

Research Article

# Attitudes and prejudice towards immigration in rural and urban contexts in Spain

## Actitudes y prejuicios hacia la inmigración en contextos rurales y urbanos en España

Beatriz Sáez-Pascual: University of Burgos, Spain.

[bsp0010@alu.ubu.es](mailto:bsp0010@alu.ubu.es)

**Date of Reception:** 13/05/2024

**Acceptance Date:** 11/07/2024

**Publication Date:** 22/08/2024

### How to cite the article:

Sáez-Pascual, B. (2024). Attitudes and prejudice towards immigration in rural and urban contexts in Spain [Actitudes y prejuicios hacia la inmigración en contextos rurales y urbanos en España]. *European Public & Social Innovation Review*, 9, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.31637/epsir-2024-514>

### Abstract:

**Introduction:** For years now, Spain has been a country that receives immigration wherein different cultures coexist. The aim of this research is to examine the levels of attitudes, subtle and blatant prejudice, as well as their dimensions, from native people to immigrant people in urban and rural areas. **Methodology:** The scale adapted to the native population by Rueda and Navas is from Meertens and Pettigrew's scales of subtle and blatant prejudice and the scale of attitudes towards immigration by León, Mira & Gómez. **Results:** The results obtained from the prejudice scale ( $\alpha=.804$ ) and attitudes scale ( $\alpha=.672$ ) demonstrate an appropriate level of internal consistency. Results reveal that people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of prejudice (subtle and blatant) than people living in urban areas. **Discussion:** Furthermore, people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude) than people living in urban areas. **Conclusions:** Finally, people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of attitudes (negative social distancing attitude) than people living in urban areas. The results obtained are discussed, referring to the previous literature.

**Keywords:** subtle prejudice; blatant prejudice; attitudes; immigration; immigrants; natives; rural context; urban context.

### Resumen:

**Introducción:** Durante años, España ha sido un país receptor de inmigración, donde coexisten diferentes culturas. El objetivo de esta investigación es examinar los niveles de

actitudes, prejuicios sutiles y manifiestos, así como sus dimensiones, de personas nativas hacia personas inmigrantes en áreas urbanas y rurales. **Metodología:** Se empleó la escala adaptada a la población nativa por Rueda y Navas de la escala de prejuicio sutil y manifiesto de Meertens y Pettigrew, y, la escala de actitudes hacia la inmigración de León, Mira y Gómez. Los resultados obtenidos de la escala de prejuicio ( $\alpha = 0.804$ ) y de la escala de actitudes ( $\alpha = 0.672$ ) muestran un nivel adecuado de consistencia interna. **Resultados:** Los resultados revelan que las personas que viven en áreas rurales no muestran niveles más altos de prejuicio (sutil y manifiesto) que las personas que viven en áreas urbanas. **Discusión:** Además, las personas que viven en áreas rurales no mostraron niveles más altos de actitudes (actitud de principios de igualdad y políticas) que las personas que viven en áreas urbanas. **Conclusión:** Finalmente, las personas que viven en áreas rurales no mostraron niveles más altos de actitudes (actitud de distanciamiento social negativo) que las personas que viven en áreas urbanas. Se discuten los resultados obtenidos, haciendo referencia a la literatura previa.

**Palabras clave:** prejuicio sutil; prejuicio manifiesto; actitudes; inmigración; inmigrantes; autóctonos; entorno rural; entorno urbano.

## 1. Introduction

There is greater international migration in the world today than ever before, and this trend is expected to continue (Esses, 2021). Spain has been a country that receives immigration wherein different cultures coexist. According to the latest data from the Instituto Nacional de Estadística [INE], (2024), the foreign population living in our country at the end of 2022 was 5.542.932 people. As stated by the Observatorio Permanente de la Inmigración [OPI], (2024), the number of foreigners in Spain as of 31 December 2023 with valid residence authorization stands at 2.922.830; those with a registration certificate number 3.680.446; and those with a TIE-Withdrawal Agreement number 209.422.

It has been asserted that “immigration brings importing positive long-term impacts to local societies and economies as it contributes to the increase of the host population and improve its socio-demographic characteristics” (Liltsi et al., 2020, p. 2). In Spain, a country with an extensive agricultural output, rural racism takes on violent forms in addition to the poor living and working conditions of immigrants (Blaschke & Ruiz, 2002). One of the greatest challenges of modern societies is the integration between culturally diverse groups (Civalero et al., 2019).

