

“Not “just words”: Exposure to homophobic epithets leads to dehumanizing and physical distancing from homosexuals

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Social Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID:	EJSP-14-0184.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Peer Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Running head: Homophobic epithets and dehumanization

Not “just words”: Exposure to homophobic epithets leads to dehumanizing and physical distancing from gay men

For Peer Review

Abstract

We examined whether homophobic epithets (e.g., *faggot*) function as labels of deviance for homosexuals that contribute to their dehumanization and physical distance. Across two studies, participants were supraliminally (Study 1) and subliminally (Study 2) exposed to a homophobic epithet, a category label or a generic insult. Participants were then asked to associate human-related and animal-related words to homosexuals and heterosexuals. Results showed that after exposure to a homophobic epithet, compared to a category label or a generic insult, participants associated less human-related words with homosexuals, indicating dehumanization. In Study 2, we also assessed the effect of a homophobic epithet on physical distance from a target-group member and found that homophobic epithets led to greater physical distancing of a gay man. These findings indicate that homophobic epithets foster dehumanization and avoidance of gay people, in ways that other insults or labels do not.

keywords: derogatory labels, deviance, dehumanization, homophobia, physical distance

Word count: 6536 (text) + 592 (footnotes) + 2116 (references) + 143 (abstract) + 5 (keywords) = 9392

1
2
3
4 **Not “just words”:** Exposure to homophobic epithets leads to dehumanizing and physical
5
6 **distancing from gay men**
7
8
9

10 Despite their negative and hostile tone, homophobic epithets toward gay men such as *faggot* and
11 *poof* are frequently used in everyday language (D’Augelli & Hersberg, 1993; Kosciw, Greytak, & Diaz,
12 2009). For example, US participants who belong to sexual minorities experience about two
13
14 homophobic hassles per week, most commonly in the form of verbal attacks such as homophobic
15 epithets (Swim, Johnston, & Pearson, 2009). Even individuals who are neither targets of such slurs nor
16 use this derogatory language themselves encounter homophobic epithets (e.g., heterosexuals
17 overhearing a homophobic slur). This raises the question of whether, and in which ways, homophobic
18 language may contribute to the persistence of homophobia.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28
29 There is initial evidence that exposure to homophobic epithets has evaluative consequences. Among
30 heterosexuals, exposure to homophobic epithets (e.g., *faggot*) leads to the activation of less positive
31 associations toward gay men compared to category labels (e.g., *gay*; Carnaghi & Maass, 2007; 2008). It
32 thus appears that even though homophobic epithets may be commonly considered as “just words” that
33 people encounter in their daily life, overhearing them dampens the extent to which gay men are seen in
34 a positive light. The current work is to move beyond the role of mere evaluative association elicited by
35 these terms. Homophobic epithets may not work as simply offensive terms, as they convey both a
36 negative evaluation and point to a group in a disparaging manner. However, homophobic epithets,
37 compared to category labels, combine a strong negative evaluation with a representation of gay men as
38 deviant (see Carnaghi, Maass, & Fasoli, 2011; Plummer, 2001). Because of this, in our research, we
39 examined whether homophobic epithets can contribute to consequences other than negative evaluative
40 responses. Specifically, we first and foremost aimed to assess whether homophobic epithets contribute
41 to the dehumanization of gay men. As a secondary aim, we examined whether these terms are
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 associated with physical distance from gay men. We will discuss both aims in turn.
5
6

7 **Consequences of homophobic epithets for dehumanization and physical distance**

8

9 Derogatory group labels such as homophobic epithets are highly offensive terms whose purpose is
10 to “negate a person or group's culture, heritage, and family in one word, by dehumanizing the person or
11 group” (Simon & Greenberg, 1996; p. 1195). As the definition implies, derogatory group labels elicit
12 not only a negative evaluation of the target, but achieve much more. Rather than functioning like a
13 generic insult, homophobic epithets may serve to dehumanize their target.
14
15
16
17
18
19

20
21 Dehumanization occurs when people perceive others as belonging to a lower order of humanity
22 (Haslam, 2006; Vaes, Leyens, Paladino, & Miranda, 2012). Instances of dehumanization of gay people
23 emerge in hate crimes against sexual minorities (Herek, Cogan & Gillis, 2002), anti-gay rhetoric, and
24 even in descriptions of aggression toward homosexuals (Herek, 2000). Homophobic language is a
25 common expression of verbal aggression (see D’Augelli et al., 1992; Swim et al., 2008) that legitimizes
26 and reinforces heterosexist norms and culture (Herek, 1990). Hence, as the definition suggests,
27 homophobic epithets highlight a representation of gay men as deviant in a way that “negates” shared
28 values and norms and contribute to their dehumanization.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 Dehumanization involves the denial of human characteristics and attributes to others. It is often
41 observed in intergroup contexts (e.g., Paladino & Vaes, 2009; Vaes & Paladino, 2010; Viki,
42 Winchester, Titshall, Chisango, Pina, & Russell, 2006) and it is different to just holding negative
43 perception of groups (Haslam & Loughnan, 2012). It has been shown to be distinct from in-group
44 favoritism (e.g., Leyens, Demoulin, Vaes, Gaunt, & Paladino, 2007). Indeed even groups that are not
45 negatively stereotyped can be targets of dehumanization (Leyens et al., 2000), and those who are
46 targets of negative attitudes are not necessarily dehumanized (Cortes, Demoulin, Rodriguez,
47 Rodriguez, & Leyens, 2005). Also, intergroup categorization is not *per se* a sufficient cause of
48 dehumanization as shown by studies using minimal groups (Demoulin et al., 2009), in the context of
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 gender-based relationships (Vaes, Paladino, & Puvia, 2011; Viki & Abrams, 2003) or ethnic intergroup
5
6 comparisons (Bain, 2014). Critically for the present research, dehumanization is not inevitable in the
7
8 context of sexual orientation (Brown & Hegarty, 2005). However, where it does occur it can result in
9
10 reduced empathy and support, and greater tolerance of cruelty (see Vaes et al., 2012; Viki, Osgood, &
11
12 Phillips, 2013). Finally, dehumanizing goes hand in hand with the exclusion from moral concern
13
14 (Bastian & Haslam, 2010; Opatow, 1990). People excluded from moral concern tend to be judged as
15
16 less human (Brandt & Reyna, 2011; Haslam, Bastian, Laham & Loughnan, 2011) and moral concern
17
18 has been found linked to the extent to which a person is perceived as human (Bastian, Laham, Wilson,
19
20 Haslam, & Koval, 2011).
21
22
23
24

