



The Journal of Positive Psychology

Dedicated to furthering research and promoting good practice

ISSN: 1743-9760 (Print) 1743-9779 (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/rpos20

Remarkable hospitality: a study of interpersonal hospitality exemplars

Elizabeth J. Krumrei-Mancuso, Brian H. Ge & Shauna M. Bowes

To cite this article: Elizabeth J. Krumrei-Mancuso, Brian H. Ge & Shauna M. Bowes (16 Jan 2026): Remarkable hospitality: a study of interpersonal hospitality exemplars, The Journal of Positive Psychology, DOI: [10.1080/17439760.2026.2615934](https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2026.2615934)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2026.2615934>



© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.



Published online: 16 Jan 2026.



[Submit your article to this journal](#)



Article views: 604



[View related articles](#)



[View Crossmark data](#)



This article has been awarded the Centre for Open Science 'Open Materials' badge.



This article has been awarded the Centre for Open Science 'Preregistered' badge.

Remarkable hospitality: a study of interpersonal hospitality exemplars

Elizabeth J. Krumrei-Mancuso^a, Brian H. Ge^b and Shauna M. Bowes^c

^aPsychology Department, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA, USA; ^bRoman Family Center for Decision Research, The University of Chicago Booth School of Business, Chicago, IL, USA; ^cDepartment of Psychology, The University of Alabama in Huntsville, Huntsville, AL, USA

ABSTRACT

This mixed-methods study examined hospitality among a purposive sample of individuals ($N = 26$) who had housed refugees from Ukraine since the 2022 escalation of the Russo-Ukrainian war. Quantitative analyses examined how this sample compared to other samples and what factors predicted various aspects of hospitableness. The findings suggest that, although empathy and perspective taking were relevant, extending hospitality in remarkable ways was not primarily dependent on particular character traits. We explored qualitative themes related to the experiences, motivations, and challenges of both everyday hospitality and remarkable acts of hospitality among our sample. Superordinate value commitments, empathy, having been the recipient of hospitality, and religiosity were all relevant motivational factors for extending hospitality. We observed complex themes about how participants overcame barriers to engaging in hospitality and how this ultimately resulted in enrichment.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 5 November 2025
Accepted 10 November 2025

KEYWORDS

Hospitality; character; virtue; refugee; prosociality; empathy; religion; spirituality; moral exemplar

Virtues are not the stuff of saints and heroes. They are spiritual technologies and tools for the art of living. (On Being, 2020, p. 3)

Hospitality provides a structure through which individuals care for one another. Being hospitable is seen as morally right in many countries (Biswas-Diener et al., 2019). In the U.S., the general population thinks about hospitality as being open to receiving guests, being interpersonally warm, and being proactive and generous in caring for guests (Meagher, 2025). More technically, hospitality is a positive social and emotional interaction in which a host shares personal resources with a guest within the host's territory (see Biswas-Diener et al., 2019). A host's territory can be interpreted broadly as the host's space of influence, for example, a railway worker hosting passengers on a train or even a blog writer hosting readers in virtual space (Bell, 2007).

The hospitality literature is most robust on the meso- and macro levels, particularly in the study of cultural and commercial hospitality. Less empirical work has examined the practice of hospitality on an individual level or hospitableness – the inclination to engage in hospitality. However, recent psychological work demonstrates growing interest in studying hospitality as a pro-social behavior and studying the psychological features of hospitable people (Biswas-Diener et al., 2019; Meagher, 2025; Meagher et al., 2022). More work is needed to

understand hospitableness, given that it has been identified as an important component of moral and character development (Brooks, 2020; Snyder, 2019). In addition, hospitality has been correlated with indicators of individual wellbeing and social thriving across more than a dozen countries, including life satisfaction, positive affect, flourishing, social support, trust, respect and sense of belonging (Biswas-Diener et al., 2019; Selvam et al., 2022; Yıldırım & Güler, 2021).

Given the potential good hospitality has to offer, there is value in understanding this construct better. Prior work suggests hospitableness is associated with various individual difference factors, including personality (Biswas-Diener et al., 2019; Meagher et al., 2022; Selvam et al., 2022; Yıldırım & Güler, 2021), perspective-taking (Biswas-Diener et al., 2019), and empathic concern (Meagher et al., 2022). We were interested in replicating and extending these findings among individuals extending hospitality to strangers fleeing war.

Hospitality in the context of forced displacement

Ancient hospitality was designed to care for the most vulnerable and invisible in society – those detached from relations and institutions that could sustain and support them. Today, such hospitality continues to be practiced in relation to the displaced. Philosopher Jacques Derrida

CONTACT Elizabeth J. Krumrei-Mancuso  Elizabeth.mancuso@pepperdine.edu  Social Science Division, Seaver College, Pepperdine University, Malibu, CA 90263, USA

© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited. The terms on which this article has been published allow the posting of the Accepted Manuscript in a repository by the author(s) or with their consent.

has described the ideal of unconditional hospitality as the act of welcoming another without limits, reserve, or expectations (Derrida, 2003; Dufourmantelle et al., 2000). In practice, hospitality is always conditional, involving calculated risks (Derrida, 2005; Dufourmantelle et al., 2000). Though not fully unconditional, we were interested in studying remarkable instances of hospitality in which hosts were willing to make themselves vulnerable to unknown and unpredictable guests. We did so by examining individuals who welcomed strangers displaced due to the 2022 escalation of the Russo-Ukrainian war.

Extending hospitality to refugees is challenging, given the critical nature of the displacement and the intercultural communication required (Luczaj et al., 2024). Understanding this type of hospitality is aided by the recent work of Bassoli and Luccioni (2024), who reviewed 75 studies (90% qualitative) of homestay accommodation of refugees in Europe. Their synthesis demonstrates how precarious hospitality can be in practice: hosts can be compassionate, giving, and accommodating, but they can also have high expectations of their guests and become demanding and intrusive. Hosts might experience a disturbance in their own family's intimacy, face tension with family and friends, or become psychologically fatigued. Despite this, many positive outcomes have been observed, including social bonding between hosts and guests, positive reshaping of representations of foreigners, and improvement in language and intercultural skills. For guests, benefits include improvements in health and living conditions, feelings of acceptance, educational and employment opportunities, social network enhancement, and emotional support.

A few recent studies have examined hospitality specifically toward Ukrainian refugees through qualitative interviews with 15 hosts (Luczaj, 2023) and 28 guests (Luczaj et al., 2024) in Poland and 17 guests in Israel (Birger et al., 2024). This work mirrors many of the findings from the general European context (Bassoli & Luccioni, 2024) about lived hospitality. Hosts felt challenged by the emotionally charged experiences of their guests, the need to adapt pre-existing routines around guests' needs and the depletion of hosts' financial and emotional resources over time (Birger et al., 2024; Luczaj, 2023). Among Ukrainian guests, the pervasive discourse surrounding gratitude for hosts, though sincere, seemed to conceal more ambivalent emotions related to acculturation challenges and the experience of war. Guests reported feelings of fear and ontological insecurity, concerns for their children's adaptation, fear for those left behind, and complex emotions surrounding the loss of autonomy, feelings of indebtedness, and occasional

intrusiveness and judgment from hosts (Luczaj, 2023; Luczaj et al., 2024). Despite these challenges and complexities, the host-guest relations were in most cases positive (Luczaj, 2023; Luczaj et al., 2024).

In addition to learning about such lived experiences of hospitality, we were interested in studying the factors that might help hosts approximate Derrida's (2003) vision of unconditional hospitality, as when hosts open themselves fully to guests, despite differences and the unknown. Qualitative work has suggested that hospitality provides a context for exchanging social capital, such as financial and emotional support, information, and social connections (Griffin & Glover, 2023; Schanzel et al., 2014). Bonding social capital centers on the sharing of relational ties and resources within a community (Williams, 2006). Thus, this form of social capital, through network support and resources, might facilitate hosts being able to extend hospitality. Bridging social capital centers on the creation of social networks and sharing of resources across social divides (Williams, 2006). Therefore, this type of social capital may particularly facilitate hospitality toward strangers and those with social and demographic differences.