Intolerance arises in areas with significantly less exposure to ethnic immigrant communities (Forrest & Dunn, 2013), but, migration flows are inevitable, and whether immigrants make significant contributions to their new societies or experience roadblocks preventing them from doing so will largely depend on how immigrants are viewed and treated by receiving communities (Esses, 2021), “with more experience with immigration and integration, there is a getting used to effect” (Lancee & Schaeffer, 2016, p. 8). Just as positive interactions may enhance attitudes toward immigrants, negative interactions, especially when linked with feelings of intergroup anxiety and threat, can heighten prejudice toward immigrants (Esses, 2021).

There are diverse attitudes, both positive and negative, towards immigration, the native population might be prejudiced towards immigrants. Native residents in less urbanized areas tend to harbor more adverse views regarding immigration and multiculturalism, in contrast to those in more urbanized areas. Previous studies show increased geographical differences between 'backwater' and 'cosmopolitan' areas over the last decade regarding attitudes towards multiculturalism and immigration (Huijsmans et al., 2021). People's

attitudes toward immigrants and immigration may also influence the qualities they think are most important for the newcomers to have (Zahl-Thanem & Haugen, 2019).

Prejudice remains an unpleasant experience in immigrants' everyday lives, especially for those of stigmatized groups (Wei et al., 2019). Ethnic prejudice relies on particular aspects of minorities, connoting them negatively and using them as legitimising beliefs for discriminatory practices (Civalero *et al.*, 2019). Allport defined prejudice as an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalizations (Eagly & Diekman, 2017). However, Allport also observed that negative evaluations do not always lead to hostile feelings; he noted that while perceptions of group-threat may prompt criticism of out-groups, this is not always the case (Rinken & Mariscal-de-Gante, 2024).

Pettigrew and Meertens differentiated between two types of prejudice: subtle and blatant. Within blatant prejudice, we find two components, Civalero et al., (2019) explain that the first is threat-rejection, which involves racist beliefs based on the genetic inferiority of the outgroup and denies the existence of discrimination against these groups. The second component involves an emotional resistance to maintaining close relationships with the outgroup. On the other hand, subtle prejudice is reflected in three more covert components. The first dimension involves the defence of traditional values of the ingroup, the exaggeration of cultural differences, and the covert denial of positive emotional responses towards the outgroup.

Such stereotypical representations not only overlook the diversity of rural areas but also ignore the opportunities that (inter)national migration brings for rural places to prosper and be economically productive (Goicolea et al., 2023). It has been suggested that the more different or unfamiliar an immigrant group's culture and norms are from those of the receiving society, the more likely it is that cultural threat will be elicited (Esses, 2021). Apart from race and ethnicity, aspects that are prone to bear on natives' stances include migration motive, legal status, value orientation, educational attainment, and occupational profile, among others (Rinken & Mariscal-de-Gante, 2024).

The demography of the rural population in the 2020 report, prepared by the General Subdirectorate of Analysis, Coordination, and Statistics of MAPA (2021), indicates that the Law 45/2007 on the Sustainable Development of Rural Areas classifies a municipality as rural if it has fewer than 30,000 inhabitants and less than 100 inhabitants per square kilometre. In 2020, 15.9% of the Spanish population was registered in rural municipalities. Rural areas represent 82.0% of the total number of municipalities and occupy 84.0% of the Spanish land area, with the employment rate in rural areas being 44.5%, lower than in cities. More than 13% of movers become concerned about immigration directly after they have moved. That is, when individuals are confronted with increasing diversity, perceived threat increases, resulting in more negative attitudes towards immigration (Lancee & Schaeffer, 2016). For immigrants, factors such as social class, ethnicity, gender, and legal status intersect to shape their position in society and influence their adaptation strategies (Horolets et al., 2019).

Spain is one of the European countries with the most extensive rural areas (Blaschke & Ruiz, 2002). Rural areas have been viewed as predominantly Caucasian landscapes where cultural diversity and even ethnicity are seldom visible (Forrest & Dunn, 2013).

Immigrants are viewed as workers for jobs undesirable to the native population due to their working conditions (Sampedro, 2022). Studies of immigration and the rural environment, such as Giannetto & Shirley van der Maarel (2024), highlight the case of a town in Sardinia,

Italy, where immigrants are taking on jobs that native residents avoid. These jobs are intensive and repetitive manual labor, often poorly paid and precarious due to their seasonal nature. This rural setting has become a home for Romanian immigrants and young people from West Africa, who are seen as the 'other' due to their skin color, languages, and Muslim religion. The relationship between the native and immigrant populations tends to be established based on principles of instrumentality and subordination. The successful integration of immigrants is crucial for rural areas grappling with population decline and labor shortages (Zahl-Thanem & Haugen, 2019).

