by the German Research Foundation (DFG) - project RTG 1723 in the frame of the research training group "Globalization and Development". We also thank Laura Barros, Paul Glewwe, Keisaku Higashida, Marcela Ibañez, Tewodros Kebede, Jason Kerwin, Krisztina Kis-Katos, Friederike Lenel, Rama Dasi Mariani, Kirsten Schuettler, Svein Erik Stave, and Jan von der Goltz for offering feedback on the study design. We are additionally grateful for comments received at the DIW 2022 Workshop on the Integration of Refugee Families in Host Countries (Berlin, Germany), the Summer Workshop on the Economics of Inter-Group Relations and Integration (Royal Holloway, UK), the 14th International Conference on Economics of Global Interactions: New perspectives on trade, factor mobility and development (Bari, Italy), the 17th AFD-World Bank International Conference on migration and development (Bologna, Italy), the 2023 Nordic Conference in Development Economics (Gothenburg, Sweden), the 2023 European Association of Labour Economics Conference (Prague, Czech Republic), the 7th International Conference "Understanding Forced and Voluntary Migration" (Lille, France), the 2023 German Development Economics Conference (Dresden, Germany), the 2023 International Conference on Development Economics (Paris, France), and the Joint Data Center's 2024 Conference on Forced Displacement (Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire).

[†]FEB LICOS, KU Leuven, Belgium. Email: julie.bousquet@kuleuven.be.

[‡]University of Göttingen, Germany. Email: anna.gasten@uni-goettingen.de

[§]Institute of Development Policy (IOB), University of Antwerp, Belgium. Email: MarkMarvin.Kadigo@uantwerpen.be

[¶]Fonds de la Recherche Scientifique – FNRS, LIDAM/IRES-UC Louvain, Lancaster University Management School, Lancaster, LA1 4YX, UK. Email: jean-francois.maystadt@uclouvain.be

[‖]University of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. Email: csalemi@uvic.ca

Contents

A Appendix

A.1 Deviation from the Pre-Analysis Plan (PAP)

Tables A1 and A2 provide a summary of deviations from the PAP, encompassing both supplementary analyses that were not pre-registered and adjustments or omissions of exclusions initially specified in the study. These deviations are not motivated by the magnitude or statistical significance of the estimated coefficients, but by methodological improvements, conceptual clarifications or unexpected practical challenges.

Table A1: Deviation from the PAP

Exclusions	**Explanation**
The term "discrimination"	In the PAP, particularly when formulating our hypotheses for testing, we use the term "discrimination." For example, we state, "*H3: Discrimination against members of the out-group is more pronounced when preconceived notions of labor market competition are strong*". We have replaced this term with "prejudice," which conveys self-reported attitudes, as the term "discrimination" implies that we would be evaluating revealed preferences through observed actions or measuring psychometrics, which is not within the scope of our study.
Target sample size	We aimed to have a total sample of 8,000 households, comprising 4,000 host community members (nationals) and 4,000 refugees, both employed and unemployed, distributed between rural and urban areas in Uganda and Ethiopia. Due to difficulties to locate refugee households (especially in urban areas), low response rates and logistical and budget constraints, the target sample size could not be reached for all sub-groups (see Table A3). Further reduction occurred during the third sampling stage, where individuals were randomly selected to participate in the experiment, limited by age constraints (only respondents of working age were included). As outlined in Section A.2 above, this adjustment in sample size did not impact the implementation of our experiment because randomization was carried out at the individual level. For some heterogeneous analyses for the group of refugees, smaller sample size is however limiting statistical power of our analysis.

Continued on next page

Exclusions	Explanation
Reporting the ***H1*** & ***H2*** regression coefficients	According to the PAP, we are testing 3 hypotheses; ***H1***, ***H2*** & ***H3*** with the following regression. $$y_i = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 OutGroup_i + \alpha_2 SameOcc_i + \alpha_3(OutGroup_i * SameOcc_i) + X_i'\gamma + u_i \quad \text{(A1)}$$ The answer to Hypothesis ***H3*** is derived from α_3 in our long model (1). However, ***H1*** & ***H2*** could in principle be answered with a "short model", which involves regressing the dependent variable on two separate dummies for both treatments. The partial effects of this fully saturated long model are equivalent to the coefficients of the short model, so we refrain from reporting separate regressions. On the one hand, α_1 represents the coefficient of prejudice for those who see the vignette of an out-group but with different occupation and α_2 represents the coefficient of prejudice for those who see the vignette of a character with same occupation but belonging to the in-group. On the other hand, *H1* represents the coefficient of prejudice for those who see the vignette of an out-group irrespective of the occupation characteristic and *H2* represents the coefficient of prejudice for those who see the vignette of a character with same occupation irrespective of belonging to the out-group or in-group. When providing answers to our hypotheses (1 & 2), we always interpret the H coefficients together with the underlying α coefficients. Contrary to the PAP, we do not only report our H coefficients, because from a political perspective, we would not have a similar distribution in the general household sample as in the experimental sample. Therefore, the underlying α coefficients are what are truly important. Hence, we present the α coefficients in the figures within the main text and infer all estimates for the three hypotheses from the long model, reporting marginal effects as *H1* & *H2* coefficients in the Tables A11 and A16 in Annex A.6.
Heterogeneity by key occupational characteristics	We intended to examine the relative effect of being categorized by occupation, for instance as either employers, own account workers, or wage workers, on attitudes. Whilst the analysis, split between self-employed workers and wage workers (available upon request) leads to some new results on the group of refugees, the sample distribution does not offer enough variation or large enough sample size to avoid significant concerns with statistical power.