25
26 We reason that homophobic epithets portray gay men as deviant, in ways that mere category labels
27
28 or generic insults do not. Deviance is the consequences of the application of values and norms;
29
30 individuals that are perceived at odds with this normative system are judged as deviants (Becker, 1963;
31
32 Jetten & Hornsey, 2014). As far as male homosexuality as deviance is concerned, the norms are those
33
34 of hetero-normativity (i.e., the assumption that heterosexuality is the norm and all other forms of sexual
35
36 expression are, not just different, but deviant expressions of sexuality; that is something negatively
37
38 evaluated and that should be condemned; see Kimmel, 1997; LaMar & Kite, 1998). There are several
39
40 studies suggesting that homophobic epithets portray gay men as deviants. For instance, although both
41
42 category and homophobic epithets activate gay stereotypes to the same extent, only homophobic
43
44 epithets carry a negative affective connotation (Carnaghi & Maass, 2007; 2008). Moreover, when used
45
46 by primary school children, these epithets typically point to individuals that do not appear to conform
47
48 to peer norms (Plummer, 2001; Steinfeldt, Vaughan, LaFollette, & Steinfeldt, 2012; Thorne, 1993).
49
50 Furthermore, interview (e.g. Phoenix et al., 2003; Renold, 2002; Stoudt, 2006), survey (Franklin, 2000)
51
52 and experimental studies (Carnaghi et al., 2011) suggest that homophobic language goes hand in hand
53
54 with the endorsement of masculine norms highlighting the deviant nature as well as a call for
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 ‘punishment’ of those individuals that are perceived to deviate from these norms (Pascoe et al., 2011;
5
6 Plummer, 2001; Slaatten, Anderssen, & Hetland, 2014). In contrast to homophobic epithets (which
7
8 carry an insulting and distancing motivation, Carnaghi & Maass, 2006; 2008; see also Allport, 1954;
9
10 Mullen & Rice, 2003; Leader, Mullen, & Rice, 2009), category labels such as “gay” or “homosexual”
11
12 are terms used to label a social group characterized by sexual orientation, carrying nowadays less
13
14 evaluative weight than in the past. Hence, while category labels (for at least most people) have a
15
16 primarily *descriptive/denotative* function (i.e. indicating men who love/have sex with other men),
17
18 homophobic epithets have a *defensive* or *value-expressive* function (see Herek, 1990; Jewell &
19
20 Morrison, 2010). Consistent with this, Carnaghi, Maass, and Fasoli (2011) have shown that exposure to
21
22 the word “faggot” increases the tendency of heterosexual men to affirm their male identity, resulting in
23
24 differentiating themselves from gay men, but not from women, to a greater extent than “gay” or a gay-
25
26 unrelated derogatory label.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Individuals who are perceived as deviant (Vasiljevic & Viki, 2014) or as lacking in normative
34
35 standards (e.g., moral values) are more likely to be the target of dehumanization (Brandt & Reyna,
36
37 2011; Haslam et al., 2011). Thus, we argue that homophobic epithets, compared to category labels and
38
39 generic insults should elicit dehumanization of male homosexuals. That is, homophobic language does
40
41 not only disparage gay men but also places the spotlight on them as deviants, exposing them to
42
43 dehumanization. Those who are perceived as violating values, especially ingroup values (Greenhalgh &
44
45 Watt, 2014), or behaving in an anti-normative manner are indeed appraised as less human (Vasiljlieck
46
47 & Viki, 2014).
48
49
50

51
52 In our work we test whether homophobic epithets lead to a denial of uniquely-human qualities
53
54 (Haslam, 2006), a form of dehumanization associated with viewing others as more like animals.
55
56 Specifically, we expect that priming participants with homophobic epithets should decrease the
57
58 attribution of these uniquely human characteristics to gay men. While the impact of homophobic
59
60

1
2
3
4 epithets (Carnaghi & Maass, 2007; 2008) on valence has been already shown, the prediction that they
5
6 would have dehumanizing consequences has not been tested. If homophobic epithets lead to the
7
8 dehumanization of gay men, this speaks to the capacity of homophobic language to have more severe
9
10 consequences for gay men than those suggested by research to date.
11
12

13
14 We also tested the impact of homophobic epithets on physical distance. Maintaining social-
15
16 psychological distance from derogated individuals has emerged in studies about derogatory ethnic
17
18 labels (Leader, Mullen, & Rice, 2009), but has not been tested with regard to homophobic epithets and
19
20 actual behavior. Previous research has shown that people tend to maintain physical distance toward
21
22 individuals labeled as deviant, perceived as dissimilar and negatively stereotyped (Heinemann,
23
24 Pellander, Vogelbusch, & Wojtek, 1981; Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, & Jetten, 1994; Skitka,
25
26 Bauman, & Sargis, 2005; Snyder & Endelman, 1979). Moreover, physical distancing is a way to
27
28 protect the self from physical and psychological contagion (Kurzban & Leary, 2001; Park, Faulkner, &
29
30 Schaller, 2003). In this regard, it should be noted that some authors have argued that antigay prejudice
31
32 is related to perceived threat to heterosexuals' health and values (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). This fear
33
34 of contagion at the psychological as well as at the physical level should be particularly salient in
35
36 heterosexuals when gay men are labelled in a disparaging way. This is because homophobic epithets
37
38 can stress gay deviance, and thus, the "threat" that gay's pose. Hence, compared to category labels or
39
40 generic insults, we expect homophobic epithets to be more likely to induce physical distancing from a
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
gay man.

Overview of the studies and hypotheses

53 The aim of the present research was to examine whether exposure to homophobic epithets would
54
55 enhance responses observed in response to exposure to deviance: dehumanization and physical
56
57 distancing. Across two studies, we manipulated the type of label heterosexual participants were
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 exposed to (i.e., homophobic epithet, category label and generic insult), and investigated how this
5
6 affected dehumanization assessed as the denial of human qualities (Studies 1 and 2). Moreover, the
7
8 effects of homophobic epithets were assessed in two different cultural contexts (Italy, Study 1;
9
10 Australia, Study 2), using different manipulations. Finally, in Study 2 we also included a measure of
11
12 physical distance toward a gay person. We expect that, compared to category labels and generic insult,
13
14 exposure to homophobic epithet would lead heterosexual participants to dehumanize gay men and to
15
16 physically distance themselves more from a gay target.
17
18
19

20 21 22 **Study 1** 23

24 This study investigated the effect of homophobic slurs on the dehumanization of gay men,
25
26 comparing the impact of a homophobic epithet with exposure to the category group label. Moreover, to
27
28 establish whether the effect of homophobic epithets is caused by their homophobic content and not just
29
30 by their negative valence, we included an experimental condition in which an equally negative but gay-
31
32 irrelevant slur (i.e., generic insult) was presented. In this way we ensured that it was not the mere
33
34 exposure to any offensive term, but rather to the specific representation elicited by this class of anti-gay
35
36 labels, that produced any dehumanization.
37
38
39

40 We exposed participants to the different types of labels (homophobic vs. category vs. generic insult)
41
42 and measured the attribution of humanness to homosexuals and heterosexuals. We predicted that,
43
44 compared to the category label and generic insult conditions, when heterosexual participants have been
45
46 exposed to homophobic epithets, they would show a higher level of dehumanization of homosexuals,
47
48 by decreasing the attribution of human-related words to this group.¹ Similarly, we expect higher
49
50 dehumanization (i.e., lower attribution of human-related words) of homosexuals after exposure to a
51
52 homophobic epithet than to a generic insult. This would show that it is the homophobic content, and
53
54 not the mere negative tone of these epithets, that decreases the attribution of humanity to homosexuals.
55
56
57
58
59
60

Method

Participants

Ninety-five Italian students (59 males; $M_{age} = 23.56$, $SD = 4.87$) participated voluntarily in the study. Two male participants who identified themselves as homosexuals were excluded from analyses, leaving 93 heterosexual participants in the final sample. Participants were randomly assigned to and equally distributed ($N = 31$) across conditions.