In other countries, Zhou et al. (2024) explain that the central conflict between groups is not primarily due to differences in nationality, race, or ethnicity, as is often the case in Western countries, but rather is related to the discriminatory institution of the *hukou* system, which creates a gap between the economies and cultures of rural and urban areas. The *hukou* system is a central strategy through which the Chinese state controls mobility and citizenship. Other studies, in Sweden, such as Arora-Jonsson (2017) point out that municipal officers in rural areas believed that immigrants should engage in agriculture “since they have so much to contribute to vegetable cultivation that the Swedes have forgotten”. However, none of the immigrants had the necessary knowledge for farming under Swedish conditions and did not consider it a realistic option.

New configurations of migration into rural areas have been established. Blaschke & Ruiz (2002) point out that migrants are recruited by agencies to immigrate as labour to specific places (...) for example, Maghreb and Polish workers are found in Andalusia and throughout Europe; there are also foreign seasonal workers working in the wine harvest. Inhabitants of less-urbanised areas (...) may suffer the negative consequences, such as the relocation of manufacturing jobs abroad and low-skilled migrants vying for the remaining low-skilled jobs, they are more likely to oppose immigration and European integration (Huijsmans et al., 2021). Immigrants contribute to increasing the workforce in rural communities, and their cooperation in the workplace along with friendly relations contribute to enhancing the integration levels of immigrants in these areas (Liltsi et al., 2020).

The urban/non-urban distinction may seem superficial when questioning the causes of racial inequality. Highlighting structural causes (e.g., racism and discrimination), which reveal deeper racial attitudes, can cause the cosmopolitan nature of urban residents to vanish (Carter, 2010).

Rural areas have often been depicted as symbols of national identity and tradition; such portrayals tend to characterize rural regions as traditional, conservative, racially homogeneous, and predominantly white, contrasting with the dynamic and multicultural nature of urban settings (Goicolea et al., 2023). Small towns and rurality are often associated with whiteness (...) renders invisible thousands of immigrants of color who have made their homes in rural places (Edge et al., 2023). Zahl-Thanem & Haugen (2019) explain that natives living in rural areas consider it more important for immigrants who may settle in their community to be willing to adapt to local values, speak the language, and participate in local events, compared to those living in urban contexts. In many European countries and anti-racist projects, various examples of anti-racist activities have been established both in countries and rural areas. Each country report includes statistics, data on ruralism and racism, and highlights selected good practices against racism in the countryside (Blaschke & Ruiz, 2002).

In 2013, the highest levels of discrimination occurred among the population residing in the smallest municipalities. However, in 2020, higher rates of discrimination were observed in

municipalities with larger populations, while these rates significantly decrease in rural municipalities, those with fewer than 20,000 inhabitants (Suso et al., 2020). Giannetto & Shirley van der Maarel (2024) highlight that in response to rejection by natives, immigrants chose not to engage in one-way integration processes or seek solutions through two-way exchanges of mutual accommodation. Instead, they avoided further confrontations to steer clear of additional animosities and racist incidents, refocusing on their primary goal: working and earning money to support their families.

Regarding the urban context, ethnic diversity is notably more prevalent in highly urbanized areas (Huijismans et al., 2021), and population diversity has traditionally been recognized as a defining characteristic of the urban landscape (Lee & Sharp, 2017). Cities (urban context) are regarded more appealing habitats to live for individuals who hold cosmopolitan attitudes and lifestyle preferences (Huijismans et al., 2021). Social scientists (...) argued that cities make urbanites more tolerant of differences in others (Huggins & Debies-Carl, 2015). Individuals with higher educational attainment, who generally hold more favourable attitudes towards European unification, multiculturalism and immigration tend to self-select into urban areas (Huijismans et al., 2021).

“Hate speech against immigrants is not necessarily more prevalent in areas with a high immigrant population” (Rodríguez et al., 2024, p. 4). The treatment of ethnic minority groups in the mass media may play a part in situations where second-hand (mass media) information is a major influence on attitude formation (Forrest & Dunn, 2013).

The **objective** of this research is to examine the levels of attitudes, subtle and blatant prejudice, as well as their dimensions, from native people towards immigrant people in urban and rural areas.