Continued on next page

Exclusions	Explanation
Analysis on the entire outgroup	In the PAP, we planned to examine whether our treatment had an impact on prejudice towards a generalized out-group, independently of the fictitious character. We thus included a set of questions measuring private and work-related prejudice that was not framed for Aida/ Robert, but for the out-group overall. These questions were administered in the module following the experiment and relate to both nationals and refugees (i.e., a refugee would answer a question related to a host, and vice versa). We do not observe any differences in results between Panel A and B, both at the aggregated and individual-variable levels. However, we initially intended to mirror our experimental setting, i.e., let all individuals also answer the questions on the "in group". Because of field constraints, we couldn't implement this setup during our data collection. We henceforth decided not to show the analysis in the paper, albeit the partial results are available upon request.
Marital status as covariate	We exclude marital status from the list of covariates in the regressions. As this variable contains missing observations, including it as a control variable in the regressions reduces the final sample size by 11 observations. This drop in sample count is only observed with the inclusion of marital status as a covariate and not with the other covariates. None-the-less, excluding marital status as a control does not bias our coefficients of interest α_1, α_2 and α_3 since we find, from the balance tests, that the treatment group assignment is also balanced along the respondents' marital status.

Table A2: Addition to the PAP

Additional Analysis	**Explanation**
Heterogenous analyses by locality, gender, education level, & ethno-linguistic proximity.	Anticipating statistical power constraints, the initial plan was to divide the analysis by country to explore the potential impact of differing refugee management approaches in Ethiopia and Uganda. However, we discovered that it would be meaningful to further conduct a split analysis by locality. This is because of the substantial differences in local characteristics, particularly the possible contextual differences between the urban and rural settings, which could interact in various ways with the policy environments in the countries and result in varying responses among the study participants. Additionally, since we assigned respondents to view a vignette narrative featuring a character of the same gender, we did not consider gender as a treatment variable. This approach allows us to investigate whether the attitudes of males are comparable to those of females within this context. Similarly, we applied this approach to assess the relative importance of education level, which can serve as a proxy for skill level and, consequently, predisposition to certain types of jobs in the market. Furthermore, in alignment with the contact theory, where we examine the significance of having friends from the out-group, we also explore the relevance of ethno-linguistic proximity, which may serve as a mediating variable.

A.2 Sampling and data collection

Our study uses a vignette experiment that was embedded in a large survey on refugee-host interactions and labor market integration, designed and commissioned by the World Bank.[1] FAFO, an implementation partner, collected survey responses from late January 2022 to late July 2022 in Uganda and Ethiopia.

The data from the larger survey is described in World Bank (2023). Samples were drawn to represent the refugee population and host populations in two urban and two rural settings. In Ethiopia, data was collected from the city of Addis Ababa as the urban location with 150 EAs. Jijiga (45 EAs) and Kebribeyah, including Kebribeyah refugee settlement, (35 EAs) serve as the rural locations.

The sampling exercise relied on pre-existing sampling frames containing the primary sampling units (PSUs), which correspond to enumeration areas (EAs). In Ethiopia, the Central Statistical Agency provided a sampling frame that was originally intended for use in a planned (but never implemented) 2020 Census. In Uganda, the sampling frame was

[1] The survey aims at gathering comparable data in four refugee-hosting localities in Uganda and Ethiopia. It collects household-level information on socio-demographic characteristics as well as individual data on labor market characteristics, refugee-host interactions and social networks for one randomly selected individual (RSI) per household. The survey experiment described here is part of the RSI questionnaire.

provided by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics (UBOS). The sampling procedure incorporated modifications to capture sufficient sample sizes for both refugees and hosts.

In the first round of EA selection, the team used a Probability Proportionate to Size (PPS) approach to select the first set of EAs. This first set of EAs contains both host and refugee households. To obtain sufficient numbers of refugee households in the final sample, the study team conducted a second sampling round that selected additional EAs bordering those chosen in the first round of EA selection. For Addis Ababa, where refugee households are difficult to capture using conventional sampling methods, the team used an Adaptive Cluster Sampling strategy (ACS) in which refugee households were identified for sampling.

Following a complete listing of households, the samples were drawn to represent the population of refugees and host populations in two urban and two rural settings. In Ethiopia, data was collected from the city of Addis Ababa as the urban location with 150 AEEs. Jijiga (45 EAs) and Kebribeyah, including Kebribeyah refugee settlement, (35 EAs) serve as the rural locations.[2] In Uganda, the rural EAs fall in the Isingiro district (75 EAs) and the Nakivale refugee settlement (40 EAs).[3] For urban Uganda, the EAs fall in the Kampala district with 150 EAs.[4]

In the second stage of the sampling, households were then sampled from the EAs. In line with the objective of the PAP (1,200 host households and 1,200 refugee households in each of the four sites), the survey teams managed to get in contact with a total of 9,047 households (hosts and refugees together). A third sampling stage was performed to obtain a randomly selected individual (RSI); only one individual per household, of working age (18 – 65 years) irrespective of labor force participation status (employed, unemployed or out of the labor force). Field constraints limited our sample sizes in some locations. In 14.6% of the 9,047 households, no individual could be interviewed either because of non-eligibility or refusal to participate. The largest and lowest coverage in the RSI are to be found in Nakivale for refugees (94%) and in Kampala among the hosts (74%). Our experimental sample is further limited to respondents who are either employed or unemployed but actively seeking work within the past month. Individuals not participating in the labor force were excluded from the experiment, as outlined in the PAP. Our final sample consists of 4,716 individual respondents: 1,749 refugees and 2,967 hosts. Table A3 reports sample counts by location and group. This change in sample size does not affect the rollout of our experiment, since the randomization was performed independently of group size, sampling stratification and at the individual level.

[2]In the rest of the manuscript, we mention Jijiga/Kebribeyah as the aggregation between Jijiga and Kebribeyah, both considered rural areas.

[3]In the rest of the manuscript, we mention Isingiro/Nakivale as the term that encompasses both the town of Isingiro and the Nakivale settlement, both considered rural areas.

[4]Our results are representative of host and refugee outlooks in the four study sites examined. The findings may not be externally valid to other refugee-hosting countries or contexts. Throughout, we discuss the exact findings in relation to the experiment, and additional discussion of what these results may convey (in terms of respondent's behaviors) are primarily speculative.