Materials

Prime-words. The words *omosessuale* [homosexual] and *gay* were used as prime for the category labels, while *frocio* [faggot] and *culattone* [fairy] for the homophobic epithet condition. These labels have been used in previous research (Carnaghi & Maass, 2007; Carnaghi et al., 2011) and are differently perceived in terms of valence. Homophobic epithets are clearly more offensive than category labels (Carnaghi & Maass, 2008; Carnaghi et al., 2011), although they refer to the same sexual minority group, gay men (Carnaghi et al., 2011). We included a condition in which participants were primed with a generic insult that is *coglione* [asshole]. This slur does not differ from the homophobic epithets in terms of valence and offensiveness (Carnaghi & Maass, 2008) but it is unrelated to sexual orientation and does not activate a deviant representation of the target from heteronormativity. Moreover, it is a generic insult that in Italian, due to the grammatical gender, is applicable to male individuals.²

Human and animal related words. Ten human-related and ten animal-related words were used as stimuli for the dehumanization tasks. These stimuli have been used in other recent studies assessing dehumanization (i.e., Piccoli, Foroni, & Carnaghi, 2013) and were also pilot tested for the present study. A sample of university students ($N = 15$, 7 males, $M_{age} = 22.33$, $SD = 1.65$) rated these words and others on humanity and valence (7-points scale for humanity; 1 = very animal-like; 7 = very human-like and for valence; 1 = completely negative; 7 = completely positive, see also Viki et al., 2006; Study

1
2
3
4 4). The 10 human-related words ($M = 6.34$, $SD = .31$) were judged on average as more human than the
5
6 animal-related words ($M = 2.45$, $SD = .61$), $t(14) = 19.84$, $p < .001$, $d = 10.60$, 95% CI [3.472, 4.314].
7
8 Moreover, the mean rating of each of the 10 chosen human-related words were all significantly above
9
10 the scale mid-point (all $t_s > 3.63$, $p_s < .003$). The mean of each of the animal-related word was below
11
12 the scale midpoint ($t_s > -2.51$, $p_s < .02$). Importantly, human and animal-related words did not differ in
13
14 terms of their valence, $t(14) = .44$, $p = .66$, $d = .23$, 95% CI [-.230, .350] (animal-related: $M = 4.53$, SD
15
16 = .47, and human-related: $M = 4.59$, $SD = .60$). The ten animal-related words were: pedigree
17
18 [pedigree], natura [nature], animale [animal], specie [species], meticcio [mongrel], zampa [paw],
19
20 selvaggio [wild], branco [herd], istinti [instinct], cucciolo [cub]); and ten human-related words: (i.e.
21
22 cittadino [citizen], capelli [hair], bocca [mouth], gente [folk], persona [person], etnia [ethnic], cultura
23
24 [culture], faccia [face], umano [human] and piede [feet]).³
25
26
27
28
29

30 Procedure

31
32
33 Participants were recruited in the libraries and public areas of an Italian university. They were told
34
35 that the experiment comprised two distinct tasks. Specifically, they were informed that the researchers
36
37 were investigating the way people freely associate concepts. As part of the cover story, they first
38
39 received a *free association task*. Following the procedure outlined by Carnaghi et al. (2011),
40
41 participants were presented with 5 stimuli-words and they were asked to write down the first three
42
43 concepts that came to their mind. Participants first read 4 filler stimulus words (i.e., sun, American,
44
45 crapper, table), after which they were exposed to the prime stimulus word. Depending on the
46
47 experimental condition, the prime-word was either a category label (i.e., *gay* or *omosessuale*
48
49 [homosexual]), a homophobic epithet (i.e., *frocio* [faggot] or *culattone* [fairy]) or a generic insult (i.e.,
50
51 *coglione* [asshole]). Once participants completed the task, they were instructed to return to each
52
53 associated word they generated and rate how closely related it was to the stimulus-word on a 3-point
54
55 scale from 1 (completely irrelevant) to 3 (completely relevant). Differently from Carnaghi and Maass
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 (2008), participants rated the relevance, instead of the valence, of their associations with the stimuli-
5
6 words to avoid enhancing the salience of the evaluative dimension of their associations.³
7
8

9 Next, participants were introduced to the *dehumanization measure*. They were told that the task
10 examined the way people associated concepts with social categories. Specifically, they were told that
11 each participant would rate two randomly selected groups, and in their case these groups turned out to
12 be heterosexuals and homosexuals. Following Viki et al.'s (2006) procedure, they were presented with
13 twenty words and asked to select at least 8-10 words that they would associate with heterosexuals and
14 homosexuals (the order in which words had to be assigned to heterosexuals and homosexuals was
15 counterbalanced). The twenty words comprised ten animal-related words and ten human-related words.
16 Two randomly generated word orders were created and counterbalanced across participants. Note that
17 this measure of dehumanization is ipsative (Viki, Osgood, & Phillips, 2013). Hence, the number of
18 selected animal- and human-related words is related and analyses focused on attributions of human-
19 related words.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 At the end of the questionnaire, among other scales, we measured participants' frequency of contact
36 with homosexuals (in their circle of friends, acquaintance, work/university colleagues and neighbors;
37 Van Dick et al., 2004), as well as the number of homosexual friends. Finally, participants completed
38 the *Inclusion of Other in the Self scale* (IOS; Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992). The IOS scale is a graphic
39 measure used for representing the relationship between the self and a close other. The scale consisted
40 of seven pairs of circles, with one circle representing the self and the other circle representing the
41 homosexual person they knew best. The figures corresponded to different degrees of closeness, from
42 two close but not overlapping circles, to two almost completely overlapping circles. Participants had to
43 choose the figure that best represented their relation with the homosexual person they knew best.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 At the end of the questionnaire participants indicated their gender, age, sexual orientation, and they
57 were debriefed.
58
59
60

Results

Preliminary analysis

Participants reported that they had 4 homosexual friends on average. No differences between experimental conditions emerged on frequency of contact, $F(1, 90) = 1.05, p = .35, \eta_p^2 = .02$, and closeness (IOS), $F(1, 89) = 1.54, p = .22, \eta_p^2 = .03$. Preliminary analyses revealed that participant gender did not affect the interpretation of any of the effects reported below.

Dehumanization

For each participant, human-related and animal-related words associated with heterosexuals and homosexuals were summed. Although participants were invited to choose between 8 and 10 words, there was variability in the total number of words they selected. We created an index for each group by dividing the number of selected human-related words by the total number of selected words. This index was entered in a 2 (Group: heterosexuals vs. homosexuals) x 3 (Condition: category label vs. homophobic epithet vs. generic insult). The first variable was treated as within-participants and the other as a between-participants factor.⁴

The expected interaction between Group and Condition was significant, $F(2, 90) = 3.98, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .08$. Pairwise analyses corrected for multiple comparisons (Bonferroni's correction) showed that words were differently attributed to homosexuals across conditions, $F(2, 90) = 6.75, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .13$. The proportion of human-related words attributed to homosexuals was lower in the homophobic epithet ($M = .52, SD = .17$) than in the category label condition ($M = .64, SD = .16; p = .003, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.228, -.036]$) and in the generic insult condition ($M = .63, SD = .13; p = .01, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.212, -.020]$). No difference emerged between the category label and generic insult conditions ($p = 1.00, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.080, .112]$). No significant differences between conditions emerged for the human-related words associated with the heterosexual target group, $F(2, 90) = .40, p = .67, \eta_p^2 = .009$, suggesting that the type of label

1
2
3
4 did not influence the perception of heterosexuals' humanity (see Figure 1).
5
6

7 Several additional effects were identified which were not critical to hypotheses. A significant main
8 effect of condition, $F(2, 90) = 3.89, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .08$, indicated that participants chose less human-
9 related words in the homophobic epithet ($M = .57, SD = .11$) than the category label ($M = .65, SD = .13$;
10 $p = .04, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.155, -.002]$) and generic insult condition ($M = .62, SD = .13; p = .06, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.149,$
11 $.003]$). A significant main effect of Group, $F(1, 90) = 5.22, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .05$, suggested instead that
12 participants attributed overall more human-related words to heterosexuals ($M = .64, SD = .14$) than
13 homosexuals ($M = .60, SD = .16; 95\% \text{ CI } [.005, .071]$). However, these effects were qualified by the
14 interaction discussed above.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Discussion*