The general aim of this research is detailed in three specific objectives:

- 1) To assess whether individuals residing in rural areas exhibit higher levels of subtle and blatant prejudice compared to those living in urban areas.
- 2) To compare the levels of attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude) between people living in urban areas and those living in rural areas.
- 3) To examine the levels of attitudes (negative social distancing attitude) between people living in rural areas and those living in urban areas.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1. Participants

The sample selection was carried out through non-probabilistic convenience sampling. The sample comprised a total of 640 participants with 56.4% females ( $n = 361$ ) and 43.6% males ( $n = 279$ ), ranging in age from 14 to 80 years with a mean age of 25.79 years ( $SD = 14.86$ ). As for the environment in which the participants have grown up, 38.6% come from rural context ( $n = 247$ ), while 61.3% come from urban context ( $n = 393$ ).

### 2.2. Instruments

The two data collection instruments used in this study were firstly the scale adapted for the

native population by Rueda and Navas in 1996 from Meertens and Pettigrew's scales of subtle and blatant prejudice. This adaptation includes modifications made in Navas' et al. study in 2004. The scale consists of 29 multiple-choice items, Likert type, measured on a scale from 1 to 5 (1: Strongly Disagree; 2: Disagree; 3: Neither Agree nor Disagree; 4: Agree; 5: Strongly Agree).

There are two subscales or dimensions of blatant prejudice: the threat and rejection subscale and the intimacy subscale. On the other hand, there are four subscales of subtle prejudice: the traditional values subscale, the cultural differences subscale, the affective prejudice subscale, and, subtle negative emotions subscale.

The topics addressed in the scale were the following: the education they provide to their children, their religious beliefs and practices, their beliefs about relationships between men and women, their ways of communicating with people, their hygiene and cleanliness habits, their dietary habits and customs, and their ways of being and seeing life.

The second scale was the scale of attitudes towards immigration by León, Mira & Gómez in 2007. Both scales consist of items, Likert type, calibrated on a scale from 1 to 5 (1: strongly disagree; 2: disagree; 3: neither agree nor disagree; 4: agree; 5: strongly agree). In turn, León et al., (2007) state that the scale exhibits very acceptable psychometric characteristics and has good internal consistency and reliability.

Sub-scales or dimensions of attitudes: equality principles and policies (12 items), positive social distance (5 items), negative social distance (4 items), positive favorability (7 items), and, negative favorability (5 items).

León et al., (2007) explain that the *equality principles and policies* factor refers to principles of equal opportunities and the implementation of egalitarian principles (education, subsidies, voting in elections...). The *positive social distance* factor refers to situations of close intimacy with an immigrant (having an immigrant boss or neighbour...). *Negative social distance* refers to situations that one would not share with immigrants (going to the cinema, swimming pool...). Fourthly, *positive favorability* refers to the trust or quality of human relationships that can be expected from interactions with immigrants (hardworking, honest, etc.). Finally, *negative favorability* refers to negative aspects of immigrants' personalities (intolerant, untrustworthy, etc.)

### **2.3. Design and procedure**

The scale outlined in the preceding section was implemented at the educational institutions and in associations that work with immigrants of each participant, all of which were part of the educational system in both in-person and online formats. While instructions for completing the questionnaire were provided, ensuring detailed directives for accurate completion. Participants were consistently informed about the objectives of the current research, underscored the voluntary nature of their participation, and guaranteed their anonymity. The data collected were coded and analyzed using IBM SPSS 25 software.

### **2.4. Data analysis**

The data collected were coded and analyzed using the IBM SPSS 25 software. The sample selection was carried out through non-probabilistic convenience sampling. A total of 640

participants, immigrant participants made up of a total of 21.6% ( $n=138$ ), while native participants made up a total of 78.4% ( $n=502$ ).

The participants were part of various educational centres and associations that work with immigrants and refugees.