Table A3: Study sample

Country	Residence	Location	Enumeration areas	N
Uganda	Rural	Isingiro District	Isingiro/Nakivale: 94	858 hosts, 705 refugees
Uganda	Urban	Kampala District	Kampala: 195	691 hosts, 545 refugees
Ethiopia	Rural	Somali region	Jijiga/Kebribeyah: 31	570 hosts, 301 refugees
Ethiopia	Urban	Addis Ababa	Addis Ababa: 262	848 hosts, 198 refugees

While the sample was drawn to be representative of the local population, the lower response rate raises the question of whether there is potential selection bias among our respondents. Table A4 demonstrates that the descriptive statistics for HHR-LMS households are largely comparable to those of households interviewed in the same four sub-regions by the nationally representative LSMS surveys (the 2021/2022 Socio-Economic Panel Survey for Ethiopia (ESPS) and the 2019/2020 Uganda National Panel Survey (UNPS)). Despite slight differences in both time (as our data was collected in 2022, compared to the 2019/2020 UNPS and 2021/2022 ESPS) and space (as the LSMS analysis is limited to the sub-regions in which our study sites are located), we still find that the descriptive statistics are largely comparable.

Table A4: Summary Statistics: HHR-LMS vs LSMS

Panel A: Ethiopia	**HHR-LMS**			**LSMS**		
	Mean	**SD**	**Obs**	**Mean**	**SD**	**Obs**
Male	0.52	0.50	14,18	0.51	0.50	3,504
Age of the respondent	32.81	9.98	1,418	35.26	11.94	3,504
Received at least primary education	0.63	0.48	1,418	0.47	0.50	3,080
Household Size	5.10	2.59	1,418	5.61	2.50	1,147
Panel B: Uganda	**HHR-LMS**			**LSMS**		
Male	0.40	0.49	1,549	0.50	0.50	1,037
Age of the respondent	34.33	11.20	1,549	34.25	12.37	1,037
Received at least primary education	0.66	0.47	1,549	0.72	0.45	1,025
Household Size	4.57	2.48	1,549	4.47	2.57	435

Notes: We use sampling weights for all datasets. HHR-LMS descriptive statistics are based on the Randomly Selected Individual (RSI) sample used for the analysis in this paper. LSMS data stems from the "Socio-Economic Panel Survey 2021–2022" for Ethiopia and the "Uganda National Panel Survey 2019–2020" for Uganda. For both countries, the LSMS data is restricted to the regions included in this analysis: Addis Ababa and the Somali region for Ethiopia, and Kampala and Ankole for Uganda. Additionally, the LSMS analysis is limited to individuals in the labor force (aged 18–65 years), consistent with the RSI sample of the HHR-LMS survey.

A.3 Additional information on the experiment

We implement the survey experiment with all respondents who are currently employed or unemployed: respondents out of the labor force are excluded from the experiment.

For each respondent, we randomize the vignette character's citizenship status as being a national or a refugee, meaning that refugee and host respondents alike are randomly exposed to a story about an in-group or out-group member. We use information from the labor module to determine the respondent's primary occupation, and we randomly set the vignette character's occupation to be the same as or different than the respondent's. When interviewing respondents who are unemployed at the time of the interview, we inquire about their preferred occupation in the labor module and incorporate this desired occupation within the vignette. We designed the randomization such that when matching to vignette characters with a different occupation. The vignette character's occupation is at the same skill level as the respondent. For example, a respondent who is a farmer may be matched with a respondent who is a waiter or cleaner.The rationale for restricting the definition of a different occupation within the same skill set was to avoid priming differences in social class or status of the different occupation.

We use information from the labor module to determine the respondent's primary occupation, and we randomly set the vignette character's occupation to be the same as or different than the respondent's. The tablet used to collect responses was programmed to auto-fill the occupation of the vignette character based on the respondent's answers in the labor module, which took place before the experiment in the questionnaire. The enumerators were responsible for ensuring that the survey program correctly auto-filled the occupation of the fictitious individual within the narrative.

If the respondent reported that they were currently working, the enumerator had to shorten the string occupation indicated in the survey to a shorter string of 1-2 words for example; "Primary school teacher for Maths" to "Teacher". Further, the enumerator asked whether the reported occupation requires at least a secondary level of schooling and recorded "yes" or "no".

If the respondent reported that they were currently not employed, but were actively searching for a job, the enumerator asked what occupation the respondent is searching for. They then had to shorten the string occupation indicated in the survey and determine whether the reported occupation would require at least a secondary level of schooling or not, as well. These steps are crucial for the auto-filling of the fictitious individual's occupation in the narrative.

Table A5 lists the occupations we used when matching respondents to occupations different than their own by skill level.[5]

[5]Enumerators are required to confirm that the occupation which is randomly selected for the narrative is noticeably different from the one provided by the respondent. If the chosen occupation is too similar, the random draw of occupations from Table A5 is repeated until a sufficiently distinct occupation is found.

Table A5: A draw of occupations disaggregated by skill level

List A: Below secondary schooling	List B: Above secondary schooling
Farmer	Lawyer
Shopkeeper	Doctor
Waiter	Teacher
Cleaner	Banker
Security officer	Architect

We carefully chose the names given to the fictitious character in the vignette to ensure the names were neutral with respect to ethnic and religious connotations. The enumerators read out the narrative to the respondents, and enumerators were trained to carefully and vividly administer the experiment without compromising its integrity by strictly adhering to the prescribed language.

Given the exogenous variation in the fictitious character's citizenship and occupation, the narrative vignette resulted in the treatment arm matrix shown in Table A6. For refugees and hosts alike, the respondents assigned to treatment arm T1 received a narrative about an in-group member working in the same occupation as theirs. Those assigned to T2 listened to a narrative about an in-group member working in an occupation different from theirs. Respondents in the treatment arm T3 received a narrative about an outgroup member working in the same occupation as theirs, while the treatment group T4 was exposed to a narrative about an outgroup member in a different occupation. Due to random assignment with equal probabilities, the sample groups for the four treatment arms are roughly the same size. Note that the randomization was performed at the individual level before the start of the experimental module. That way, each individual is randomly allocated to one of the following treatment arms, providing balance and our identification strategy.