We were also interested in examining a number of individual difference factors that might contribute to extending hospitality to displaced strangers. Relevant factors might include open-mindedness, which is associated with greater willingness to interact with diverse groups (Hotchin & West, 2022), and perspective-taking, which relates to both liking and helping outgroup members (Shih et al., 2009). We also considered that intellectual humility – awareness of the limitations of one's knowledge – might facilitate a willingness to welcome guests with cultural and ideological differences, given that intellectual humility is associated with less disfavor toward those with religious and political differences (Krumrei-Mancuso & Newman, 2020). Research has also indicated that intellectual humility can elicit perspective-taking, thereby resulting in altruism and benevolence toward others (Krumrei-Mancuso, 2017).

The current study

This mixed-methods study examined a purposive sample of individuals in Europe who extended hospitality to refugees from Ukraine in 2022–2023. We used qualitative questions to learn about the motivations, facilitators, barriers, and outcomes of this hospitality.

Quantitatively, we examined whether our purposive sample had intrapersonal characteristics previously associated with hospitableness. Based on previous research, we hypothesized our sample would have higher scores for hospitableness, empathic concern, extraversion,

agreeableness, and open-mindedness, and lower scores for negative emotionality than samples in the literature (Biswas-Diener et al., 2019; Meagher et al., 2022; Selvam et al., 2022; Yıldırım & Güler, 2021). Theoretical work suggests hospitality can be driven by the recognition of others as co-humans (Pohl, 1999). Therefore, we also hypothesized that our sample would score higher in sense of common humanity than a comparison sample.

In addition to comparing to other samples, we examined factors that might facilitate the following indicators of hospitality within our sample: interpersonal hospitableness, proactively seeking information about housing Ukrainian guests, ease in deciding to house Ukrainian guests, and experiencing enrichment from housing Ukrainian guests. Based on social learning theory, we hypothesized that having received hospitality oneself would be predictive of these indicators of hospitality. Based on theory and previous research, we hypothesized that a sense of common humanity (Pohl, 1999), empathic concern (Meagher et al., 2022), perspective taking (Biswas-Diener et al., 2019), and social capital (Griffin & Glover, 2023; Schanzel et al., 2014) would also predict these indicators of hospitality.

We expected certain factors would be relevant to the ease with which participants would extend hospitality to strangers and those different from themselves in various ways. In particular, we hypothesized that open-mindedness, perspective taking, intellectual humility, and bridging social capital would each predict greater ease in extending hospitality to those who are strangers and different from oneself, because these factors have been associated with prosocial attitudes and behaviors toward diverse individuals and outgroup members (e.g. Hotchin & West, 2022; Krumrei-Mancuso & Newman, 2020; Shih et al., 2009; Williams, 2006).

For many, hospitality is also central to their religious identity and can be grounded in the conviction that all humans bear the image of God (Pohl, 1999, 2002; Siddiqui, 2015). Therefore, we hypothesized that self-rated religiousness, public and private religious practice, and religious belief salience would each predict indicators of hospitality among those who identified as religious. We also hypothesized that religious belief salience would predict hospitality being motivated to a greater extent by one's religion and would predict higher levels of hospitality above and beyond general, self-rated religiousness.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited through churches and organizations in the Netherlands and Belgium and through

snowball sampling. The sample consisted of 26 adults aged 25–91 years ($M = 59.73$, $SD = 17.73$) who had housed or organized housing of one or more refugees from Ukraine. Table 1 provides demographic descriptions. Among participants, 53.8% had housed guest(s) in their own living space and 61.5% had been involved in the decision-making and practical organization of providing housing in a location that was not their primary residence, such as a church building or other space to which they had access (15.4% had done both). The number of refugees participants had housed in their primary residence ranged from 1 to 40 ($M = 7.71$, $SD = 10.29$). The number of refugees participants had arranged housing for in another space ranged from 4 to 200 ($M = 25.88$, $SD = 47.50$).

Measures

For each quantitative scale, items were averaged to create a mean score. We report the internal consistencies from our sample.

Table 1. Participant demographics.

Descriptive	Percentage
Gender	
Female	53.8
Male	46.2
Country of Residence	
Netherlands	53.8
Belgium	30.8
Germany	3.8
France	3.8
Poland	3.8
U.K.	3.8
Living in Household	
Spouse	96.2
No children	69.2
One child	15.4
Two children	7.7
Three children	7.7
Migration	
Ever migrated	80.8
Race and Ethnicity	
White	88.5
Spanish, Hispanic, or Latinx	7.7
Highest Education	
Secondary school or less	11.5
Vocational degree	15.4
Bachelor's degree	52.8
Graduate or professional degree	11.5
Political Orientation	
Conservative	53.8
Moderate	30.8
Liberal	7.6
Haven't given it much thought	7.7
Religion & Spirituality	
Christian	92.3
Agnostic	3.8
New Age Pagan	3.8
Moderately or very religious	76.9
Not at all or slightly religious	23.1
Moderately or very spiritual	80.7
Not at all or slightly spiritual	19.2

Open-ended questions

Participants responded in writing to 19 open-ended questions about hospitality and about housing refugees from Ukraine (see [Figure 1](#)).

Hospitableness

The 12-item Interpersonal Hospitality Scale (Meagher et al., 2022) assessed hospitableness ($\alpha = .78$). We used the full scale, which assesses responsibility for guests, welcomingness, and a lack of perceived imposition (e.g. 'I enjoy having people over, regardless of who they are'). Items were rated on a scale from 1 'strongly disagree' to 7 'strongly agree'.

Common humanity

Zoghbi-Manrique de Lara and Guerra-Baez (2016) 4-item scale assessed compassion for others' common humanity ($\alpha = .86$; e.g. 'When I see someone down and out, I remind myself that anyone in the world can feel that way'). Items were rated on a scale from 1 'almost never' to 5 'almost always'.

Empathy

Two 7-item subscales of the Interpersonal Reactivity Inventory (Davis, 1983) assessed cognitive and emotional aspects of empathy. The perspective taking subscale assessed participants' ability to adopt the perspectives of other people ($\alpha = .85$; e.g. 'I try to look at everybody's side of a disagreement before I make a decision'). The empathetic concern subscale assessed feelings of warmth and compassion for others ($\alpha = .80$; e.g. 'I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me'). Items were rated on a scale from 0 'does not describe me well' to 4 'describes me very well'.

Social capital

Williams (2006) Internet Social Capital Scales assessed the affective bonds of a person's social network that yield positive outcomes such as emotional support and the ability to mobilize others. These scales were validated for both online and offline contexts. In this study, the terms 'online' and 'offline' were omitted in order to assess social capital generally without referencing the internet. The 10-item bonding subscale assessed emotional and substantive support provided by one's social network ($\alpha = .87$; e.g. 'There are several people I trust to help solve my problems'). The 10-item bridging subscale assessed the extent to which individuals make connections between their social networks and the social networks of others ($\alpha = .90$; e.g. 'Interacting with people gives me new people to talk to'). This form of social capital is associated with

broadening social horizons and opening opportunities for information and resource sharing. Items were rated on a scale from 1 'strongly disagree' to 5 'strongly agree'.

Intellectual humility

The 6-item Intellectual Humility Scale (Leary et al., 2017) assessed the degree to which people recognize their beliefs might be limited or wrong ($\alpha = .77$; e.g. 'I accept that my beliefs and attitudes may be wrong'). Items were rated on a scale from 1 'not at all like me' to 5 'very much like me'.