The nationalities of the immigrant participants were: Algeria ( $n = 3$ ); Argentina ( $n = 7$ ); Bolivia ( $n = 2$ ); Brazil ( $n = 4$ ); Bulgaria ( $n = 2$ ); Cameroon ( $n = 1$ ); Chile ( $n = 4$ ); China ( $n = 2$ ); Colombia ( $n = 17$ ); Democratic Republic of the Congo ( $n = 1$ ); Cuba ( $n = 1$ ); Ecuador ( $n = 10$ ); Gambia ( $n = 4$ ); Georgia ( $n = 1$ ); Ghana ( $n = 5$ ); Equatorial Guinea ( $n = 3$ ); Honduras ( $n = 1$ ); India ( $n = 1$ ); Italy ( $n = 3$ ); Morocco ( $n = 11$ ); Moldova ( $n = 1$ ); Nigeria ( $n = 1$ ); Pakistan ( $n = 1$ ); Peru ( $n = 8$ ); Poland ( $n = 1$ ); Portugal ( $n = 2$ ); Dominican Republic ( $n = 6$ ); Romania ( $n = 7$ ); El Salvador ( $n = 1$ ); Senegal ( $n = 3$ ); Syria ( $n = 1$ ); Ukraine ( $n = 8$ ); Venezuela ( $n = 15$ ).

### 3. Results

The result obtained for the attitude was ( $\alpha ,672$ ). Next, we can observe the results of the sub-scales of the attitude scale: equality principles and policies ( $\alpha ,863$ ), positive social distance ( $\alpha ,564$ ), negative social distance ( $\alpha ,777$ ), positive favorability ( $\alpha ,778$ ), negative favorability ( $\alpha ,827$ ).

The outcome derived from the prejudice scale ( $\alpha ,804$ ) and the results obtained from the blatant prejudice scale ( $\alpha = .798$ ) demonstrate an appropriate level of internal consistency. However, those yielded by the subtle prejudice scale ( $\alpha = .623$ ) show a relatively low value.

**Hypothesis 1: People living in rural areas will have higher levels of subtle prejudice and blatant prejudice than people living in urban areas.**

**Table 1.**

*Anova between prejudice and context*

	M	SD
Rural	2,39	,52
Urban	2,38	,47

**Source:** Author's elaboration (2024).

To test Hypothesis 1, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The result indicates that  $F_{(2,637)} = .341$ ,  $p = ,711$ , meaning there are significant differences based on the context of the participants in relation to prejudice. Specifically, as shown in Table 1, people living in rural areas not exhibited higher levels of prejudice than people living in urban areas. There-fore, Hypothesis 1 can be refuted.

**Hypothesis 2: People living in urban areas will have higher levels of attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude) than people living in rural areas.**

**Table 2.**

*Anova between attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude) and context*

	M	SD
Rural	3,79	,70
Urban	3,82	,66

**Source:** Author's elaboration (2024).

To test Hypothesis 2, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The result indicates that  $F_{(2,637)} = 106$ ,  $p = ,889$ , meaning there are significant differences based on the context of the participants in relation to attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude). Specifically, as shown in Table 2, people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude) than people living in urban areas. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 can be refuted.

**Hypothesis 3: People living in rural areas will have higher levels of attitudes (negative social distancing attitude) than people living in urban areas.**

**Table 3.**

*Anova between attitudes (negative social distancing attitude) and context*

	M	SD
Rural	1,82	,79
Urban	1,84	,73

**Source:** Author's elaboration (2024).

To test Hypothesis 3, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted. The result indicates that  $F_{(2,637)} = 415$ ,  $p = ,660$ , meaning there are significant differences based on the context of the participants in relation to attitudes (negative social distancing attitude). Specifically, as shown in Table 3, people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of attitudes (negative social distancing attitude) than people living in urban areas. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 can be refuted.

## 4. Discussion

The main objective of the current research was to examine the levels of attitudes, subtle and blatant prejudice, as well as its dimensions, from native people to immigrant people in urban and rural areas.

The obtained data show that people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of



prejudice (subtle and blatant) than people living in urban areas (Hypothesis 1) previous studies indicate that prejudice influences the decision to choose a more uniform residential area, suggesting that over time, homogeneous neighborhoods not only become more uniform but also foster increased prejudice among their residents (Lancee & Schaeffer, 2016). Along these lines, discriminatory practices in housing can also create a spatial disparity where immigrants face limited access to good employment opportunities and top-tier schools, longer commutes to work, insufficient access to healthcare, and consequently, poorer health outcomes. (Esses, 2021). At the same time, discoveries also refine the depiction of rural areas as more conservative and racially prejudiced compared to urban areas, indicating that racism was perceived as a danger and something unwelcome (at least by some young people and at a discursive level) in rural communities as well (Goicolea et al., 2023).