Table A6: Treatment arm matrix

	Same occupation	Different occupation
In-group	T1	T2
Out-group	T3	T4

The survey was programmed to automatically fill the fictitious individual's occupation in the narrative with the shortened string that is the same occupation as the respondent if the respondent being interviewed was assigned to the T1 and T3 treatment arms. If the respondent being interviewed was assigned to the T2 and T4 treatment arms, the narrative that was read to them had the auto-filled fictitious individual's occupation, which was different from the respondent's occupation. However, the skill level is expected to match the schooling level of the respondent, to avoid hierarchical judgments about the fictitious individual. Hence, the auto-filled occupation was randomly drawn from a list of occupations in the same skill level as the occupation of the respondent or the occupation which the respondent is searching for.

To verify that the occupation to be autofilled in the narrative was indeed different from the respondent's occupation, the enumerator was shown both the respondent's own occupation and the one randomly drawn by the computer from the above list. They then confirmed that the two occupations were indeed different before the narrative was presented with the randomly drawn occupation string being used as the occupation of the fictitious individual in the narrative.

A.4 Measuring attitudes using the Anderson index

The following list contains all of the questions that the respondent answered immediately after being read the vignette.

1. I would feel comfortable when interacting with Aida/Robert.
2. I would get along with Aida/Robert.
3. I am comfortable if someone like Aida/Robert lives close to me.
4. I am comfortable if someone like Aida/Robert marries a family member.
5. Someone like Aida/Robert can work with me.
6. Someone like Aida/Robert can become my supervisor.

Possible responses to the questions are organized along a five-point Likert scale (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree). The original questions (5-point Likert scales) are then entered into an index as continuous variables with values ranging from 1 to 5. Higher values indicate more negative views toward the fictitious character.

Following the Anderson approach (Anderson, 2008), we use this data to generate a single, continuous indicator of respondent attitudes towards the vignette character, aggregated across all three dimensions of interactions. As in the single measures, higher index values reflect more negative attitudes. The Anderson method of index construction uses the generalized least-squares weighting method. A standardized inverse-covariance weighted average is generated for each observation from the individual indicators/variables. According to Muller (1989) and cited in Schwab et al. (2020), a change of 0.2 standard deviation is considered a small effect size, a change of 0.5 standard deviation represents a medium effect size, and a change of 0.9 standard deviation indicates a large effect size.

We construct our attitudes index following methods described in Anderson (2008). We construct the prejudice index using the *swindex* command in Stata (Schwab et al., 2021). As described by Schwab et al. (2020), the process involves normalizing each indicator by demeaning it (subtracting the mean of the indicator in the reference group) and then dividing each indicator by the reference group's standard deviation. Then, we construct weights for each of the six indicators using the inverse of the covariance matrix of the normalized indicators. By employing this approach, the weighting of highly correlated

indicators in the resulting index is reduced, while giving more prominence to uncorrelated or less correlated indicators. This enhances the efficiency of the index. The weight refers to the relative importance that an indicator brings to the index. A less or uncorrelated indicator essentially introduces new information not provided by the other indicators to the index, thus receiving more weight. Because we normalize the indicators and rescale the index based on the full sample, it becomes normally distributed with mean zero and standard deviation one, and thus will have an "effect size" interpretation.

A.5 Additional descriptive statistics

In this section, we present a set of balance tables. Given our confidence in the effectiveness of our randomization strategy, we do not expect to observe significant imbalances in characteristics between groups, as the population distributions should not differ significantly. Therefore, we provide simple t-test comparisons of means between groups. We observe a few characteristics with significant differences, but they represent only a small fraction (9 out of 100). Additionally, we conducted Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests for equality in distribution.[6] A significant p-value in these tests would suggest significant differences in the distribution of individual characteristics between groups. However, we find only a few variables that exhibit differences between the groups (age, for instance). Therefore, we are confident that our groups are indeed balanced across key demographic characteristics, and we can draw balanced conclusions from our results.

[6]Not shown. Available on request

Table A7: Balance Tables

Variable	(T1) Mean	(T2) Mean	(T3) Mean	(T4) Mean	(T1)-(T2) Diff.	(T1)-(T3) Diff.	(T1)-(T4) Diff.	(T2)-(T3) Diff.	(T2)-(T4) Diff.	(T3)-(T4) Diff.
Panel A: Pooled Sample										
Country is Ethiopia	0.39	0.43	0.39	0.42	-0.05	-0.00	-0.03	0.05	0.02	-0.03
Urban	0.58	0.63	0.63	0.61	-0.05	-0.04*	-0.03	0.01	0.02	0.02
Age	33.60	32.95	32.90	32.85	0.65	0.70	0.75	0.05	0.10	0.05
Male	0.47	0.46	0.45	0.48	0.02	0.02	-0.01	0.00	-0.02	-0.03
At least primary	0.61	0.61	0.62	0.59	0.01	-0.00	0.03	-0.01	0.02	0.03
Household Size	5.16	5.09	5.09	5.16	0.07	0.07	-0.00	-0.00	-0.08	-0.07
Employed	0.77	0.75	0.79	0.78	0.01	-0.02	-0.01	-0.03	-0.03	0.01
Panel B: Hosts										
Country is Ethiopia	0.46	0.49	0.46	0.47	-0.04	-0.01	-0.01	0.03	0.02	-0.01
Urban	0.69	0.73	0.73	0.73	-0.05*	-0.05*	-0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00
Age	34.27	32.67	33.30	34.29	1.60**	0.97	-0.01	-0.63	-1.62***	-0.99
Male	0.50	0.46	0.42	0.46	0.04	0.09***	0.05	0.04	0.01	-0.04
At least primary	0.63	0.66	0.65	0.61	-0.02	-0.02	0.02	0.00	0.05	0.04
Household Size	4.94	4.85	4.71	4.90	0.10	0.24	0.05	0.14	-0.05	-0.19
Employed	0.86	0.85	0.86	0.86	0.01	0.01	0.00	-0.01	-0.01	-0.01
Panel C: Refugees										
Country is Ethiopia	0.26	0.35	0.26	0.34	-0.10	-0.00	-0.08	0.10	0.01	-0.08
Urban	0.40	0.49	0.44	0.43	-0.09	-0.04	-0.03	0.05	0.06	0.01
Age	32.39	33.34	32.20	30.72	-0.95	0.19	1.66**	1.14	2.62	1.48
Male	0.42	0.45	0.51	0.52	-0.03	-0.09*	-0.10*	-0.06	-0.07	-0.01
At least primary	0.57	0.54	0.55	0.55	0.04	0.02	0.03	-0.01	-0.01	0.00
Household Size	5.54	5.42	5.75	5.56	0.12	-0.20	-0.01	-0.33	-0.14	0.19
Employed	0.59	0.62	0.66	0.66	-0.03	-0.08	-0.07	-0.04	-0.04	0.00