Personality

The 60-item Big Five Inventory-2 (Soto & John, 2017) assessed personality domains with 12 items each. Items were rated on a scale from 1 'disagree strongly' to 5 'agree strongly'. Internal consistency was $\alpha = .87$ for extraversion (e.g. 'I am someone who is outgoing, sociable'), $\alpha = .79$ for agreeableness (e.g. 'I am someone who is compassionate, has a soft heart'), $\alpha = .78$ for conscientiousness (e.g. 'I am someone who is dependable, steady'), $\alpha = .92$ for negative emotionality (e.g. 'I am someone who worries a lot'), and $\alpha = .81$ for open-mindedness (e.g. 'I am someone who values art and beauty').

Religious belief salience

The 5-item Religious Belief Salience Scale (Blaine & Crocker, 1995) assessed the extent to which participants find religion important and integrate it into their daily lives ($\alpha = .95$; e.g. 'My religious beliefs are what lie behind my whole approach to life'). Items were rated on a scale from 1 'strongly disagree' to 7 'strongly agree'.

Descriptive information

Participants responded to a number of questions about hospitality and hosting refugees designed for the current study. These items included: (1) 'Does being hospitable relate to your religious faith?' (1 'not at all' to 4 'completely'), (2) 'Does/did your motivation for housing Ukrainian guest(s) relate to your religious faith?' (1 'not at all' to 4 'completely'), (3) 'To what extent has your experience of receiving hospitality impacted the way in which you extend hospitality?' (1 'none at all' to 5 'a great deal').

Participants responded to the following seven items on a semantic differential scale from 0 to 10 with scale anchors reflecting the content of each item (e.g. 'easy' and 'difficult' for items 2 and 3): (1) 'Did information about the possibility and way to house Ukrainian guest(s) come to you or did you seek out information?'; (2) 'How easy or difficult was it to arrange the logistics of housing Ukrainian guest(s)?'; (3) 'Was your decision to

1. Did you attach any requirements to who you would house or arrange housing for? For example: gender, age, relationship status, language ability, religious faith? Please state what your requirements were and explain why.
- 2. What was your motivation for deciding to house Ukrainian guest(s)?**
3. Explain what made the decision to house Ukrainian guest(s) easy or difficult.
4. Explain how or in what ways your motivation for housing Ukrainian guest(s) relate to your religious faith (or indicate "not at all").
- 5. What has been enriching or beneficial to you about housing Ukrainian guest(s)? If nothing, you can state "none".**
6. What challenges or negative experiences have come out of the process of housing Ukrainian guest(s) for you? If nothing, you can state "none".
7. What does the word, "hospitality" mean to you? How do you define this term?
8. How or in what ways does being hospitable relate to your religious faith? (Or type, "not at all").
9. In what way(s) has your hospitality changed over your lifetime (if at all)? Can you explain why?
- 10. What motivates you to be hospitable?**
- 11. What barriers have you experienced to being hospitable?**
- 12. Have you overcome any barriers to being hospitable? If so, how?**
13. Do you intentionally place certain boundaries or limits around your hospitality (e.g., financial, time commitment, private space, other)? Please describe and explain.
14. What things, factors, or people help you to be hospitable?
- 15. What positive results have you experienced from extending hospitality (if any)?**
- 16. What negative results have you experienced from extending hospitality (if any)?**
- 17. Describe ways in which you have experienced hospitality from others in your life.**
- 18. How has receiving hospitality from others impacted you (if at all)?**
19. Would you like to provide any additional information or comment on any of the questions?

Figure 1. Qualitative items (bolded items included in qualitative analyses).

house Ukrainian guest(s) easy or difficult to make?'; (4) 'How personally enriching has it been to you to house Ukrainian guest(s)?'; (5) 'To what extent do you view yourself as a hospitable person?'; (6); 'How important is it to you to be hospitable?'; and (7) 'How much hospitality have you experienced from others in your life?'.

Participants responded to seven items on a sliding scale ranging from 0 'easier to extend hospitality to someone who is similar' to 10 'easier to extend hospitality to someone who is different' based on the question stem: 'Is it easier to extend hospitality to people who are similar to you in the following ways or people who are different than you in the following ways? Or does it not make a difference?'. The items included: religious faith, age, gender, race, culture, language, and country of origin. These items were reverse coded to report the extent to which participants found it easier to extend hospitality to someone similar to themselves. Finally, participants responded to two items on a sliding scale from 0 'harder to extend hospitality' to 10 'easier to extend hospitality' regarding (1) someone they already know and (2) someone known by personal contacts.

Procedures

This research was approved by Pepperdine University's IRB (#23-04-2144). Ethical standards were followed, including gathering informed consent prior to data collection. Data were collected in 2023 via an online survey in English. Participants completed qualitative items and then quantitative surveys. After participants' identities were verified for study eligibility, data were analyzed anonymously. Participants were offered a €20 gift card to a European online retailer.

One participant was deleted listwise for starting the survey and discontinuing after completing only a few of the open-ended items. No outliers were identified based on the pre-registered outlier labeling rule.

We pre-registered that we would explore differences on the basis of participants' immigration status and levels of religiosity and spirituality. Given the small size of some subgroups, we report these findings in the supplement.

Results

Quantitative analyses

Descriptive statistics

Variable descriptives are included in [Table 2](#). Our participants attached high importance to being hospitable, viewed themselves as hospitable people and indicated they had experienced a good deal of hospitality

themselves. Participants indicated interpersonal differences were not much of a factor in how easy it is to extend hospitality to someone. Language and religious differences posed the most challenges to hospitality, but were still in the neutral range. On average, participants did not find it difficult to make the decision to house Ukrainian guests. The degree of effort participants put into seeking information and arranging housing for Ukrainian guests was moderate. The sample generally agreed that their hospitableness and hosting Ukrainian guests were related to their religious faith and that they were motivated by the hospitality they had themselves experienced from others.

Mean comparisons

Given the unequal sample sizes between our sample and the pre-registered comparison samples, we made comparisons with Welch's two-sample *t*-tests (see [Table 2](#)).

We compared our sample's personality domains to that of Soto and John's (2017) internet sample. Two comparisons were consistent with hypotheses – our sample was slightly higher in conscientiousness and moderately lower on negative emotionality than the comparison sample. Contrary to hypotheses, our sample was moderately lower in open-mindedness than the comparison sample. No significant differences were observed for agreeableness or extraversion.

We compared our sample's sense of common humanity to the Zoghbi-Manrique de Lara and Guerra-Baez (2016) sample of employees working in the hospitality industry. There was no significant difference.

We compared our sample's empathic concern and hospitableness to Meagher et al.'s (2022) Study 3 sample. Consistent with hypotheses, our sample was moderately higher on hospitableness. However, contrary to expectations, our sample was moderately lower in empathic concern.

Simple linear regressions

[Table 3](#) displays the findings of pre-registered regressions. The significant findings were consistent with our hypotheses and are summarized here. Empathic concern and perspective taking were moderately to strongly related to investing greater effort in seeking information about housing Ukrainian refugees. Hosts having received more hospitality themselves were strongly associated with them finding it easier to make the decision to house Ukrainian refugees. Perspective taking, bridging social capital, private religious practice, organizational religious participation, and self-reported spirituality were each moderately to strongly related to experiencing more enrichment from extending hospitality to Ukrainian refugees. Having received more hospitality oneself, self-reported religiosity,

Table 2. Descriptive statistics and pre-registered mean comparisons.