Residing in rural areas is commonly associated with increased resistance to immigrants, which could pose a barrier hindering the successful integration of immigrants in those regions (Zahl-Thanem & Haugen, 2019). On the contrary, in the present research, the results show that people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude - education, subsidies, voting in elections...-) than people living in urban areas (Hypothesis 2) previous studies indicate that residing in culturally varied regions correlates with holding more accepting attitudes toward immigrants, and shifts in the ethnic makeup of neighborhoods correspond to evolving views on immigration over time (Huijismans et al., 2021). The population living in rural areas (44%) perceives greater tension between different demographic groups (Suso et al., 2020).

Finally, people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of attitudes (negative social distance attitude - going to the cinema, swimming pool...-) than people living in urban areas (Hypothesis 3) previous studies indicate that residents of less urbanized municipalities tend to hold more unfavorable views towards immigration, multiculturalism, and European integration compared to residents of municipalities with higher levels of urbanization (Huijismans et al., 2021). In rural context, immigrants were treated with less respect while shopping or dining out, at sporting or other public events, they were treated less respectfully, not trusted, called names, or otherwise insulted (Forrest & Dunn, 2013).

## 5. Conclusions

The main conclusions of the present research are that people living in rural areas did not exhibit higher levels of prejudice (subtle and blatant) or attitudes (equality principles and policies attitude, and, negative social distance attitude) than people living in urban areas.

What defines rural racism in classical terms is the existence of patriarchal structures based on values of land possession. These work in such a way that the arrival of the stranger (both the city dweller and the foreigner) creates an extra menace (Blaschke & Ruiz, 2002). In rural contexts, the illegal employment of immigrant workers determines not only their poor living and work conditions, but also makes them more vulnerable to falling victims of racist incidents (Blaschke & Ruiz, 2002).

Over the last decades many large cities have become economic centres. They are therefore likely to take relatively positive stances towards European integration and immigration (Huijismans et al., 2021). Greater proximity and interaction, knowledge, and direct contact between people of different origins and ethnicities tend to reduce the likelihood of discrimination. This is because situations of differential treatment towards these groups are often based on stigmatization and stereotypes stemming from a lack of knowledge (Suso et

al., 2020).

“The imaginary of rural places as smaller, where everyone knows each other, represents ‘strangers’ as more notorious and visible there, from this perspective, the ‘other’ is stereotyped and reified” (Goicolea et al., 2023, p. 698). A welcoming community is among a small number of basic requirements for the successful integration of immigrants into any new society (Forrest & Dunn, 2013).

Apart from Caucasian communities, both organizations and local authorities struggled to involve immigrants in meetings and broader integration agendas, often assigning identities without sufficient evidence (Arora-Jonsson, 2017). Regarding the associations of immigrants themselves, Rodriguez et al., (2024) explain that they have not regularly experienced hatred and note that in the places where they are located, the neighbours are very receptive to the social activities of the association.

Understanding the nature of contemporary prejudice is essential for planning the development of intervention programmes aimed at reducing it (Frías-Navarro et al., 2009). While empowering immigrants remains vital on a personal level, focusing efforts on communicating initiatives at a broader scale to immigrants could be pivotal in diminishing systemic obstacles (Wei et al., 2019). In education is where society has one of the most powerful tools against racism by promoting inclusion, cultural diversity, respect, and anti-racist attitudes. It is necessary to work at the school level by implementing programs that promote cultural diversity, empathy, and inclusion, teaching students about the importance of respecting immigrants regardless of their race or origin.

This research has some limitations, such as inequality in the sample group, with a greater number of urban participants compared to rural participants, and the use of non-probabilistic sampling.

In future research, the limitations present in this study should be addressed. Additionally, it would be interesting to study the relationship between the education level of native people and attitudes, as well as subtle and overt prejudice towards immigrants. Previous studies explain that individuals with higher educational attainment, who generally hold more favourable attitudes towards (...) immigration, tend to select themselves into cities (Huijsmans et al., 2021). Living in rural areas itself does not correlate with negative attitudes toward immigrants once educational levels and social interactions with immigrants are accounted for (Zahl-Thanem & Haugen, 2019).

Similarly, it would be interesting to study the relationship between prejudice and attitudes towards immigrants according to the age range of native participants because Rinken & Mariscal-de-Gante (2024) explain that existing studies indicate an association between an increase in the age of respondents and a higher proportion of immigrant residents with anti-immigrant sentiments, but not with anti-immigration attitudes.