Note: The Diff columns are the difference-in-means of treatment status on the demographic variables. Treatment arms T1, T2, T3 & T4 result from the treatment matrix shown in Table A6. Stars indicate whether this difference is significant. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. The analysis uses weighted data and relies on cluster-robust standard errors.

Table A8: Summary Statistics in Uganda

	HOSTS			**REFUGEES**		
	Mean	SD	Obs	Mean	SD	Obs
Country is Ethiopia	0.00	0.00	1549	0.00	0.00	1250
Urban	0.57	0.50	1549	0.44	0.50	1250
Male	0.40	0.49	1549	0.48	0.50	1250
Age of the respondent	34.33	11.20	1549	33.02	11.18	1250
Household Size	4.57	2.48	1549	5.43	2.82	1250
Received at least primary education Level	0.66	0.47	1549	0.52	0.50	1250
Anderson Index: Prejudice by country; Social, private and work	0.02	0.98	1549	0.05	1.10	1250
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Social	0.01	0.99	1549	-0.00	1.07	1250
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Private	0.01	0.97	1549	0.05	1.06	1250
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Work	0.01	0.98	1549	0.04	1.09	1250
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Labor market competition	0.01	0.97	1549	-0.02	1.00	1250
Treatment group assignment: Same occupation	0.52	0.50	1549	0.49	0.50	1250
Treatment group assignment: Out-group	0.50	0.50	1549	0.50	0.50	1250

Note: We use sampling weights.

Table A9: Summary Statistics in Ethiopia

	HOSTS			REFUGEES		
	Mean	SD	Obs	Mean	SD	Obs
Country is Ethiopia	1.00	0.00	1418	1.00	0.00	499
Urban	0.89	0.31	1418	0.40	0.49	499
Male	0.52	0.50	1418	0.49	0.50	499
Age of the respondent	32.81	9.98	1418	30.01	9.57	499
Household size	5.10	2.59	1418	6.15	3.63	499
Received at least primary education Level	0.63	0.48	1418	0.59	0.49	499
Anderson Index: Prejudice by country; Social, private and work	0.02	1.03	1418	-0.03	1.02	499
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Social	0.02	1.02	1418	-0.09	1.12	499
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Private	0.02	1.03	1418	0.05	0.99	499
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Work	0.01	1.02	1418	-0.18	1.04	499
Anderson Index: Prejudice by refugee group and country; Labor market competition	0.03	0.95	1418	-0.24	1.13	499
Treatment group assignment: Same occupation	0.50	0.50	1418	0.38	0.49	499
Treatment group assignment: Out-group	0.50	0.50	1418	0.48	0.50	499

Note: We use sampling weights.

A.6 Results in tables

A.6.1 Index of labor market competition

Table A10: Labor Market Competition Index

	(1)		(2)	
TREATMENT VARIABLE	***HOSTS***		***REFUGEES***	
PANEL A: Index of Labor Market Competition				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.00	(0.06)	0.20	(0.16)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	0.16**	(0.06)	0.54***	(0.16)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	-0.04	(0.08)	-0.19	(0.18)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.02	(0.04)	0.12	(0.10)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	0.14***	(0.04)	0.45***	(0.10)
N	2967		1749	
Mean	0.02		-0.07	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment status, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. We report the Anderson (2008) *sharpened False Discovery Rate (FDR) q-values*, applied over each group individually.

A.6.2 Table of Main results

Table A11: Prejudice Index

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) ***HOSTS***		(2) ***REFUGEES***	
PANEL A: Prejudice Index				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.03	(0.06)	-0.09	(0.13)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.18***	(0.06)	0.01	(0.14)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.26***	(0.08)	-0.05	(0.17)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.16***	(0.04)	-0.12	(0.08)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.05	(0.04)	-0.02	(0.09)
N	2967		1749	
Mean	0.02		0.02	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. We report the Anderson (2008) *sharpened False Discovery Rate (FDR) q-values*, applied over each group individually. An explanation of the coefficients' interpretation can be found in Equation 1 in the main text.

A.7 Robustness of main results

A.7.1 Main results by individual indicators

Table A12: Main Results by Individual Indicators

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) ***HOSTS***		(2) ***REFUGEES***	
PANEL A: Prejudice Index on Social Interactions - OLS and Margins				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.01	(0.06)	-0.02	(0.15)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.13**	(0.06)	0.01	(0.15)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.24**	(0.09)	-0.16	(0.18)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.11**	(0.04)	-0.09	(0.09)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.01	(0.04)	-0.07	(0.10)
N	2967		1749	
Mean	0.01		-0.03	
PANEL B: Prejudice Index on Private Interactions - OLS and Margins				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.06	(0.06)	-0.19	(0.11)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.19***	(0.06)	0.01	(0.13)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.25***	(0.08)	0.07	(0.16)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.19***	(0.05)	-0.15	(0.08)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.07*	(0.04)	0.04	(0.08)
N	2967		1749	
Mean	0.01		0.05	
PANEL C: Prejudice Index on Work Interactions - OLS and Margins				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.01	(0.06)	0.07	(0.13)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.13	(0.06)	0.02	(0.14)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.16	(0.08)	-0.13	(0.17)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.08	(0.04)	0.01	(0.08)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.06	(0.04)	-0.05	(0.10)
N	2967		1749	
Mean	0.01		-0.02	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment and marital status, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. An explanation of the coefficients' interpretation can be found in Equation 1 in the main text.