26
27 Results of Study 1 showed that exposure to homophobic epithets fostered dehumanization of
28 homosexuals. When participants were confronted with a homophobic epithet (compared to a category
29 label or a generic insult), we found a significant decrease in the proportion of human-related words
30 attributed to homosexuals. Thus, dehumanization of homosexuals was unique to the homophobic
31 epithet condition, and not to generic insult or category labels, suggesting that it is the specific anti-gay
32 content and not only the offensiveness of the label or the categorization itself that influenced the
33 dehumanization of the target group. The current results highlight that the effects of homophobic
34 epithets go beyond the mere negative evaluation of the target as they affect the extent to which
35 heterosexuals see homosexuals as human beings.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Study 2**

51
52 In Study 2 we aimed to consolidate and extend the results of Study 1 in several respects. First, to
53 broaden the generalizability of the dehumanization findings beyond a single linguistic and cultural
54 context, this study was conducted in Australia (and in English). Second, one weakness of Study 1 was
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 that explicit exposure to a homophobic label may have signaled that anti-gay attitudes were tolerated, if
5
6 not promoted, by the experimenter (Lehavot & Lambert, 2007). In order to provide greater assurance
7
8 that dehumanization specifically arises from exposure to homophobic epithets rather than to other
9
10 contextual variables, participants in Study 2 were subliminally presented with a homophobic epithet. In
11
12 addition, at the end of the questionnaire, for exploratory purposes we added questions to examine
13
14 whether the homophobic epithet affected the perception of the context or the tendency to “get along”
15
16 with the researcher. Third, as we aimed to establish the effect of homophobic epithets on
17
18 dehumanization, controlling for valence, in Study 2 we directly tested the attribution of both positive
19
20 and negative human-related and animal-related words to describe homosexuals and heterosexuals. That
21
22 is, words were selected so that the human-animal and the positive-negative dimensions were orthogonal
23
24 (see Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001).
25
26
27
28
29

30 Moreover, we examined whether homophobic epithets, compared to category labels and generic
31
32 insult, increase physical distancing, often observed as a reaction to deviant people (see Heinemann et
33
34 al., 1981).
35
36
37

38 *Method*

39 **Participants**

40
41
42
43 Sixty-one participants (28 males and 33 females) took part in the study in return for 10 Australian
44
45 dollars. Their age ranged from 17 to 50 years ($M_{\text{age}} = 22.90$, $SD = 5.20$). One homosexual participant
46
47 was excluded from the analyses, leaving a sample of 60. Participants were randomly assigned to and
48
49 equally distributed ($N = 20$) across conditions.
50
51
52

53 **Materials**

54
55
56 *Prime-words.* Three different prime-words were used: *gay* as a category label, *faggot* as a
57
58 homophobic epithet and *asshole* as a generic insult. As in Study 1 no differences between labels of the
59
60

1
2
3
4 same category were found, we relied here on the most common label of each type (i.e., *gay*, *faggot* and
5
6 *asshole*).⁵
7
8

9 ***Human and animal related words.*** Ten human related and ten animal related words were used as
10
11 stimuli for the dehumanization tasks. In this case both positive and negative human and animal related
12
13 words were included. These stimuli-words were exactly the same as those used by Viki et al. (2006;
14
15 Study 4).
16
17

18 **Procedure**

19
20 Participants were recruited through advertisements posted on the university website and they were
21
22 informed that the study consisted of three separate tasks that were combined for time reasons. They
23
24 were told the study included a computer task to assess ability in estimation of even and odd quantity of
25
26 dots in a speed task, a discussion with another student about a topic suggested by the researcher, and a
27
28 short questionnaire about attitudes and beliefs towards different groups.
29
30
31

32
33 In particular, participants were first introduced to a computer task in which they had to indicate if
34
35 the number of circles presented on the screen was even or odd. Following Chen and Bargh (1997; see
36
37 also Carnaghi et al., 2011) this task served as the experimental manipulation. Depending on the
38
39 condition, participants were subliminally primed (13 ms) with a category label (i.e., *gay*), a
40
41 homophobic epithet (i.e., *faggot*) or a generic insult (i.e., *asshole*). The task consisted of 40 trials. On
42
43 each trial the subliminal prime was followed by a first mask (a series of 13 black cross-hatched) and by
44
45 a second mask (a number of circles randomly presented on the screen) for 13 ms each. Then,
46
47 participants were asked to indicate as quickly and accurately as possible if the number of circles
48
49 (randomly varying between 5 and 25) presented in a target picture was even or odd, pressing one of
50
51 two response-keys on the keyboard. Reaction times were not recorded as the task served only as a
52
53 manipulation.
54
55
56
57

58
59 Next, participants were informed that the following task involved a discussion with another student.
60

1
2
3
4 Specifically, they were told they were going to meet a person to talk about issues at the university that
5 are of relevance to gay people and that, because of the topic, they would discuss these issues with a gay
6 man whose name was Mark, a student of the same age as the participant. The room in which the
7 experiment took place contained a number of chairs stacked close to a table. The researcher mentioned
8 that he had to call Mark in and asked the participant to prepare the room for the interaction. Participants
9 were asked to take two chairs, one for themselves and one for Mark, and to place them in the room
10 wherever they wanted. The initial positioning of chairs and furniture was arranged in such a way that
11 there was free space in the center of the room to create a setting for the interaction. Following Novelli
12 and colleagues' (Novelli, Drury, & Reichen, 2010) procedure, measures were taken of each of the four
13 leg-to-leg distances plus the distance between the middle of the front edge of the base of the seats.
14 Then, a physical distance index was formed based on the mean of the five measurements.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 While the researcher went outside the laboratory to supposedly find Mark, participants completed a
31 questionnaire. Participants were first asked to report demographic information (i.e., age, gender, and
32 sexual orientation) and then to complete the *dehumanization measure* (Viki et al., 2006).
33
34
35
36

37 At the very end of the questionnaire, among other scales participants were asked to indicate their
38 number of homosexual friends and to indicate their closeness to the homosexual friend they knew
39 better on the IOS scale (Aron et al., 1992). To assess tolerance of discrimination towards gay men
40 (*social norms*), participants were asked to indicate how much they thought it was socially acceptable to
41 use certain labels to describe people. Three of these labels were similar to the primes used in the study
42 (i.e., *gay*, *faggot*, *asshole*) and two other labels were fillers (i.e., *bitch* for women and *boong* for
43 Australian Aboriginals). Participants provided their responses on a 5-point scale, ranging from 1 (not at
44 all) to 5 (very much). We also assessed participants tendency to get along with the researcher using 5
45 items adapted from Lun, Sinclair, Whitchurch and Glenn (2007; e.g., "How friendly was the
46 researcher?", "How smooth was the interaction with the researcher?" and "How much have you tried to
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 agree with the researcher's opinion?", $\alpha = .88$). Another item was aimed to assess the perceived
5
6 homophobic attitudes of the researcher (i.e., "How important do you think not being homophobic is to
7
8 the researcher?"). Participants answered on 7-point scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). Finally,
9
10 they were thanked and debriefed.
11
12

13 *Results*

14 **Preliminary analyses**

15
16 Participants reported to have between 3 and 4 homosexual friends on average. Across conditions, no
17
18 difference on frequency of contact was observed, $F(1, 55) = 2.52, p = .09, \eta_p^2 = .08$, nor for closeness
19
20 (IOS), $F(1, 55) = 1.91, p = .16, \eta_p^2 = .06$. Findings reported below were not affected by participants'
21
22 gender and gender will therefore not be examined further.
23
24
25
26