Construct	Range	Mean (SD)				
General hospitality descriptives						
Hospitality relates to religion	1–4	2.77 (.91)				
Hospitality impacted by having received hospitality	1–5	3.92 (1.16)				
View self as hospitable person	0–10	7.51 (1.57)				
Importance of being hospitable	0–10	8.38 (1.36)				
Hospitality received from others	0–10	7.43 (2.57)				
<i>Easier to extend hospitality to someone of the same:</i>						
Religious faith	0–10	5.70 (2.35)				
Age	0–10	4.53 (1.44)				
Gender	0–10	4.93 (1.67)				
Race	0–10	4.88 (.98)				
Culture	0–10	5.17 (1.65)				
Language	0–10	5.80 (2.83)				
Country of origin	0–10	5.02 (1.72)				
<i>Easier to extend hospitality to someone who:</i>						
You already know	0–10	7.41 (2.43)				
Is known by personal contacts	0–10	5.66 (2.45)				
Hospitality toward Ukrainian guests descriptives						
Housing Ukrainian guests relates to religion	1–4	2.85 (1.05)				
Sought out information	0–10	4.05 (3.69)				
Difficulty of arranging housing	0–10	4.93 (2.51)				
Difficulty of making decision	0–10	2.86 (2.42)				
Personally enriching	0–10	7.03 (3.07)				
Variables of Interest						
Perspective Taking	0–4	2.67 (.71)				
Bonding Social Capital	1–5	4.15 (.57)				
Bridging Social Capital	1–5	4.06 (.59)				
Intellectual Humility	1–5	3.94 (.57)				
Religious Belief Salience	1–7	5.85 (1.48)				
Construct	Range	Our Sample Mean (SD)	Comparison Sample Mean (SD)	<i>t</i> (df)	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
General Personality			Soto & John 2017 <i>N</i> = 1,000			
Extraversion	1–5	3.21 (.79)	3.23 (.80)	–.13 (26.35)	.900	.03
Agreeableness	1–5	3.83 (.55)	3.68 (.64)	1.37 (26.79)	.183	.24
Conscientiousness	1–5	3.69 (.60)	3.43 (.77)	2.16 (27.19)*	.039	.34
Negative Emotionality	1–5	2.49 (.86)	3.07 (.87)	–3.39 (26.35)	.002	.67
			**			
Open-Mindedness	1–5	3.54 (.68)	3.92 (.65)	–2.82 (26.20)	.009	.58
			**			
Common Humanity			Zoghbi Manrique de Lara & Guerra Baez (2016) <i>N</i> = 280			
Common Humanity	1–5	3.38 (1.03)	3.56 (1.60)	–.81 (37.29)	.426	.12
Empathy			Meagher et al. (2022) <i>N</i> = 311			
Empathic Concern	0–4	3.04 (.66)	3.68 (.87)	–4.62 (32.74)		.75

			<.001			
Hospitality						
Hospitableness	1–7	4.99 (.75)	4.43 (1.07)	3.52 (34.15)**	.001	.53

***is $p < .001$ and **is $p < .01$.

and religious belief salience were each moderately to strongly related to more hospitableness. Private religious practice and organizational religious participation were both moderately related to attaching greater importance to being a hospitable person.

Hierarchical linear regressions

Table 4 displays the findings of pre-registered hierarchical regressions examining whether religious belief salience – the extent to which people make religion central to their lives – would predict indicators of hospitality

above and beyond general, self-rated levels of religiousness. This effect was observed only for hospitality being motivated by one's religious faith, with a moderate effect.

Qualitative analyses

We conducted a thematic analysis of 234 responses written by 26 participants in response to nine prompts (see Figure 1). To construct our codebook, one of the authors used MAXQDA (1989–2025) to conduct open

Table 3. Linear regressions with predictors of aspects of hospitality.

Models	R^2	b (β)	SE	p	95% CI
DV: Information Seeking					
IV: Hospitality Received	.02	-.20 (-.14)	.29	.492	-.80, .40
IV: Common Humanity	.03	.57 (.16)	.72	.435	-.92, 2.06
IV: Empathic Concern	.19	2.23 (.44)*	1.02	.025	.33, 4.53
IV: Perspective Taking	.24	2.58 (.49)*	.93	.010	.66, 4.49
IV: Bonding	.00	-.17 (-.03)	1.31	.897	-2.87, 2.53
IV: Bridging	.01	.45 (.07)	1.26	.722	-2.15, 3.06
IV: Private Religious Practice	.02	-.26 (-.12)	.44	.556	-1.17, .64
IV: Organizational Religious Participation	.03	-.38 (-.18)	.42	.370	-1.25, .48
IV: Religiosity	.01	-.37 (-.10)	.80	.646	-2.01, 1.27
IV: Spirituality	.11	1.07 (.32)	.64	.107	-.25, 2.39
IV: Religious Belief Salience	.05	-.57 (-.23)	.50	.263	-1.59, .46
DV: Decision Difficulty					
IV: Hospitality Received	.27	-.49 (-.52)**	.16	.007	-.82, -.15
IV: Common Humanity	.01	-.21 (-.09)	.48	.665	-1.19, .78
IV: Empathic Concern	.04	.70 (.19)	.73	.345	-.80, 2.20
IV: Perspective Taking	.08	.94 (.27)	.67	.176	-.45, 2.33
IV: Bonding	.06	-1.02 (-.24)	.83	.235	-2.73, .70
IV: Bridging	.01	.38 (.09)	.83	.654	-1.33, 2.08
IV: Private Religious Practice	.02	.20 (.14)	.29	.483	-.39, .80
IV: Organizational Religious Participation	.01	.10 (.07)	.28	.723	-.48, .68
IV: Religiosity	.07	-.66 (-.26)	.51	.208	-1.70, .39
IV: Spirituality	.07	.58 (.27)	.43	.183	-.29, 1.46
IV: Religious Belief Salience	.00	-.09 (-.05)	.33	.795	-.77, .60
DV: Enriching					
IV: Hospitality Received	.01	.13 (.11)	.24	.587	-.37, .63
IV: Common Humanity	.01	-.30 (-.10)	.60	.629	-1.54, .95
IV: Empathic Concern	.08	1.34 (.29)	.90	.150	-.52, 3.20
IV: Perspective Taking	.20	1.96 (.45)*	.79	.021	.33, 3.60
IV: Bonding	.06	1.26 (.24)	1.06	.245	-.92, 3.44
IV: Bridging	.44	3.42 (.66)***	.79	< .001	1.80, 5.05
IV: Private Religious Practice	.22	.85 (.47)*	.33	.016	.18, 1.52
IV: Organizational Religious Participation	.30	.96 (.55)**	.30	.004	.34, 1.57
IV: Religiosity	.15	1.27 (.39)	.61	.050	.00, 2.53
IV: Spirituality	.28	1.46 (.53)**	.48	.005	.48, 2.44
IV: Religious Belief Salience	.13	.18 (.36)	.10	.073	-.02, .38
DV: Hospitableness					
IV: Hospitality Received	.32	.16 (.57)**	.05	.003	.06, .27
IV: Common Humanity	.00	-.02 (-.02)	.15	.921	-.32, .29
IV: Empathic Concern	.01	.13 (.11)	.23	.583	-.34, .60
IV: Perspective Taking	.03	.18 (.17)	.21	.409	-.26, .62
IV: Bonding	.08	.37 (.28)	.26	.163	-.16, .89
IV: Bridging	.09	.37 (.30)	.25	.140	-.13, .88
IV: Private Religious Practice	.11	.14 (.33)	.09	.102	-.03, .32
IV: Organizational Religious Participation	.14	.16 (.38)	.08	.057	-.01, .33
IV: Religiosity	.26	.41 (.51)**	.14	.008	.12, .69
IV: Spirituality	.06	.17 (.25)	.13	.215	-.11, .44
IV: Religious Belief Salience	.19	.90 (.44)*	.38	.026	.12, 1.69
DV: Extend Hospitality – Other Demographics					
IV: Perspective Taking	.02	.19 (.13)	.29	.519	-.40, .78
IV: Bridging	.03	.27 (.16)	.34	.432	-.43, .97
IV: Intellectual Humility	.03	.29 (.17)	.35	.416	-.44, 1.02
IV: Open-Mindedness	.02	-.22 (-.15)	.30	.464	-.84, .39
DV: Extend Hospitality – Other Cultures					
IV: Perspective Taking	.11	.47 (.33)	.27	.096	-.09, 1.04
IV: Bridging	.09	.51 (.30)	.33	.134	-.17, 1.18
IV: Intellectual Humility	.06	.44 (.25)	.35	.213	-.27, 1.16
IV: Open-Mindedness	.01	-.12 (-.08)	.30	.682	-.74, .50
DV: Extent Hospitality – Known Others					
IV: Perspective Taking	.00	.03 (.02)	.29	.913	-.57, .63
IV: Bridging	.08	-.46 (-.28)	.33	.173	-1.14, .22
IV: Intellectual Humility	.04	-.34 (-.20)	.35	.338	-1.07, .38
IV: Open-Mindedness	.03	-.25 (-.17)	.30	.418	-.86, .37
DV: Hospitality Importance					
IV: Private Religious Practice	.23	.38 (.48)*	.14	.013	.09, .68
IV: Organizational Religious Participation	.22	.36 (.47)*	.14	.017	.07, .65
IV: Religiosity	.11	.48 (.33)	.28	.099	-.10, 1.05
IV: Spirituality	.04	.23 (.19)	.24	.351	-.27, .74
IV: Religious Belief Salience	.13	.34 (.37)	.18	.066	-.03, .70