A.7.2 Prejudice indicator: Dummy outcome

Table A13: Prejudice Indicator: Dummy Outcome

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) ***HOSTS***		(2) ***REFUGEES***	
PANEL A: Prejudice Indicator (Dummy)				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.02	(0.03)	-0.02	(0.06)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.09***	(0.03)	0.03	(0.07)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.13***	(0.04)	-0.06	(0.07)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.08***	(0.02)	-0.05	(0.04)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.02	(0.02)	0.00	(0.04)
N	2967		1749	
Mean	0.42		0.43	

Weighted regressions. The dependent variable is transformed to a "prejudice indicator" which takes value 1 if the respondent strongly disagrees, disagrees, or neither agrees nor disagrees with the positively framed questions concerning inter-group contact, and takes value 0 otherwise. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment and marital status, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. An explanation of the coefficients' interpretation can be found in Equation 1 in the main text.

A.7.3 Clustered and non-clustered SEs

Table A14: Clustered and Non-Clustered SEs on Main Results

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) ***HOSTS***		(2) ***REFUGEES***	
PANEL A: Prejudice Index				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.03	(0.06) [0.05]	-0.09	(0.13) [0.07]
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.18***	(0.06) [0.05]	0.01	(0.14) [0.07]
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.26***	(0.08) [0.07]	-0.05	(0.17) [0.10]
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.16***	(0.04) [0.04]	-0.12	(0.08) [0.05]
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.05	(0.04) [0.04]	-0.02	(0.09) [0.05]
N	.	2967	.	1749
Mean	0.02		0.02	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index and report the Anderson (2008) *sharpened False Discovery Rate (FDR) q-values*, applied over each group individually. Clustered standard errors are shown in parentheses *()* and unclustered standard errors in brackets *[]*. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All models include the same control variables: age, gender, household size, education, employment status, country of residence, and urban/rural areas.

A.7.4 Analysis on the unemployed

The main analysis includes the entire sample of individuals who received the treatment. However, one might question the practicality of presenting narratives about "occupations" to unemployed individuals. While we carefully designed the questionnaire to include them, we acknowledge that there may be relevance issues. Additionally, when we asked unemployed individuals about their ideal job, some may have answered with a broad response like "any job." Consequently, for individuals in the treatment group who received the "same occupation" vignette, they would have encountered a fictitious character with job characteristics that resembled "any job," potentially diminishing the relevance of the vignette and, consequently, our intended treatment. As a result, we decided to conduct

robustness analyses on (1) a subset of employed individuals only and (2) when filtering the unemployed respondents' "ideal occupations" to distinguish between realistic and relevant items versus irrelevant ones. The results are presented in the table below.

For hosts (1), panels B and C yield results that are quite similar to the baseline results in Panel A. This finding reassures us that the treatment of the unemployed population does not significantly affect the results. In the case of refugees, we do observe some differential impact, particularly in panel B, where we find a significant decrease in prejudice against outgroup members who have the same occupation. This aligns with our earlier discussion that refugees either exhibit neutrality or experience a decrease in prejudice (as discussed in Table A16). Nonetheless, we continue to focus on the results of the entire sample due to considerations of sample size and statistical power, as agreed upon in the PAP. In the future, more attention should be given to addressing the treatment of unemployed individuals in survey designs.

Table A15: Prejudice Index, over different sample definition

	(1)		(2)	
TREATMENT VARIABLE	***HOSTS***		***REFUGEES***	
PANEL A: Full Sample of Employed and Unemployed				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.03	(0.06)	-0.09	(0.13)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.18***	(0.06)	0.01	(0.14)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.26***	(0.08)	-0.05	(0.17)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.16***	(0.04)	-0.12	(0.08)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.05	(0.04)	-0.02	(0.09)
N	2967		1749	
Mean	0.02		0.02	
PANEL B: SubSet of Cleaned Unemployed Occupations				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.03	(0.07)	-0.27**	(0.12)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.19***	(0.06)	-0.14	(0.12)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.26***	(0.08)	0.13	(0.15)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.16***	(0.04)	-0.21**	(0.08)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.05	(0.04)	-0.07	(0.09)
N	2918		1674	
Mean	0.02		0.05	
PANEL C: Employed Only				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.04	(0.07)	-0.19*	(0.11)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.17**	(0.07)	-0.04	(0.11)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.27***	(0.09)	0.20	(0.17)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.18***	(0.05)	-0.10	(0.08)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.03	(0.05)	0.06	(0.09)
N	2551		1179	
Mean	0.02		0.00	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment and marital status, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. An explanation of the coefficients' interpretation can be found in Equation 1 in the main text. Panel A shows the baseline results as in Table A11.

A.8 Additional tables

Table A16: Prejudice Index, by Locality

	(1)		(2)	
TREATMENT VARIABLE	***HOSTS***		***REFUGEES***	
PANEL A.1: Addis Ababa				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.23*	(0.12)	0.24	(0.23)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.35***	(0.11)	-0.37	(0.33)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.48***	(0.17)	0.18	(0.36)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.00	(0.08)	0.30	(0.20)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.11	(0.08)	-0.28	(0.22)
N	848		198	
Mean	0.05		-0.14	
PANEL A.2: Jijiga/Kebribeyah				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.18	(0.13)	-0.35	(0.28)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.11	(0.13)	0.04	(0.19)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	-0.05	(0.19)	-0.29	(0.23)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.15*	(0.09)	-0.47*	(0.24)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.14	(0.10)	-0.10	(0.17)
N	570		301	
Mean	-0.04		-0.01	
PANEL A.3: Kampala				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.01	(0.13)	-0.16	(0.17)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.11	(0.12)	0.01	(0.21)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.08	(0.18)	0.30	(0.31)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.05	(0.09)	-0.01	(0.13)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.07	(0.10)	0.15	(0.18)
N	691		545	
Mean	0.03		0.13	
PANEL A.4: Isingiro/Nakivale				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.30***	(0.11)	-0.20	(0.13)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.02	(0.11)	-0.05	(0.13)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.26*	(0.14)	-0.08	(0.18)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.43***	(0.09)	-0.24***	(0.08)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	0.10	(0.07)	-0.09	(0.08)
N	858		705	
Mean	0.01		-0.04	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment and marital status, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. An explanation of the coefficients' interpretation can be found in Equation 1 in the main text.