Rodriguez et al., (2024) explain that in their research, several of the surveyed associations identified that hate speech originated from far-right parties, creating a perfect breeding ground for uncooperative, racist, and xenophobic attitudes and behaviours, which in some cases lead to assaults. Therefore, in future research, it would be interesting to include the Altemeyer Authoritarianism Scale, specifically the 30-item 1986 version adapted by Seoane & Garzón in 1992. The aim is to analyse prejudice and attitudes towards immigration from an ideological perspective.

## 6. References

- Arora-Jonsson, S. (2017). Development and integration at a crossroads: Culture, race and ethnicity in rural Sweden. *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 49(7), 1594-1612. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X17701130>
- Blaschke, J. & Ruiz, G. (2002). *Racism in Rural Areas: Final Report of the Study for the European Monitoring Centre on Racism and Xenophobia*. EUMC. [https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/225-rurras.pdf](https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/225-rurras.pdf)
- Carter, J. C. (2010). A Cosmopolitan Way of Life for All? A Reassessment of the Impact of Urban and Region on Racial Attitudes From 1972 to 2006. *Journal of Black Studies*, 40(6), 1075-1093. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021934708325464>
- Civalero, L., Alonso, D. & Brussino, S. (2019). Evaluación del prejuicio hacia inmigrantes: adaptación argentina de la escala de prejuicio sutil y manifiesto. *Ciencias Psicológicas*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.22235/cp.v13i1.1814>
- Diekman, A. & Eagly, A. (2017). What is the Problem? Prejudice as an Attitude-in-Context. <http://hdl.handle.net/2374.MIA/6028>
- Edge, S., Davis, C., Dean J., Onilude Y., Rishworth, A. & Wilson, K. (2023). The role of urban and rural greenspaces in shaping immigrant wellbeing and settlement in place. *Wellbeing, Space and Society*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wss.2023.100127>
- Esses, V. (2021). Prejudice and Discrimination Toward Immigrants. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 72, 503–31. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-080520-102803>
- Forrest, J. & Dunn, K. (2013). Cultural diversity, racialisation and the experience of racism in rural Australia: the South Australian case. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 30, 1-9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2012.11.002>
- Frías-Navarro, D., Monterde, H. & Peris, F. (2009). La medida del prejuicio manifiesto y sutil. *Interpsiquis* 1, 1-9. <https://www.uv.es/~friasnav/BIBLIOEscalaPrejuicio1.pdf>
- Giannetto, L. & van der Maarel, S. (2024). Invisibility and (dis)Integration: Examining the meaning of migrant inclusion in everyday lived experience in rural areas. *Social Inclusion*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.7771>
- Goicolea, I., Gotfredsen, A., Jonsson, F. & Wernesjö, U. (2023). The Promise of Belonging: Racialized Youth Subject Positions in the Swedish Rural North. *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, 24, 695–713. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-022-00973-y>
- Horolets, A., Stodolska, M. & Peters, K. (2019). Natural Environments and Leisure among Rural-to-Urban Immigrants: An Application of Bourdieu's Concepts of Habitus, Social and Cultural Capital, and Field. *Leisure sciences*, 41(4), 313-329. <https://doi.org/ubu-es.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/01490400.2018.1448023>
- Huggins, C. M. & Debies-Carl, J. S. (2015). Tolerance in the City: The Multilevel Effects of Urban Environments on Permissive Attitudes. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 37(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/juaf.12141>