*** $p < .001$, ** $p < .01$, * $p < .05$.

IV = Independent variable; DV = Dependent variable. Each IV and DV combination is a separate model (e.g. extend hospitality – other demographics and intellectual humility is one model).

Table 4. Pre-registered hierarchical regressions.

Models	R^2	ΔR^2	b (β)	SE	p	95% CI
DV: Hospitality to Ukrainian Refugees Motivated by Religious Faith	.50	.03				
Step 1 IV: Religiosity			.49 (.44)	.29	.100	–.10, 1.09
Step 2 IV: Religious Belief Salience			.23 (.32)	.18	.229	–.15, .61
DV: Hospitality Motivated by Religious Faith	.58	.10*				
Step 1 IV: Religiosity			.23 (.24)	.23	.324	–.24, .71
Step 2 IV: Religious Belief Salience			.35 (.57)*	.15	.025	.05, .65
DV: Importance Hospitality	.06	.03				
Step 1 IV: Religiosity			.12 (.08)	.51	.814	–.94, 1.18
Step 2 IV: Religious Belief Salience			.27 (.30)	.33	.413	–.40, .94
DV: Information Seeking	.00	.07				
Step 1 IV: Religiosity			1.25 (.32)	1.43	.389	–1.70, 4.21
Step 2 IV: Religious Belief Salience			–1.24 (–.50)	.91	.187	–3.11, .65
DV: Decision Difficulty	.08	.09				
Step 1 IV: Religiosity			–1.80 (–.70)	.90	.057	–3.66, .06
Step 2 IV: Religious Belief Salience			.87 (.53)	.57	.142	–.31, 2.06
DV: Enriching	.12	.04				
Step 1 IV: Religiosity			.26 (.08)	1.12	.817	–2.05, 2.57
Step 2 IV: Religious Belief Salience			.76 (.37)	.71	.293	–.70, 2.23
DV: Hospitableness	.21	.02				
Step 1 IV: Religiosity			.55 (.70)	.26*	.043	.02, 1.09
Step 2 IV: Religious Belief Salience			–.11 (–.23)	.16	.495	–.45, .23

* $p < .05$.

IV = Independent variable; DV = Dependent variable.

coding, deriving 118 descriptive labels and, following a few iterations, 30 themes. The responses were split into concise segments, with each segment coded as a separate unit (317 total). Commonalities between themes in the first round of coding were consolidated for the second round of coding. To establish inter-coder reliability, a subset of 73 segments (23% of the total dataset) was coded by an additional, independent coder resulting in a high Krippendorff's Alpha of 0.88 (95% CI [0.80, 0.95], 1000 bootstrap samples).

The themes are presented in Tables 5-10 alongside the percentage of participants who included each theme in their responses. In this section, we use quotation marks to indicate direct quotes from participants.

Factors motivating hospitality

Motivating factors for hospitality in general and toward Ukrainian guests are summarized in Table 5. The primary reason participants provided for engaging in general hospitality was that they felt a moral duty to do so, whether based on religious values or humanistic principles (61.54%). Participants used the language of moral imperatives, including concerns of failing to 'honor [God]' as well as 'wanting to do what's right'. Other motivating factors included the desire to alleviate suffering (38.46%) and enjoying engaging in hospitality (19.23%). Less frequent were feeling a sense of responsibility to social relations (15.38%) and being inspired by the hospitality of others (11.54%). For example, one participant

Table 5. Factors motivating hospitality, general & Ukraine (N = 26).

Code Definitions & Subthemes	% of sample where theme was present: General hospitality	% of sample where theme was present: Hospitality to Ukrainian refugees
Desire to Alleviate Suffering: Compassion or empathy-based desires to resolve struggles or meet needs; feeling for the misfortunes of others.	38.46% (n = 10)	46.15% (n = 12)
Moral Duty: Devotion to a superordinate moral or values system (secular or religious) compelling hospitable behavior; religious prescriptions or scriptures; dedication to humanistic ideals.	61.54% (n = 16)	15.38% (n = 4)
Duty to Social Relations: Sense of duty to interpersonal connections including friend/family or community networks either engaged in hospitality, in need of hospitality, or in need of assistance extending hospitality.	15.38% (n = 4)	38.46% (n = 10)
Extending Hospitality is Enjoyable: Personal enjoyment, satisfaction, or pleasure derived from extending hospitality. Emphasis on the hospitable act being intrinsically rewarding.	19.23% (n = 5)	–
Inspiration from Models: Being inspired or guided by examples who demonstrate hospitality. Learning from others' actions, especially from moral exemplars.	11.54% (n = 3)	–

described a family member receiving unexpected kindness from a German soldier during the Second World War.

Similar themes were present as motivating factors in housing Ukrainian guests, though the prevalence differed. The predominant theme in hospitality to Ukrainian refugees was desire to alleviate suffering, driven by a focus on the hardship and needs of Ukrainian guests (46.15%). A common response was that participants noticed an unmet need and recognized they had the means to fulfill it. One participant described, ‘people need a place to shelter ... we have a number of unused rooms. It just made sense’. Sense of duty to social relations was the second most prominent theme (38.46%), with participants referring to church communities and friend networks as initiators or facilitators of hosting Ukrainian refugees. Interestingly, moral duty – the primary motivating factor for general hospitality – was a comparatively less prominent motivation for extending hospitality to Ukrainian guests (15.38%).

Barriers to extending hospitality and strategies for overcoming them

We explored with participants what barriers stood in the way of extending hospitality (Table 6) and how they

overcame these barriers (Table 7). The most common barrier cited was interpersonal challenges (38.46%). This included challenges to social skills, such as it being ‘difficult to keep a conversation going, depending on the person’ as well as anticipated language barriers specific to hosting refugees. This theme also included concerns about guests who might be dishonest, who might ‘misuse’ hospitality, or who have emotional problems too complex for the participant to assist with. The next two most prominent barriers were disruption to privacy/comfort zone and fatigue (23.08% each). Regarding the first, participants detailed issues ranging from being introverted to broader anxieties surrounding the ‘uncertainty and the vulnerability of having someone “unknown” in our home’. Regarding fatigue, a common response was simply ‘being tired’ and other descriptions of exhaustion. Additionally, participants faced the challenge of balancing hosting responsibilities with existing familial and career responsibilities (19.23%) and had concerns about having sufficient resources to extend hospitality (19.23%).

The most common theme for overcoming these barriers was becoming familiar with extending hospitality (42.3%) either through habituation (e.g. ‘The more you

Table 6. Barriers to and negative outcomes of extending hospitality.