27
28 To test whether homophobic epithets affected the perception of context, we conducted a 3 (Term:
29
30 gay vs. faggot vs. asshole) x 3 (Condition: category label vs. homophobic epithet vs. generic insult)
31
32 analysis of variance on the measure assessing the social acceptability of labels, where the first was a
33
34 within-participants and the last two between-participants factors. Analysis yielded a main effect of
35
36 Term, $F(2, 114) = 52.83, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .48$. Pairwise multiple comparison (Bonferroni's correction)
37
38 showed that *gay* ($M = 3.40, SD = 1.14$) was rated as more acceptable than *faggot* ($M = 1.72, SD = .99$;
39
40 $p < .001, 95\% CI [1.332, 2.034]$) and *asshole* ($M = 2.65, SD = 1.25; p < .001, 95\% CI [.402, 1.098]$).
41
42
43
44 Condition did not affect participants' evaluation and no significant interaction was found ($F_s < 1.83, p_s$
45
46 $> .13$).
47
48

49
50 The tendency to get along with the researcher was also analyzed in a 3 (Condition: category label vs.
51
52 homophobic epithet vs. generic insult) analysis of variance. Results revealed no significant effect of
53
54 condition, $F(2, 57) = .90, p = .41, \eta_p^2 = .03$, suggesting that exposure to a homophobic epithet
55
56 (compared to a category label or a generic insult), did not differently affect perceptions of the
57
58 researcher.
59
60

Dehumanization

As in Study 1, we divided the number of positive and negative human-related words associated with each group by the total number of selected words. A 2 (Group: heterosexuals vs. homosexuals) x 2 (Word Valence: positive vs. negative) x 3 Condition (category label vs. homophobic epithet vs. generic insult) repeated measures analysis of variance was performed on participants' human-related words attribution. The first two factors were treated as within-participant factors, whereas the last one was a between-participant factor.

The predicted interaction between Group and Condition was significant, $F(2, 57) = 5.14, p = .009, \eta_p^2 = .15$. Pairwise analyses corrected for multiple comparison (Bonferroni's correction) revealed that labels affected participants attribution of human-related words to homosexuals, $F(2, 57) = 4.92, p = .01, \eta_p^2 = .15$. Less human-related words were attributed to homosexuals in the homophobic epithet ($M = .26, SD = .04$) than both the category label ($M = .32, SD = .07, p = .01, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.121, -.009]$) and the generic insult ($M = .32, SD = .09, p = .04, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.113, -.002]$) condition. No difference emerged between category label and generic insult condition ($p = 1.00, 95\% \text{ CI } [-.048, .063]$). No differences emerged in attribution of human-related words to heterosexual across conditions, $F(2, 57) = .33, p = .72, \eta_p^2 = .01$.

Additional effects were found, but they did not affect the expected interaction. A main effect of Valence, $F(1, 57) = 69.10, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .55$, showed that participants selected overall more positive ($M = .37, SD = .10$) than negative human-related words ($M = .21, SD = .08; 95\% \text{ CI } [.118, .193]$). No other significant effects or interactions emerged ($F_s > 2.57, p_s < .11$).

Physical distance

We conducted a univariate analysis of variance on the physical distance index with Condition (category label vs. homophobic epithet vs. generic insult) as between-participants variable. A main effect of Condition, $F(2, 56) = 3.67, p = .03, \eta_p^2 = .12$, was found. As shown by pairwise analyses

1
2
3
4 corrected for multiple comparison (Bonferroni's correction) participants tended to sit further away
5
6 from the gay man when they were primed with the homophobic epithet ($M = 107.72$, $SD = 15.71$) than
7
8 with the generic insult ($M = 97.61$, $SD = 9.16$; $p = .04$, 95% CI [.312, 19.907]). The same non-
9
10 significant trend emerged between homophobic epithet and category label ($M = 99.63$, $SD = 11.23$; $p =$
11
12 $.13$, 95% CI [-.652, 16.83]) condition. The category label and the generic insult condition did not differ
13
14 ($p = 1.00$, 95% CI [-7.78, 11.82]).
15
16

17 18 19 **Correlation Analyses**

20
21 For exploratory purposes, we examined the relationship between dehumanization and physical
22
23 distance. Correlational analyses between the indexes of positive and negative human-related words, for
24
25 both groups, and sitting distance were not significant ($r_s < .06$, $p_s > .17$), suggesting that the two
26
27 measures were not strongly related.
28
29

30 31 32 **Discussion**

33
34 Study 2 provided further evidence of the consequences of exposure to a homophobic epithet on
35
36 dehumanization and physical distance. Results of Study 1 were replicated in a different cultural
37
38 context. As in Study 1, compared to a category label or a generic insult condition, when homosexuals
39
40 were portrayed in a homophobic way, heterosexual participants decreased their attribution of human-
41
42 related words to homosexuals – indicating a tendency to dehumanize them. In fact, dehumanization of
43
44 homosexuals emerged only when participants were subjected to target-specific slurs (i.e., *faggot*) rather
45
46 than a generic insult (i.e., *asshole*), showing again that it the specific nature, and not the negative tone
47
48 of the labels *per se*, that induced the denial of humanness to homosexuals. This tendency disappeared
49
50 when participants were exposed to a homophobic epithet. This result was not found in Study 1, and it
51
52 may be explained by the differences in the two cultural contexts especially in terms of attitudes toward
53
54 gay men between countries as Australia is a less homophobic country than Italy (Kelly, 2001). Finally,
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 as we did not find any interaction with valence of words, we suggest that homophobic epithets seem to
5
6 have an impact on group perception that goes beyond the mere negative evaluation of the target.
7
8

9 Study 2 showed also that the exposure to a homophobic epithet affected heterosexuals' non-verbal
10
11 behavior in a way consistent with that toward deviants. When encountering homophobic slurs
12
13 participant tended to maintain greater physical distance from a gay man. Importantly, these effects
14
15 emerged even though participants were not explicitly primed with homophobic labels.
16
17
18

19 **General discussion**

20
21 The use of homophobic epithets is one of the most common ways to point out homosexuals'
22
23 deviance from heteronormativity (Plummer, 2001; Preston & Stanley, 1987). The present research
24
25 extended previous findings by showing such responses to deviance on two indicators: dehumanization
26
27 and physical distancing. Results showed that after exposure to a homophobic epithet, compared to a
28
29 category label or generic insult, heterosexual participants were more likely to deny humanness to
30
31 homosexuals. Importantly, dehumanization of homosexuals emerged both when the homophobic
32
33 epithet was supraliminally (Study 1) or subliminally (Study 2) presented. These results highlight the
34
35 possibility that homophobic language can affect heterosexuals' reactions even when it is not explicit.
36
37 Moreover, in Study 2 we found evidence that homophobic epithets impacted on heterosexuals' actual
38
39 behavior, increasing tendency to physically distance themselves from a gay man they expected to
40
41 interact with.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Our work extends previous literature in several respects. First, our findings show that homophobic
49
50 epithets are more than just negative words that promote less positive perception of homosexuals
51
52 (Carnaghi & Maass, 2007; 2008). Homophobic epithets, but not category labels or gay-unrelated
53
54 insults, seem to function as indicators of deviance, and this contributes to perception of homosexuals as
55
56 belonging to a lower order of humanity. In doing so, homophobic epithets potentially expose gay men
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 to a range of severe consequences (see Vaes et al., 2012) such as excluding homosexuals from moral
5 concern, enhancing tolerance for gay stigma and discrimination (see Viki, Fullerton, Raggett, Tait &
6
7
8
9 Witshire, 2012), and even for violence against them (Viki et al., 2013).

10
11 Second, homophobic epithets seem to prompt behavioral distancing. This finding contributes to the
12 idea that physical distance is associated with deviance (Heinemann, 1981). In our study, physical
13 distance was particularly elicited by homophobic epithets rather than general insults, suggesting that it
14 is the homophobic, deviance-marker contents of these labels, rather than the negative tone, that led
15 participants to distancing from an outgroup member. Furthermore, to our knowledge, this was the first
16 time the non-verbal behavioral consequences of homophobic epithets have been tested. This second
17 finding highlights how subtle but also far-reaching the effects of homophobic epithets can be.