Table A17: Regression Coefficient Comparisons Across Locations

Variable	**Addis Ababa**	**Jijiga/Kebribeyah**	**Kampala**	**Isingiro/Nakivale**
Panel A: Regression Coefficients (Addis Ababa as Baseline)				
α_1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.23*	0.18	0.01	0.30***
Difference of α_1 to baseline (Addis Ababa)		p=0.0202	p=0.1664	p=0.0010
α_2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.35***	-0.11	-0.11	-0.02
Difference of α_2 to baseline (Addis Ababa)		p=0.1636	p=0.1234	p=0.0309
α_3: OutGroup × Same Occupation	0.48***	-0.05	0.08	0.26*
Difference of α_3 to baseline (Addis Ababa)		p=0.0332	p=0.0991	p=0.2948
Panel B: Regression Coefficients (Isingiro as Baseline)				
α_1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.23*	0.18	0.01	0.30***
Difference of α_1 to baseline (Isingiro)	p=0.0010	p=0.4880	p=0.0940	
α_2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.35***	-0.11	-0.11	-0.02
Difference of α_2 to baseline (Isingiro)	p=0.0309	p=0.5763	p=0.5637	
α_3: OutGroup × Same Occupation	0.48***	-0.05	0.08	0.26*
Difference of α_3 to baseline (Isingiro)	p=0.2948	p=0.1812	p=0.4237	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance stars refer to the difference of coefficients from zero: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. P-values indicate the difference in coefficients between each location and Addis Ababa (Panel A) or Isingiro (Panel B). Main controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. An explanation of the coefficients' interpretation can be found in Equation 1 in the main text.

Table A18: Prejudice Index, by Gender and Education Level

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) *HOSTS*		(2) *REFUGEES*	
PANEL A: GENDER				
PANEL A.1: Women				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.08	(0.08)	-0.04	(0.14)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.16*	(0.08)	0.07	(0.15)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.24*	(0.12)	-0.09	(0.19)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.20***	(0.06)	-0.08	(0.11)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.04	(0.06)	0.03	(0.11)
N	1626		934	
Mean	0.01		0.05	
PANEL A.2: Men				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.02	(0.09)	-0.24	(0.19)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.18**	(0.08)	-0.13	(0.19)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.28**	(0.12)	0.09	(0.26)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.12*	(0.06)	-0.20	(0.14)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.05	(0.05)	-0.08	(0.13)
N	1341		815	
Mean	0.02		0.01	
PANEL B: EDUCATION LEVEL				
PANEL B.1: Below Primary Education				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.09	(0.11)	-0.33***	(0.11)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.20*	(0.11)	-0.19	(0.13)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.25	(0.15)	0.01	(0.14)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.21***	(0.07)	-0.33***	(0.10)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.07	(0.07)	-0.19**	(0.09)
N	1027		831	
Mean	-0.00		0.01	
PANEL B.2: At Least Primary Education				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.02	(0.08)	0.07	(0.16)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.14**	(0.07)	0.12	(0.16)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.23**	(0.10)	-0.07	(0.23)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.14**	(0.05)	0.03	(0.11)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.03	(0.05)	0.08	(0.13)
N	1929		911	
Mean	0.02		0.03	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. All models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employments, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. An explanation of the coefficients' interpretation can be found in Equation 1 in the main text.

Table A19: Prejudice Index, by industry-location groups of high/ low competition

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) *HOSTS*		(2) *REFUGEES*	
Working hours beyond legal threshold				
PANEL A.1: Low share over-worked				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.14*	(0.08)	-0.14	(0.11)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.08	(0.08)	-0.10	(0.12)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.16	(0.11)	0.00	(0.15)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.21***	(0.06)	-0.13	(0.10)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.01	(0.06)	-0.10	(0.09)
N	1644		970	
Mean	0.02		0.01	
PANEL A.2: High share over-worked				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.12	(0.10)	-0.07	(0.18)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.31***	(0.08)	0.10	(0.17)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.39***	(0.12)	-0.02	(0.27)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.08	(0.07)	-0.08	(0.13)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.11*	(0.06)	0.09	(0.14)
N	1321		779	
Mean	0.01		0.04	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. The sample is stratified according to the percentage of respondents reporting weekly working hours exceeding the legal threshold of 48 hours. Panel A.1 encompasses respondents in industry-location groups where the proportion of workers exceeding this threshold falls below the median. Panel A.2, consists of respondents employed in industry-location groups where the percentage of individuals working beyond the legal limit exceeds the median share. The median share of such workers across all industries in the four different localities stands at 56%.

Table A20: Prejudice Index, by refugee and host over-representation by industry

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) *HOSTS*		(2) *REFUGEES*	
Refugee and Host Over-Representation by Industry				
PANEL A.1: Hosts overrepresented				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.07	(0.08)	-0.12	(0.16)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.16**	(0.07)	-0.02	(0.17)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.29***	(0.10)	-0.17	(0.20)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.22***	(0.05)	-0.20**	(0.10)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.02	(0.05)	-0.11	(0.10)
N	2076		1199	
Mean	0.02		0.01	
PANEL A.2: Refugees overrepresented				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.02	(0.11)	-0.09	(0.13)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.21**	(0.10)	-0.03	(0.15)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.10	(0.15)	0.34	(0.26)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.03	(0.09)	0.06	(0.13)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.16*	(0.09)	0.15	(0.13)
N	751		515	
Mean	0.02		0.03	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. The sample is divided based on the prevalence of hosts and refugees in the respondent's industry. This categorization is determined separately for each of the four localities, taking into account the local concentration of refugees in each of the 18 industries. In Panel A.1 (hosts over-represented), we include respondents working in industries where the proportion of hosts exceeds the local average. Panel A.2 (refugees over-represented) comprises respondents in industries where the proportion of refugees surpasses the local average.