- Huijsmans, T., Harteveld, E., Van der Brug W. & Lancee B. (2021). Are cities ever more cosmopolitan? Studying trends in urban-rural divergence of cultural attitudes. *Political Geography*, 86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102353>
- INE. (2024). *Población extranjera por Nacionalidad, comunidades, Sexo y Año*. Instituto Nacional de Estadística. <https://lc.cx/AWouPo>
- Lancee, B. & Schaeffer, M. (2016). Moving to Diversity: Residential Mobility, Changes in Ethnic Diversity, and Concerns About Immigration. In R. Koopmans, B. Lancee, & M. Schaeffer (Eds.), *Social Cohesion and Immigration in Europe and North America: Mechanisms, Conditions, and Causality* (pp. 38–55). London: Routledge. [https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract\\_id=2625709](https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2625709)
- Lee, B. A. & Sharp, G. (2017). Ethnoracial Diversity across the Rural-Urban Continuum. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 672(1), 26-45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716217708560>
- León, B., Mira, A. R. & Gómez, T. (2007). Evaluación de las opiniones sobre la inmigración y la multiculturalidad en la escuela de alumnos de magisterio. *Revista Electrónica de Investigación Psicoeducativa*, 5(12), 259-282. <http://dx.doi.org/10.25115/ejrep.v5i12.1271>
- Liltsi, P., Michailidis, A., Loizou, E. & Chatzitheodoridis, F. (2020). The impact of social capital on the immigrants' integration alongside the Rural-Urban Continuum: Evidence from Greece. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Rural Development*, 10(1), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.1005/2020.10.1/1005.1.1.8>
- Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación. (2021). *Demografía de la población rural en 2020*. Subsecretaría del Ministerio de Agricultura, Pesca y Alimentación (MAPA), Subdirección General de Análisis, Coordinación y Estadística. <https://lc.cx/-CTvIh>
- Navas, M. S., Pumares, P., Sánchez, J., García, M. C., Rojas, A. J., Cuadrado, I., Asensio, M. & Fernández, J. S. (2004). *Estrategias y actitudes de aculturación: la perspectiva de los inmigrantes y de los autóctonos en Almería*. Junta de Andalucía. <https://lc.cx/3oS5bt>
- OPI. (2024). *Extranjeros con autorización de residencia o certificado de registro en vigor*. Observatorio Permanente de la inmigración. <https://lc.cx/FqgfwA>
- Rinken, S. & Mariscal-de-Gante, Á. (2024). Do dependents matter? Exploring multiple dimensions of attitudes toward immigration and immigrants. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2024.2361072>
- Rodríguez, P., Martínez, L, & Villegas, F. (2024). Hate-Speech Countering by Immigrant and Pro-Immigrant Associations in Almeria (Spain). *Social Sciences*, 13(33). <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13010033>
- Sampedro, R. (2022). Género y repoblación rural. Mujeres autóctonas e inmigrantes en la España interior. In E. Moyano Estrada (Coord.), *La España rural: retos y oportunidades de futuro* (pp. 181-197). Mediterráneo económico. <https://lc.cx/tvkrIS>
- Seoane, J. & Garzón, A. (1992). Creencias sociales contemporáneas, Autoritarismo y humanismo. *Psicología Política*, 5, 27-52. <https://lc.cx/I5PND8>

- Suso, A., Torres, J., Olmos, N. & Mamán, D. (2020). *Percepción de la discriminación por origen racial o étnico por parte de sus potenciales víctimas en 2020*. Ministerio de Igualdad. Consejo para la Eliminación de la Discriminación Racial o Étnica. <https://lc.cx/-VEZEs>
- Wei, K., Jacobson, D. & Wu, S. (2019). The Role of Language in Anti-Immigrant Prejudice: What Can We Learn from Immigrants' Historical Experiences? *Social Sciences*, 8(93). <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8030093>
- Zahl-Thanem, A. & Haugen, M. S. (2019). Attitudes Toward Immigrants in Rural Norway. A Rural-Urban Comparison. *Special Issue: Doing art in the Countryside*, 59(4), 685-700. <https://doi-org.ubu-es.idm.oclc.org/10.1111/soru.12251>
- Zhou, J., Lin, L. & Gu, H. (2024). How attitudes from urban residents shape settlement plans of rural-to-urban migrants in China: the role of hukou. *Current Psychology*, 43, 11314-11329. <https://link-springer-com.ubu-es.idm.oclc.org/article/10.1007/s12144-023-05243-3>

## AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS, FINANCING AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

**Funding:** This investigation received either No financing external.

### AUTHOR:

**Beatriz Sáez-Pascual:**  
University of Burgos.

She holds a degree in Social Education and a Master's in "Education and Inclusive Societies" from the University of Burgos. Since 2022, she has been pursuing her PhD in the Education doctoral program at the same university, researching attitudes, prejudice, modern racism, emotions towards immigrants, and immigrants' life satisfaction. Alongside her academic activities, Beatriz has been working as a social educator at a Shelter for Unaccompanied Foreign Minors for 6 years. She has actively participated in numerous conferences, seminars, and symposiums since starting her doctoral studies.

[bsp0010@alu.ubu.es](mailto:bsp0010@alu.ubu.es)

**Orcid ID:** <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7656-7300>

**Google Scholar:**

<https://scholar.google.com/citations?hl=es&authuser=1&user=Y747UsYAAAAJ>

**ResearchGate:** <https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Beatriz-Saez-Pascual>

**Academia.edu:** <https://independent.academia.edu/BeatrizS%C3%A1ezPascual>