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 Third, these findings not only contribute to the understanding of the consequences of homophobic
29 epithets, but also to the understanding of factors that elicit dehumanization. Besides factors like
30 intergroup boundaries (i.e., status and power), ideologies (i.e., justification of wrongdoing), and
31 intergroup relations (i.e., conflict, in-group identification; see Vaes et al., 2012), we suggest that
32 linguistic factors, such as derogatory group labels, can similarly be a source of dehumanization of the
33 target of such slurs. Hence, we could refer to homophobic epithets as a “language of dehumanization”.

41 42 **Limitations**

43
44 Although dehumanization and physical distancing may both be triggered by representing
45 homosexuality and homosexual as deviant, the two measures were not related. The absence of a
46 relation may be due to the fact that these two measures differed in many respects. One mostly refers to
47 deviation from “moral” values and was assessed as perception of the target by attributing words. The
48 other is a non-verbal behavior measured as distance from the target in centimeters. To better understand
49 the relation between dehumanization and physical distance, in future research it may be fruitful to use
50 measures that can be directly compared. Moreover, although our findings support the rationale of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 homophobic epithets as deviance-markers, the link between dehumanization and the representation of
5
6
7 gay men as deviant prompted by homophobic epithets needs to be experimentally tested. In this regard,
8
9
10 other motivational processes could be examined. The representation of gay men elicited by
11
12
13 homophobic epithet may activate self-protection motives as well as emphasize group boundaries and
14
15
16 ingroup identification, especially in heterosexual men (see Bahns & Branscombe, 2010; Carnaghi et al.,
17
18
19 2011). In this regard, homophobic epithets may enhance fear of contagion in heterosexuals (see Cottrell
20
21
22 & Neuberg, 2005), that in turn leads to protective reactions such as physical distancing (see Kurzban &
23
24
25 Leary, 2001; Park et al., 2003). In doing so, heterosexuals avoid to be seen as related to gay men and as
26
27
28 accepting the deviance they pose. Moreover, homophobic epithets may elicit disgust. Disgust is likely
29
30
31 to emerge when a group values threat is observed (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005) and is an emotion related
32
33
34 to dehumanization and avoidance (Buckels & Trapnell, 2013; Hodson & Costello, 2007; see also
35
36
37 Navarrete & Fessler, 2006; Rozin, Haidt, & McCauley, 2000).

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Another point that remains to be seen is whether these effects of derogatory labels might have a
similar (or distinct) impact when examined in relation to lesbians or other minorities. Addressing these
issues can be fruitful avenues for future research, as well as replicating these finding with larger sample
sizes and a more balanced number of male and female participants.

Conclusion

Homophobic language is common. We demonstrate here that homophobic epithets impact the
extent to which heterosexuals perceived homosexual men as human beings and how they act towards
them. Our findings show that homophobic epithets are more than just common slurs as they are
deviance markers. Their impact is not merely increasing negative attitudes toward and evaluation of a
target. It goes beyond that as their specific nature induces heterosexuals dehumanizing and maintaining
distance from gay men, with all the risks that this implies for discrimination and both intergroup and
interpersonal relations. In so doing, homophobic language may be important ways in which

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

homophobia is reinforced and maintained.

For Peer Review

References

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.
- 8
9 Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the self scale and the structure of
10 interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *63*, 596-612. doi:
11 10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.596
12
13
14
- 15 Bahns, A. J., & Branscombe, N. R. (2011). Effects of legitimizing discrimination against homosexuals
16 on gay bashing. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *41*, 388-396. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.784
17
18
- 19 Bain, P. G. (2014). The structure and content of the human category, and its implications for
20 understanding dehumanization. In P. G. Bain, J. Vaes & J.-P. Leyens (Eds.), *Humanness and*
21 *dehumanization* (pp. 227-255). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
22
23
24
- 25 Bastian B., & Haslam, N. (2010) Excluded from humanity: The dehumanising effects of social
26 ostracism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*, 107-113.
27 doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2009.06.022
28
29
30
- 31 Bastian, B., Laham, S. M., Wilson, S., Haslam, N. and Koval, P. (2011), Blaming, praising, and
32 protecting our humanity: The implications of everyday dehumanization for judgments of moral
33 status. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*, 469-483. doi: 10.1348/014466610X521383
34
35
36
- 37 Becker, H.W. (1963). *Outsiders: Studies in the sociology of deviance*. New York: The Free Press.
- 38
39
- 40 Brandt, M. J., & Reyna, C. (2011). The chain of being: A hierarchy of morality. *Perspectives on*
41 *Psychological Science*, *6*, 428-446. doi: 10.1177/1745691611414587
42
43
- 44 Brown, N., & Hegarty, P. (2005). Attributing primary and secondary emotions to lesbians and gay
45 men: Denying a human essence or gender stereotype? *Lesbian & Gay Psychology Review*, *6*, 16-22
46
47
- 48 Buckels, E. E., & Trapnell, P. D. (2013). Disgust facilitates outgroup dehumanization. *Group*
49 *Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *16*, 771-780. doi:10.1177/1368430212471738
50
51
- 52 Carnaghi, A., & Maas, A. (2006). The effects of the derogatory group labels on the behavioral
53 responses. *Psicologia sociale*, *1*(1), 121-132. doi: 10.1482/21504
54
55
- 56 Carnaghi, A., Maass, A. (2007). In-group and Out-group perspectives in the use of derogatory group
57 label: *gay vs. fag*. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, *26*, 142-156. doi:
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 10.1177/0261927X07300077
5
6

7 Carnaghi, A., Maass, A. (2008). Gay or Fag? On the consequences of derogatory labels. In, Yoshi
8 Kashima, Klaus Fielder, Peter Freytag (Eds.), *Stereotype Dynamics: Language-Based Approaches*
9 *to Stereotype Formation, Maintenance, and Transformation*. Laurence Erlbaum Associates (p.
10 117-134).
11

12
13
14 Carnaghi, A., Maass, A., & Fasoli, F. (2011). Enhancing masculinity by slandering homosexuals: The
15 role of homophobic epithets in heterosexual gender identity. *Personality and Social Psychology*
16 *Bulletin*, 37, 1655-1665. doi: 10.1177/0146167211424167
17

18
19
20 Chen, M., & Bargh, J. A. (1997). Nonconscious behavioral confirmation processes: The self-fulfilling
21 nature of automatically-activated stereotypes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 541-
22 560. doi: 10.1006/jesp.1997.1329
23

24
25
26 Cortes, B. P., Demoulin, S., Rodriguez, R. T., Rodriguez, A. P., & Leyens, J. Ph. (2005). Infra-
27 humanization or familiarity ? Attribution of uniquely human emotions to the self, the ingroup, and
28 the outgroup. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 243-253. doi:
29 10.1177/0146167204271421
30

31
32
33
34 Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A
35 sociofunctional threat-based approach to prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social*
36 *Psychology*, 88, 770. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.88.5.770
37

38
39
40 D'Augelli, A. R., & Hershberger, S. L. (1993). Lesbian, gay, and bisexual youth in community settings:
41 Personal challenges and mental health problems. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 21,
42 421-448. doi:10.1007/BF00942151
43

44
45
46 Demoulin, S., Cortes, B. P., Viki, T. G., Rodriguez, A. P., Rodriguez, R. T., Paladino, M. P., &
47 Leyens, J. Ph. (2009). The role of ingroup identification in infra-humanization. *International*
48 *Journal of Psychology*, 44, 4-11. doi: 10.1080/00207590802057654
49

50
51
52 Franklin, K. (2000). Antigay behaviors among young adults - Prevalence, patterns, and motivators in a
53 noncriminal population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 339 -362.
54
55 doi:10.1177/088626000015004001
56