Code Definitions & Subthemes	% of sample where theme was present: Barrier to extending hospitality	% of sample where theme was present: Negative outcome of extending hospitality
Fatigue: Being tired, emotionally drained, or lacking energy.	23.08% (n = 6)	34.62% (n = 9)
Interpersonal Challenges: Difficulties in the host-guest relationship, such as in connecting with guests of differing backgrounds and experiences.	38.46% (n = 10)	34.62% (n = 9)
Privacy & Comfort Zone Disruption: Concerns about maintaining personal lifestyle preferences including familiar routines and private time or space.	23.08% (n = 6)	15.38% (n = 4)
Competing Responsibilities: Having pre-existing duties and responsibilities (e.g. work, family) conflicting with hospitality.	19.23% (n = 5)	–
Resource Scarcity: Practical concerns over having sufficient space, resources, or material goods to tend to guests.	19.23% (n = 5)	–
None: No barriers cited.	3.85% (n = 1)	19.23% (n = 5)

Table 7. Overcoming barriers to extending hospitality.

Code Definitions & Subthemes	% of sample where theme was present
Familiarization: Barriers are overcome by habituating to circumstances or learning new skills for adapting to disruptions in routine.	42.31% (n = 11)
Values & Beliefs: Barriers are overcome via connection to one’s value convictions. This includes reframing circumstances or engaging in religious practices such as prayer in order to promote one’s values and beliefs.	23.08% (n = 6)
Interpersonal Support: Barriers are overcome through support from or positive interactions with others. This includes positive social relations and interactions of reciprocity or gratitude with Ukrainian guests.	23.08% (n = 6)
None: Participants did not report successfully overcoming barriers.	15.38% (n = 4)

share, the easier it becomes ...) or by developing new skills or tools (e.g. learning to use Google Translate). Participants described behavioral adaptations as they grew more adept at hosting, including setting clearer boundaries on what they were able to offer and becoming more attentive to potential deception and abuse of trust. Next most common was the theme of personal values and beliefs (23.08%). One participant described how 'knowing that "holding out the message of life" includes being hospitable' was helpful for overcoming hospitality challenges and another indicated that personal reminders that 'Jesus loves this person' helped overcome barriers. Lastly, interpersonal support, whether from new or pre-existing support systems, helped alleviate barriers to hospitality (23.08%); this included social connections that developed between the host and guest.

Notably, not all participants reported such overcoming. For 15.38% of participants, the identified barriers were not surmounted. Some of these barriers were rooted in personality (e.g. 'I have not really overcome being introverted ...') and others were rooted in perceived dishonesty or malicious behavior from guests (e.g. 'The overall negative feelings remain ...'). In these cases, the negativity of the experience would go on to resurface in participant discussions of the negative outcomes of extending hospitality.

Outcomes of hospitality

Participants reflected on the positive and negative outcomes of extending hospitality as well as what was enriching about housing Ukrainian refugees. First, in terms of the negative results of extending hospitality (Table 6), interpersonal challenges with guests and fatigue were most commonly reported (34.62% each). Unlike in response to the question about barriers where language differences were often reported, these interpersonal difficulties were more unpleasant or

hostile in nature. One participant reported feeling that 'we were taken advantage of ...' and another described 'a sense of entitlement (beyond what might be normal ...)'. The third most commonly negative outcome revolved around disruption of privacy and comfort zone (15.38%), particularly in struggles to find private moments with family.

The most common theme for positive outcomes of hospitality (Table 8) was the development of relationships and the experience of positive social interactions (46.15%). A close second was the satisfaction participants received from enhancing happiness and reducing suffering (42.31%). Finally, a notable positive outcome was participants' sense that they were drawing nearer to their moral ideals (23.08%; e.g. 'Knowing that God is pleased'). In one especially illustrative case, a participant recounted the 'life changing experience' of helping a pregnant guest give birth to her child, detailing a sense of awe and humility at 'seeing the world rally around to help her'. This account featured all manner of themes, ranging from the establishment of strongly positive social bonds to the acquisition of new skills and perspectives.

When asked what was enriching specifically about extending hospitality to Ukrainian refugees, four identified themes were featured at relatively similar frequencies: (1) positive social interactions and relationships, (2) gaining new skills and perspectives, (3) being satisfied at alleviating suffering, and (4) fulfilling one's moral ideals (ranging from 34.62% to 38.46%). For example, one participant noted that '... one of the most wonderful positive results is seeing how the children are joyful and normal; now they are learning Polish and succeeding in school ...'. What was interesting was that many responses featured a mix of these themes, suggesting overlap between the factors that make hospitality enriching.

Table 8. Positive outcomes of extending hospitality & hospitality factors that were enriching.

Code Definitions & Subthemes	% of sample where theme was present: Positive outcomes of extending hospitality	% of sample where theme was present: Factors that made housing Ukrainian refugees enriching
Positive Social Interactions & Relationships: Forming new, positive relationships or experiencing positive interactions with others.	46.15% (n = 12)	38.46% (n = 10)
Moral Fulfillment: Witnessing or better embodying one's moral ideals. Includes being inspired by acting out one's superordinate duties or by observing the moral conduct of others. Often references self-transcendent experiences (e.g. awe, humility, etc.).	23.08% (n = 6)	34.62% (n = 9)
Satisfaction in Alleviating Suffering: Empathic joy at seeing the sufferings of others reduced or happiness enhanced. Often references guests' gratitude.	42.31% (n = 11)	34.62% (n = 9)
Learning New Skills & Perspectives: Gaining new competencies and/or understanding/insight from hosting guests.	3.85% (n = 1)	38.46% (n = 10)
None: No positivity or enrichment reported.	3.85% (n = 1)	11.54% (n = 3)

The importance of having experienced hospitality

Finally, participants reflected on their own experiences of receiving hospitality. The most common forms of hospitality received (Table 9) were a place of stay or place to visit (46.15%), such as ‘invitations to stay with people whenever we are in their direction’ as well as being welcomed to ‘meals at people’s houses’. Participants noted not only being welcomed into spaces but also the social engagement they received there (34.62%). Some participants also referred to general favors and kind acts as instances of hospitality (19.23%), describing offers to ‘use a car or other things we needed at times’ as well as to ‘entertain the children in order to allow us time’.

Hospitality was most commonly received from people within participants’ religious communities (30.77%) and subsequently from people within one’s social circle (23.08%). Some participants had experienced hospitality from strangers (7.69%). For example, one participant reported, ‘Many people have extended hospitality to us, even if they did not know us; after church, they

would often take us to their homes and share their lives with us’.

Four themes emerged regarding how participants were impacted by the hospitality they received (Table 10). The most common was that participants developed new perspectives (34.62%). For example, one participant reported, ‘it has taught me how it feels to be on the receiving end, especially when most needed ...’. Often, this transformation of perspective extended beyond the host–guest relationship, resulting in strengthening of faith or developing new perspectives on life. The second most frequently occurring theme was that receiving hospitality was enjoyable or resulted in positive emotions (30.77%). This positivity frequently co-occurred with the theme of receiving hospitality enhancing one’s feelings of connectedness to others (19.23%). About one-fifth of participants volunteered that having received hospitality in turn made them more hospitable (23.08%). For example, one participant noted: ‘I’ve learned a lot about how to and how not to treat guests’.

Table 9. Personal experiences of receiving hospitality.

Code Definitions & Subthemes	% of sample where theme was present
<i>What hospitality was offered</i>	
Space to Stay: Being welcomed into a physical home-space, either for repose or visitation, including overnight stays.	46.15% (n = 12)
Help: Space or social company is provided to resolve a problem or meet a pressing need. Can include physical assistance and monetary aid.	19.23% (n = 5)
Social Company: Positive human interaction, including conversation, a listening ear, social get-togethers, social meals, and religious group activities.	34.62% (n = 9)
<i>Who offered hospitality</i>	
Religious Community: Receiving hospitality from someone with shared religious affiliations.	30.77% (n = 8)
Familial Connection: Receiving hospitality from immediate or extended family members.	11.54% (n = 3)
Friendship: Receiving hospitality from within a common social circle, including direct or family friends.	23.08% (n = 6)
Strangers: Receiving hospitality from someone previously unknown.	7.69% (n = 2)
None: No prior hospitality experiences reported.	11.54% (n = 3)

Table 10. Impact of personal experiences of receiving hospitality.