Table A21: Prejudice Index, by Degree of Contact with the out-group

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) *HOSTS*		(2) *REFUGEES*	
PANEL A: CONTACT				
PANEL A.1: No out-group friends				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.04	(0.07)	0.11	(0.16)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.19***	(0.07)	0.26	(0.17)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.31***	(0.10)	-0.41*	(0.22)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.20***	(0.05)	-0.10	(0.10)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.04	(0.05)	0.06	(0.10)
N	2227		1035	
Mean	0.02		0.00	
PANEL A.2: Some out-group friends				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.02	(0.11)	-0.37**	(0.16)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.15	(0.13)	-0.35**	(0.16)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.09	(0.15)	0.38	(0.24)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.07	(0.08)	-0.21*	(0.12)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.11	(0.08)	-0.17	(0.14)
N	740		714	
Mean	0.01		0.07	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. The 5-scale source question -*Over the course of my life, I have had many friends who are [Ugandan/Ethiopian nationals]/[Refugees]*, respectively- was transformed into a binary with the unit agreeing with the statement, and the null disagreeing or being neutral.

Table A22: Prejudice Index, by shared ethno-linguistic identity with the out-group

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) *HOSTS*		(2) *REFUGEES*	
PANEL A: OUT-GROUP LANGUAGE				
PANEL A.1: Different language (main out-group language)				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.02	(0.07)	-0.11	(0.11)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.18***	(0.07)	-0.03	(0.12)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.31***	(0.09)	0.06	(0.16)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.18***	(0.05)	-0.08	(0.07)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.03	(0.05)	-0.00	(0.09)
N	2468		1443	
Mean	0.03		0.03	
PANEL A.2: Shared language (main out-group language)				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.08	(0.14)	-0.36	(0.27)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.15	(0.15)	0.04	(0.18)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.01	(0.20)	-0.29	(0.23)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.09	(0.09)	-0.47*	(0.23)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.15	(0.11)	-0.11	(0.17)
N	499		306	
Mean	-0.05		-0.03	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * p < 0.1, ** p < 0.05, *** p < 0.01. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. The sample has been categorized into two groups for analysis. Panel A.2 includes respondents who share the primary ethno-linguistic identity of the other group, indicating a significant similarity with the main ethnic group among refugees/hosts. Conversely, Panel A.1 comprises respondents with a distinct ethno-linguistic identity compared to the other group. The criteria for this distinction are defined independently for each locality, taking into account the predominant language spoken by the out-group.

Table A23: Prejudice Index, by ethnolinguistic majorities/ minorities

TREATMENT VARIABLE	(1) *HOSTS*		(2) *REFUGEES*	
PANEL A: ETHNO-LINGUISTIC MAJORITY/ MINORITY				
PANEL A.1: Linguistic minority (own group)				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	-0.21*	(0.12)	-0.30	(0.21)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.20*	(0.11)	-0.14	(0.14)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.41**	(0.18)	0.31	(0.27)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.00	(0.09)	-0.17	(0.14)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.00	(0.09)	0.03	(0.12)
N	633		315	
Mean	0.03		0.12	
PANEL A.2: Linguistic majority (own group)				
α1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.08	(0.07)	0.03	(0.13)
α2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.17**	(0.07)	0.06	(0.14)
α3: OutGroup x Same Occupation	0.23**	(0.09)	-0.17	(0.17)
H1: OutGroup (1) vs InGroup (0)	0.20***	(0.05)	-0.05	(0.09)
H2: Same (1) vs Different (0) Occupation	-0.05	(0.05)	-0.02	(0.10)
N	2334		1434	
Mean	0.01		-0.01	

Weighted regressions. We use the Anderson (2008) index. Standard errors clustered at the PSU level. Significance levels: * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. All the models include the same control variables. Controls include age, gender, household size, education, employment, country of residence, and urban/rural areas. The sample has been categorized into two groups for analysis. Panel A.1 includes respondents whose own language belongs to the local minority (always defined WITHIN their own group of hosts/ refugees; and defined separately for each of the four localities). Panel A.2. comprises respondents from the ethno-linguistic majorities.

Table A24: Retrospective power calculations

Group	Location	Minimum Detectable Size (MDS)
Refugees	All	0.15
	Jijiga	0.36
	Addis Ababa	0.44
	Isingiro	0.24
	Kampala	0.28

We use power calculation tools from the Jameel AbdelLatif Poverty Action Lab (JPAL) to estimate the minimum detectable size (MDS) based on our data properties and regression specification. For our estimates, we set the desired power size as 80% and test for the MDS based on a 5% significance level. The table reports MDS for the α_3 coefficient. All power calculations are based on a specification with all covariates included, with α_1 and α_2 treated as covariates. Since one respondent is assigned to this treatment arm for every three assigned to an alternative treatment arm, we set the treatment/control ratio to 0.33. The table reports MDS for regressions focused on refugee respondents, given the lower sample sizes in some of these regressions. Additional power calculations are available upon request.

References

Anderson, M. L. (2008). Multiple inference and gender differences in the effects of early intervention: A reevaluation of the Abecedarian, Perry Preschool, and Early Training Projects. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 103*(484), 1481–1495.

Bousquet, J., A. Gasten, M. M. Kadigo, T. Kebede, J.-F. Maystadt, C. Salemi, and S. E. Stave (2022). Does perceived labor-market competition increase out-group discrimination between refugees and hosts? Evidence from Uganda and Ethiopia. Technical report, WB group. AEA RCT Registry. June 27. https://doi.org/10.1257/rct.7602-1.0; retrieved from https://www.socialscienceregistry.org/trials/8912.

Muller, K. (1989). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences.

Schwab, B., S. Janzen, N. P. Magnan, and W. M. Thompson (2020). Constructing a summary index using the standardized inverse-covariance weighted average of indicators. *The Stata Journal 20*(4), 952–964.

Schwab, B., S. Janzen, N. P. Magnan, and W. M. Thompson (2021, February). SWINDEX: Stata module to create a standardized weighted index of multiple indicator variables. Statistical Software Components, Boston College Department of Economics.