57
58 Greenhalgh, E. M., & Watt, S. E. (2014). Preference for consistency and value dissimilarities in
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 dehumanization and prejudice toward asylum seekers in Australia. *European Journal of Social*
5 *Psychology*. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2066
6
7
8
9 Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology*
10 *Review*, 10(3), 252-264. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4
11
12
13 Haslam, N., Bastian, B., Laham, S. M., & Loughnan, S. (2011). Morality and humanness. In M.
14 Mikulincer & P. Shaver (Eds.), *The psychology of good and evil*. Washington, DC: APA Press (pp.
15 203-218).
16
17
18
19 Haslam, N., Loughnan, S., & Sun, P. (2011). Beastly: What makes animal metaphor
20 offensive?. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 30, 311-325. doi:
21 10.1177/0261927X11407168
22
23
24
25 Haslam, N., & Loughnan, S. (2012). Prejudice and dehumanization. *Beyond Prejudice: Extending the*
26 *Social Psychology of Conflict, Inequality and Social Change*, 89.
27
28
29 Herek, G. M. (1990). The Context of Anti-Gay Violence Notes on Cultural and Psychological
30 Heterosexism. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 316-333. doi: 10.1177/088626090005003006
31
32
33 Herek G. M. (2000). The psychology of sexual prejudice. *Current Direction in Psychological Science*,
34 9, 19-22. doi: 10.1111/1467-8721.00051
35
36
37 Herek, G. M. (2004). Beyond "homophobia": Thinking about sexual prejudice and stigma in the
38 twenty-first century. *Sexuality Research & Social Policy*, 1, 6-24.
39
40
41 Herek, G. M., Cogan, J. C., & Gills, J. R. (2002). Victim experiences in hate crimes based on sexual
42 orientation. *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 319-339. doi: 10.1111/1540-4560.00263
43
44
45 Heinemann, W., Pellander, F., Vogelbusch, A., & Wojtek, B. (1981). Meeting a deviant person:
46 Subjective norms and affective reactions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 11, 1-25. doi:
47 10.1002/ejsp.2420110101
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
60 Jewell, L.M., & Morrison, M.A. (2010). "But there's a million jokes about everybody:" Prevalence of,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

and reasons for, directing negative behaviours toward gay men on a Canadian university campus.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 25, 2094-2112. doi: 10.1177/0886260509354499

Jetten, J., & Hornsey, M. J. (2014). Deviance and dissent in groups. *Annual review of psychology*, 65, 461-485. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115151

Kelley, J. (2001). Attitudes towards homosexuality in 29 nations. *Australian Social Monitor*, 4, 15-22.

Kimmel, M. S. (1997). Masculinity as homophobia: Fear, shame and silence in the construction of gender identity. In M. M. Gergen & S. N. Davis (Eds), *Toward a new psychology of gender* (pp. 223-242). New York : Routledge.

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., & Diaz, E. M. (2009). Who, what, where, when, and why: Demographic and ecological factors contributing to hostile school climate for lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 38(7), 976–988. doi: 10.1007/s10964-009-9412-1

Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. R. (2001). Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: the functions of social exclusion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 187-208. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.127.2.187

LaMar, L., & Kite, M. (1998). Sex differences in attitudes toward gay men and lesbians: A multidimensional perspective. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 35, 189-196. doi: 10.1080/00224499809551932

Leader, T., Mullen, B., & Rice, D. (2009). Complexity and valence in ethnophobias and exclusion of ethnic out-groups: what puts the "hate" into hate speech?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(1), 170. doi: 10.1037/a0013066

Lehavot, K., & Lambert, A. J. (2007). Toward a greater understanding of antigay prejudice: On the role of sexual orientation and gender role violation, *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 279-292. doi: 10.1080/01973530701503390

Leyens, J-P., Demoulin, S., Vaes, J., Gaunt, R. and Paladino, M. P. (2007). Infra-humanization: The Wall of Group Differences. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 1, 139–172. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-2409.2007.00006.x

Leyens J-P., Paladino M. P., Rodriguez R., Vaes J., Demoulin S., Rodriguez A., Gaunt R. (2000). The emotional side of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 4, 186-197. doi:

1
2
3
4
5 10.1207/S15327957PSPR0402_06
6

- 7 Leverenz, D. (1986). Manhood, humiliation and public life: Some stories. *Southwest Review*, 71, Fall.
- 8
- 9 Lun, J., Sinclair, S., Whitchurch, E.R., & Glenn, C. (2007). (Why) do I think what you think?
10 Epistemic social tuning and implicit prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,
11 93(6), 957-972. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.957
12
13
- 14
- 15 Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., & Jetten, J. (1994). Out of mind but back in sight:
16 Stereotypes on the rebound. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 808–817. doi:
17 10.1037/0022-3514.67.5.808
18
19
- 20
- 21 Mullen, B., & Rice, D. R. (2003). Ethnophobias and exclusion: The behavioral consequences of
22 cognitive representation of ethnic immigrant groups. *Personality and Social Psychology*
23 *Bulletin*, 29, 1056-1067. doi: 10.1177/0146167203254505
24
25
- 26
- 27 Navarrete, C. D., & Fessler, D. M. (2006). Disease avoidance and ethnocentrism: The effects of disease
28 vulnerability and disgust sensitivity on intergroup attitudes. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 27,
29 270-282. doi:10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2005.12.001
30
31
- 32
- 33 Novelli, D., Drury, J., & Reicher, S.D. (2010). Come together: Two studies concerning the impact of
34 group relations on 'personal space'. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 223-236. doi:
35 10.1348/014466609X449377
36
37
- 38
- 39 Opatow, S. (1990). Moral exclusion and injustice: An introduction. *Journal of social issues*, 46, 1-20.
40 doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.1990.tb00268.x
41
42
- 43 Paladino, M. P. & Vaes, J. (2009), Ours is human: On the pervasiveness of infra-humanization in
44 intergroup relations. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 4, 237–251.
45 doi:10.1348/014466608X322882
46
47
- 48
- 49 Park, J. H., Faulkner, J., & Schaller, M. (2003). Evolved disease-avoidance processes and
50 contemporary anti-social behavior: Prejudicial attitudes and avoidance of people with physical
51 disabilities. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 27, 65-87.
52
53
- 54
- 55 Pascoe, C. J. (2011). *Dude, You're a Fag: Masculinity and Sexuality in High School, With a New*
56 *Preface*. Univ of California Press.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4 Piccoli, V., Foroni, F., & Carnaghi, A. (2013). Comparing Group Dehumanization and Intra-Sexual
5 Competition Among Normally Ovulating Women and Hormonal Contraceptive Users. *Personality*
6 *and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 1600-1609. doi: 10.1177/0146167213499025
7
8
9
10 Phoenix, A., Frosh, S., & Pattman, R. (2003). Producing contradictory masculine subject positions:
11 Narratives of threat, homophobia and bullying in 11–14 year old boys. *Journal of Social Issues*,
12 59, 179–195. doi:10.1111/1540-4560.t01-1-00011
13
14
15
16 Plummer, D. C. (2001). The quest for modern manhood: Masculine stereotypes, peer culture and the
17 social significance of homophobia. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 1-9. doi:10.1006/jado.2000.0370
18
19
20 Renold, E. (2002). Presumed innocence - (Hetero)sexual, heterosexist and homophobic harassment
21 among primary school girls and boys. *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research*, 9, 415–
22 434. doi:10.1177/0907568202009004004
23
24
25
26 Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & McCauley, C. (2000). Disgust. In M. Lewis & J. Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of*
27 *emotions* (2nd ed., pp. 637–652). New York: Guilford Press.
28
29
30 Simon, L., & Greenberg, J. (1996). Further progress in understanding the effects of derogatory ethnic
31 labels: The role of preexisting attitudes toward the targeted group. *Personality and Social*
32 *Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 1195–1204. doi: 10.1177/01461672962212001
33
34
35
36 Slaatten, H., Anderssen, N., & Hetland, J. (2014). Endorsement of male role norms and gay-related
37 name-calling. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 15, 335-345. doi: 10.1037/a0033734
38
39
40 Skitka, L. J., Bauman, C. W., & Sargis, E. G. (2005). Moral conviction: Another contributor to attitude
41 strength or something more?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 895-917. doi :
42 10.1037/0022-3514.88.6.895
43
44
45
46 Snyder, C. R., & Endelman, J. R. (1979). Effects of degree of interpersonal similarity on physical
47 distance and self-reported attraction: A comparison of uniqueness and reinforcement theory
48 predictions. *Journal of Personality*, 47(3), 492-505. doi : 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1979.tb00628.x
49
50
51
52 Steinfeldt, J. A., Vaughan, E. L., LaFollette, J. R., & Steinfeldt, M. C. (2012). Bullying among
53 adolescent football players: Role of masculinity and moral atmosphere. *Psychology of Men &*
54 *Masculinity*, 13, 340-353. doi: 10.1037/a0026645
55
56
57
58 Stoudt, B. G. (2006). “You’re either in or you’re out” - School violence, peer discipline, and the
59
60