Code Definitions & Subthemes	% of sample where theme was present
Gained New Perspective: New understanding, strengthened or transformed insights, growth in personal values (including religious belief) that pertain to understanding life.	38.46% (n = 10)
Positive Emotions: Pleasant emotional states such as gratitude, joy, feeling loved, or moral elevation (including admiration, humility, etc.).	30.77% (n = 8)
Enhanced Personal Capacity for Hospitality: Becoming more hospitable to others through increased motivation or ability. For example, being inspired by the hospitality one has received or a desire to pay it forward.	23.08% (n = 6)
Enhanced Feeling of Connectedness: Strengthened social bonds, friendships, or community (religious or otherwise).	19.23% (n = 5)
None: No impact of receiving hospitality reported.	11.54% (n = 3)

Discussion

This mixed-methods study examined a purposive sample of individuals extending hospitality to war refugees in order to learn about the motivations, barriers, facilitators, and outcomes of hospitality. Consistent with hypotheses, our sample scored higher in hospitableness and conscientiousness and lower in negative emotionality than comparison samples. However, contrary to hypotheses, they were not higher in extraversion, agreeableness, or sense of common humanity than comparison samples, and they were lower in open-mindedness and empathic concern. This suggests hospitality is not always associated with particular traits; individuals with a range of personalities and personal characteristics can choose to engage in remarkable acts of hospitality.

Hospitality motivation

Although our sample did not score particularly high in empathy, both empathic concern and perspective taking were associated with investing greater effort into seeking information about how to host Ukrainian refugees. Our qualitative findings suggest that superordinate value commitments and empathy were themes in motivating hospitality, both of which have been observed in previous research (Bassoli & Luccioni, 2024; Luczaj et al., 2024). The frequency of each motivational factor differed by context within-participants. Moral duty was the most frequent theme for motivating general hospitality, whereas the empathy-focused desire to alleviate suffering was most prominent for Ukraine-specific motivations. Given that value commitments are thought to shape personal standards for commendable behavior (e.g. Hardy & Carlo, 2005; Schwartz, 2012), a potential explanation is that superordinate moral imperatives (e.g. to show 'care for neighbors and strangers') prepare an abstracted generalized readiness for engaging in hospitality. Once a concrete need for hospitality surfaces, this readiness-by-principle may shift into the explicitly empathy-oriented desire to soothe suffering. In this fashion, value commitments and empathy may each be more prominent in different contexts, possibly as a function of psychological distance (Trope & Liberman, 2010). For distant or hypothetical cases, abstract values are more often invoked, while for more concrete and therefore psychologically proximal needs, the focus on the need itself predominates. Both motivations would thus facilitate the enactment of hospitable behavior, though further study is needed to confirm their respective roles and interactions across contexts.

Having received hospitality oneself was also an important factor based on both quantitative and

qualitative findings. Being the recipient of hospitality was predictive of greater hospitableness in general and of finding it easier to choose to host Ukrainian guests. The qualitative responses illuminated that participants' experiences of receiving hospitality were oftentimes helpful for gaining perspective and tightening social bonds.

Finally, religiosity was relevant to hospitality among our fairly religious sample. Self-reported religiosity and religious belief salience were related to greater hospitableness, and public and private religious activities were related to attaching greater importance to being hospitable. This may stem from religious emphasis on the importance of hospitality and the modeling of hospitality by religious figures. For example, a powerful narrative exemplar in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam is Abraham hosting three visitors, unaware that they are angels in disguise (Siddiqui, 2015).

Overcoming barriers to hospitality

At its heart, hospitality is a complex ethical imperative to welcome differences (Dufourmantelle et al., 2000). Previous qualitative work has indicated that key barriers to extending hospitality to refugees include the negative discourse surrounding the displaced and concern about opening oneself up to strangers (Sirriyeh, 2013). Theologian Christine Pohl has suggested the act of hospitality itself opposes cultural norms about who is and is not valuable and offers a structure for transcending social differences. For example, in ancient Christianity, hospitality was a vehicle for overcoming struggles over ethnic and status differences whereby individuals who viewed each other as less than human came to value one another (Pohl, 1999). The present findings suggest processes by which participants were able to overcome differences.

Our participants noted dynamics akin to adaptive processes of assimilation and accommodation (e.g. Hanfstingl et al., 2021; Piaget, 1954/1937). Participants often described initial discomfort about integrating unfamiliar individuals into their home routines, noting interpersonal challenges (e.g. language barriers, potential deception, see Table 6) and potential disruption of privacy and comfort. Such responses echo prior research on reluctance to engage with strangers, especially due to potential communication difficulties or even perceived threat (Duronto et al., 2005; Epley & Schroeder, 2014). It follows, then, that the strategies for overcoming these barriers should include familiarization. For some of our participants, this took the form of repeated exposure (e.g. 'The more you share, the easier it becomes'). Others described active adaptation in acquiring new skills to

match their new commitments, a response more aligned with accommodation. Taken together, these findings point to familiarization in both its passive and active forms as a bridge between initial anxiety about hospitality and successful enactments of hospitality.

Participants also drew on value commitments and social connection as complementary means of overcoming barriers to hospitality. Prospective challenges in hospitality were reappraised as opportunities to enact one's values, thereby rendering any resulting discomfort not only tolerable but even valuable as sources of moral accomplishment.

An additional theme in how participants managed initial discomfort was the development of positive social relations with Ukrainian guests through interactions of gratitude, reciprocity, and connection. In these instances, value commitments and interpersonal ties enabled participants to transmute the potential fatigue and anxiety surrounding hospitality into meaningful experiences.

Enrichment from extending hospitality

A number of participant characteristics were associated with experiencing more enrichment from hosting Ukrainian guests. These included participants' abilities to take another person's perspective and make connections between social networks, as well as their sense of spirituality and involvement in public and private religious activities. The qualitative narratives further highlighted that enrichment often resulted from the ways in which participants were stretched or had to overcome personal barriers to extending hospitality. For example, as participants pushed through fatigue and anxiety about hosting Ukrainian guests, they developed new perspectives and skills, built relationships, and lived out their value commitments, which were all major sources of enrichment from extending hospitality.

Implications and future directions

Advocates of hospitality have noted that hospitality contributes to individual and communal thriving (Pohl, 2011); however, existing qualitative and correlational work makes it difficult to establish causation or extrapolate findings to larger populations. The same is true for this study. Further, our small sample made it difficult to observe small effects. Future research would benefit from larger samples with greater religious and cultural diversity and from research designs capable of examining causal models.

Despite these limitations, our findings suggest the importance of value commitments, interpersonal relations, and an engagement with unfamiliarity in hospitality. Self-transcendence – the valuation of something as more important than oneself – can be conceptualized along two axes (Goodenough, 2001). The vertical is an orientation toward an ideal superordinate, often immaterial in nature (e.g. moral ideals, religious divinity, etc.). The horizontal is an orientation toward other material entities such as people and nature. Our findings suggest two hospitality dimensions that may map onto these axes of self-transcendence: a vertical orientation toward superordinate value commitments prescribing hospitality and a horizontal orientation toward social connection and interpersonal relations. This verticality was indicated in: (1) how participants perceived their hospitality motivations as faith/values-based moral imperatives, (2) how participants surmounted challenges by reappraising stressors as part of these imperatives, and (3) how participants derived enrichment from moral fulfillment. Correspondingly, horizontality was indicated in empathy motivations for hosting Ukrainian refugees and in the host–guest relationship itself, the latter of which was a central source of both challenge and enrichment. Future study may more directly examine how these axes of hospitality interact, especially concerning the role that vertical value commitments toward hospitality may play in establishing axiological infrastructure necessary for horizontal social relations.