(re)production of hegemonic masculinity. *Men and Masculinities*, 8, 273–287.

doi:10.1177/1097184X05282070

Swim, J. K., Johnston, K., & Pearson, N. B. (2009). Daily experiences with heterosexism: Relations between heterosexist hassles and psychological well-being. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 28(5), 597-629. doi: 10.1521/jscp.2009.28.5.597

Thorne, B. (1993). *Gender play: girls and boys in school*. Buckingham: Open University Press

Vaes, J., Leyens, J-P., Paladino, M. P., & Miranda, M.M. (2012). We are human, they are not: Driving forces behind outgroup dehumanization and the humanization of the ingroup. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 23, 64-106. doi: 10.1080/10463283.2012.665250

Vaes, J., & Paladino, M. P. (2010). The uniquely human content of stereotypes. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations*, 13, 23-39. doi: 10.1177/1368430209347331

Vaes, J., Paladino, P. & Puvia, E. (2011), Are sexualized women complete human beings? Why men and women dehumanize sexually objectified women. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 774–785. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.824

Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., Pettigrew, T., Christ, O., Wolf, C., Petzel, T., Castro, V.S., & Jackson, J.S. (2004). Role of perceived importance in intergroup contact. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(2), 211-227. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.2.211

Vasiljevic, M. & Viki, G. T. (2014) Dehumanization, moral disengagement, and public attitudes to crime and punishment. In P. G. Bain, J. Vaes, and J-P. Leyens (Eds) *Humanness and dehumanization*. Psychology Press, Hove.

Viki, T. G., & Abrams, D. (2003). Infra-humanization: Ambivalent sexism and the attribution of primary and secondary emotions of women. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(5), 492-499. doi: 10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00031-3

Viki, G. T., Fullerton, I., Raggett, H., Tait, F. & Wiltshire, S. (2012). The role of dehumanization in attitudes toward the social exclusion and rehabilitation of Sex Offenders. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42, 2349–2367. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00944.x

Viki, G. T., Osgood, D., & Phillips, S. (2013). Dehumanization and self-reported proclivity to torture prisoners of war. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(3), 325-328.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.11.006

Viki, T. G., Winchester, L., Titshall, L., Chisango, T., Pina, A., & Russell, R. (2006). Beyond secondary emotions: The infra-humanization of out-groups using human-related and animal-related words. *Social Cognition*, 24(6), 753-775. doi: 10.1521/soco.2006.24.6.753

Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (2001). Evaluative versus conceptual judgments in automatic stereotyping and prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 37, 244-252.
doi:10.1006/jesp.2000.1455

For Peer Review

Footnotes

¹ Throughout, the term *homosexual* is used to refer to gay men.

² In Italian, different words are used to refer to the body-parts (e.g., hair, feet) of human beings and animals. For instance, the term *capelli* refers exclusively to the hair on a human head, whereas the term *pelliccia* refers exclusively to animal hair. Consistent with this, Vaes, Paladino and Puvia (2011), showed that Italian participants rapidly categorize these Italian words as human or animal characteristics.


³ *Gay* and *homosexual* are words that can refer to both gay men and lesbian women. Epithets like *faggot* and *fairy* refer exclusively to male targets. To ensure that the category labels we used were processed as gender specific, similar to the homophobic epithets, a pilot study was conducted. Heterosexual participants ($N = 40$; 37 females, $M_{age} = 21.25$, $SD = 3.70$) were asked to indicate whether the terms *gay*, *homosexual* and *lesbian* would normally be associated with men or women on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all likely) to 6 (very likely). Although not present in our experimental design, we included the term *lesbian* as it is commonly used to describe female sexual minorities. Both the word *gay* ($M = 5.55$, $SD = .64$) and *homosexual* ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.01$) were rated as more likely to refer to men than women ($M = 1.95$, $SD = 1.04$, $t(39) = 15.51$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.97$, 95% CI [3.132, 4.068] for *gay* and $M = 1.98$, $SD = .83$, $t(39) = 12.96$, $p < .001$, $d = 4.15$, 95% CI [2.553, 3.497] for *homosexual*). In contrast, the word *lesbian* was judged as more likely to be used for women ($M = 5.88$, $SD = .52$) than for men ($M = 1.08$, $SD = .27$; $t(39) = -46.81$, $p < .001$, $d = 14.99$, 95% CI [4.593, 5.007]). Thus, despite the fact that the dictionary suggests that the terms *gay* and *homosexual* can be used to refer to both male and female homosexuals, in common language, these terms refer more to men than to women.

⁴ No differences emerged when comparing different labels of the same category. Participants exposed to the label *gay* or *homosexual* attributed the same number of human-related words to heterosexual,

1
2
3
4 $t(29) = 1.60, p = .12, d = .59$, and homosexuals, $t(29) = -.85, p = .40, d = .31$. The same was true for
5
6 participants exposed to the label *faggot* and *fairy* (heterosexuals: $t(29) = -.74, p = .46, d = .27$, and
7
8 homosexuals: $t(29) = -1.14, p = .26, d = .42$).

9
10
11 ⁵ As in Study 1, 20 Australian participants (17 females; $M_{age} = 25.35, SD = 7.65$) reported the extent to
12
13 which the terms (*homosexual* vs. *gay* vs. *lesbian*) refer to each gender. Answers were reported on a 6-
14
15 point scale ranging from 1 (not at all likely) to 6 (very likely). Pairwise *t*-test showed that *gay* ($M =$
16
17 $5.24, SD = .83$) and *homosexuals* ($M = 5.05, SD = 1.39$) are words more likely used for men than for
18
19 women ($M = 2.81, SD = 1.32; t(20) = 5.90, p < .001, d = 2.63, 95\% CI [1.570, 3.287]$ for *gay* and $M =$
20
21 $2.28, SD = .90; t(20) = 8.02, p < .001, d = 3.59, 95\% CI [2.043, 3.480]$ for *homosexual*, respectively).
22
23 On the contrary, *lesbian* is a term that refers more to women ($M = 5.81, SD = .51$) than men ($M = 1.05,$
24
25 $SD = .22, t(20) = 34.92, p < .001, d = 15.62, 95\% CI [4.477, 5.046]$).


Figure 1. Mean of human-related words attributed to heterosexuals and homosexuals across conditions (Study 1).



Review

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 2. Mean of human-related words attributed to heterosexuals and homosexuals across conditions (Study 2).



review