Conclusions

This work highlights the complex nature of hospitality. Although personal traits have previously been associated with hospitableness, the current sample demonstrates that these characteristics are not necessary for individuals to engage in remarkable acts of hospitality. People can be motivated to engage in hospitality for diverse reasons, which may differ based on the nature of the hospitality extended (e.g. inviting friends over for dinner versus welcoming refugees to stay in one's home). As seen in previous work, hospitality does not come without challenges, especially in the emotionally charged context of forced displacement, yet it was often in facing challenges and overcoming barriers that participants experienced enrichment from extending hospitality.

Acknowledgement

We gratefully acknowledge Kamryn Spease for her assistance as an independent coder of a portion of the qualitative data to establish inter-coder reliability.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Open Scholarship



This article has earned the Center for Open Science badges for Open Materials and Preregistered. The materials are openly accessible at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1212328>. Open materials and the supplement are available on the associated project page: <https://osf.io/uxz7k>.

References

- Bassoli, M., & Luccioni, C. (2024). Homestay accommodation for refugees (in Europe): A literature review. *International Migration Review*, 58(3), 1532–1567. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01979183231172101>
- Bell, D. (2007). Moments of hospitality. In J. Germann Molz & S. Gibson (Eds.), *Mobilizing hospitality*. Routledge.
- Birger, L., Tarshish, N., & Nouman, H. (2024). Expanding the boundaries of hospitality: The relationship between Ukrainian refugees and their hosts. *Journal of Ethnic & Migration Studies*, 50(16), 3942–3958. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2024.2359684>
- Biswas-Diener, R., Kushlev, K., Su, R., Goodman, F., Kashdan, T., & Diener, E. (2019). Assessing and understanding hospitality: The brief hospitality scale. *International Journal of Wellbeing*, 9(2), 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.5502/ijw.v9i2.839>
- Blaine, B., & Crocker, J. (1995). Religiousness, race, and psychological well-being: Exploring social psychological mediators. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21(10), 1031–1041. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672952110004>
- Brooks, D. (2020). *The second mountain: The quest for a moral life*. Random House.
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113>
- Derrida, J. (2003). Autoimmunity: Real and symbolic suicides. A dialogue with Jacques Derrida. In G. Borradori (Ed.), *Philosophy in a time of terror. Dialogues with Jürgen Habermas and Jacques Derrida* (pp. 85–136). University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (2005). The principle of hospitality. *Parallax*, 11(1), 6–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1353464052000321056>
- Dufourmantelle, A., Derrida, J., & Bowlby, R. (2000). *Of Hospitality: Anne Dufourmantelle Invites Jacques Derrida to Respond*. Stanford University Press.
- Duronto, P. M., Nishida, T., & Nakayama, S. I. (2005). Uncertainty, anxiety, and avoidance in communication with strangers. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29(5), 549–560. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.08.003>
- Epley, N., & Schroeder, J. (2014). Mistakenly seeking solitude. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143, 1980. 5), 1980–1999. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037323>
- Goodenough, U. (2001). Vertical and horizontal transcendence. *Zygon: Journal of Religion and Science*, 36(1), 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0591-2385.00337>
- Griffin, T., & Glover, T. D. (2023). The development of social and cultural capitals for immigrant hosts of VFR travellers. *Leisure Sciences*, 45(3), 262–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01490400.2020.1817201>
- Gunaratnam, Y. (2020). “Not in my name”: Empathy and intimacy in volunteer refugee hosting. *Journal of Sociology*, 57(3), 707–724. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783320969866>
- Hanfstingl, B., Arzenšek, A., Apschner, J., & Göll, K. I. (2021). Assimilation and accommodation. *European Psychologist*, 27(4), 320–337. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000463>
- Hardy, S. A., & Carlo, G. (2005). Identity as a source of moral motivation. *Human Development*, 48(4), 232–256. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26763842>
- Hotchin, V., & West, K. (2022). Open to contact? Increased state openness can lead to greater interest in contact with diverse groups. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 48(8), 1177–1190. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672211030125>
- Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J. (2017). Intellectual humility and prosocial values: Direct and mediated effects. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(1), 13–28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2016.1167938>
- Krumrei-Mancuso, E. J., & Newman, B. (2020). Intellectual humility in the sociopolitical domain. *Self and Identity*, 19(8), 989–1016. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2020.1714711>
- Leary, M. R., Diebels, K. J., Davisson, E. K., Jongman-Sereno, K. P., Isherwood, J. C., Raimi, K. T., Deffler, S. A., & Hoyle, R. H. (2017). Cognitive and interpersonal features of intellectual humility. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 43(6), 793–813. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167217697695>
- Luczaj, K. (2023). Multifaceted hospitality: The micro-dynamics of host-guest relations in Polish homes after 24.02.2022. *Central and Eastern European Migration Review*, 1–21.
- Luczaj, K., Leonowicz-Bukała, I., & Krasko, O. (2024). Hidden emotional costs of home accommodation: The lived experiences of Ukrainian refugees in Polish homes. *Emotion, Space and Society*, 53, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emospa.2024.101047>
- Meagher, B. R. (2025). Gracious hosts and welcomed guests: Implicit theories of good hosts and good visitors. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2025.2469517>
- Meagher, B. R., Cook, J., Silver, S. C., Van Doosselaere, M., Wint, J. I., & Zheng, X. (2022). Be our guest: The development of the interpersonal hospitality scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 105(2), 203–214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2022.2052302>
- On Being. (2020). *Better conversations: A starter guide*. Civil Conversations Project.
- Piaget, J. (1954). Conclusion. In M. Cook (Ed.), *The construction of reality in the child* (pp. 389–400). Basic Books. (Original work published 1937).
- Pohl, C. D. (1999). *Making room*. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co.
- Pohl, C. D. (2011). Hospitality and the mental health of children and families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 81(4), 482–488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1939-0025.2011.01111.x>
- Schanzel, H. A., Brocx, M., & Sadaraka, L. (2014). (Un)conditional hospitality: The host experience of the Polynesian community in Auckland. *Hospitality & Society*, 4(2), 135–154. https://doi.org/10.1386/hosp.4.2.135_1

- Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116>
- Selvam, S. G., Kiige, J. W., Soko, J., & Wissing, M. P. (2022). Conceptualising and measuring hospitality in relation to wellbeing in Kenya: Is hospitality a character strength? In L. Schutte & T. Guse (Eds.), *Embracing well-being in diverse African contexts: Research perspectives* (Vol. 16, pp. 99–121). Cross-Cultural Advancements in Positive Psychology. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-85924-4_5
- Shih, M., Wang, E., Trahan Bucher, A., & Stotzer, R. (2009). Perspective taking: Reducing prejudice towards general outgroups and specific individuals. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 12(5), 565–577. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430209337463>
- Siddiqui, M. (2015). *Hospitality and Islam: Welcoming in God's name*. Yale University Press.
- Sirriyeh, A. (2013). Hosting strangers: Hospitality and family practices in fostering unaccompanied refugee young people. *Child & Family Social Work*, 18(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1111/cfs.12044>
- Snyder, A. (2019). *The fabric of character: A wise giver's guide to supporting social and moral renewal*. Philanthropy Roundtable.
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next big five inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(1), 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>
- Trope, Y., & Liberman, N. (2010). Construal-level theory of psychological distance. *Psychological Review*, 117(2), 440–463. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0018963>
- VERBI Software. (1989–2025). MAXQDA [Computer software]. Consult. Sozialforschung GmbH. <https://www.maxqda.com>
- Williams, D. (2006). On and off the 'net: Scales for social capital in an online era. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 11(2), 593–628. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1083-6101.2006.00029.x>
- Yıldırım, M., & Güler, A. (2021). Psychometric analysis of the Turkish brief hospitality scale. *Psychological Reports*, 124(5), 2286–2301. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294120953562>
- Zoghbi-Manrique de Lara, P., & Guerra-Baez, R. (2016). Exploring the influence of ethical climate on employee compassion in the hospitality industry. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 133(3), 605–617. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2415-1>