Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań. Faculty of Psychology and Cognitive Sciences

MONIKA OBRĘBSKA

ORCID: 0000-0003-0457-5402
obrebska@amu.edu.pl

Contempt Speech and Hate Speech: Characteristics, Determinants and Consequences

Mowa pogardy i nienawiści: charakterystyka, uwarunkowania i konsekwencje

ABSTRACT

Hate speech is defined as verbal abuse against minority groups. Its emotional basis is contempt which activates anger and revulsion. Therefore, it seems to be justified to speak of "contempt speech and hate speech" as a spreading social phenomenon, in effect resulting in a generalised deterioration in attitudes toward minorities. Exposure to hate speech also leads to the phenomenon of desensitisation: the more frequent contact with hate speech in the environment is, the more accustomed to it people become, ceasing to perceive hate speech as a serious social problem. It plays an enormous role in the current social life. It is a tool used in political strife and public debate, excluding dialogue and consensus. All these reasons justify a necessity to academically address the issues of speech of contempt and speech of hate. The aim of this article is to attempt to understand and integrate motivational, cognitive and social determinants of speech of hate referring to classic social psychology studies on prejudices and stereotypes, show its psychosocial consequences and distinguish characteristic features which enable precise classifying of a given message as this category of linguistic *usus*.

Keywords: hate speech; minority groups; social prejudices; desensitisation

INTRODUCTION

On 3 January 2018 in Warsaw, a 14-year-old, dark-skinned girl was assaulted. An unidentified man was beating her shouting "Poland for Poles". As a result of the suffered injuries the girl was taken to hospital. On 13 September 2018, the website *Gazeta Warszawska* published an anti-Semitic article in reaction to the in-

formation posted the day before on the website *GOŚĆ.PL Lubelski* concerning the participation of Archbishop Grzegorz Ryś and Rabbi Boaz Pash from Jerusalem in the debate "Przełom czasu w judaizmie i chrześcijaństwie" ["Change of times in Judaism and Christianity"]. The article from *Gazeta Warszawska* reads: "This swine mustn't be tolerated unless Poland's fate is indifferent to us (…) These two criminals should be clubbed". Kosma Kołodziej is an activist engaged in LGBT movements and prodemocratic actions. On 1 January 2018, the man was attacked at the railway station in Bydgoszcz. "Three men surrounded me. Two of them were wearing balaclavas. »You must stop organising these fucking faggy demonstrations in Bydgoszcz, because they're not welcome here. You think when you cover your face we're not going to get you? We know very well where to find you«", the young man reported.

All the above examples come from the report "Hate Crimes in Poland in 2018: Selected Cases" (Cuper, 2019). Its authors raise an alarm showing the scale of the phenomenon. According to the analysis by the Ministry of Justice, only in the first half of 2018 in Poland, there were 890 incidents connected with hate crimes, 31% of which were cases of insulting a group or a person. The most frequent targets of hate speech in Poland are refugees and gays, followed by Muslims, the Romani and black people. People in Poland have contact with hate speech mainly on the Internet, television, in everyday conversations and on the street (Winiewski, Hansen, Bilewicz, Soral, Świderska, Bulska, 2017). It is becoming a real social problem whose determining factors and consequences are rarely a subject of academic research.

Hate speech is defined as verbal abuse towards minority groups. According to Mikołaj Winiewski and collaborators (2017), the emotional foundation for hate speech is contempt which activates anger and revulsion. Therefore, it seems to be justified to speak of "contempt speech and hate speech" as a spreading social phenomenon, leading in effect to a generalised deterioration in attitudes towards minorities. It plays an enormous role in the current social life. It is a tool used in political strife and public debate, excluding dialogue and consensus. As shown by the report results of 2017, the number of hateful messages is steadily rising, especially on the Internet, which offers a sense of impunity and anonymity. Hate speech is both a form and justification of violence, which in consequence leads to the phenomenon of desensitisation: the more frequent contact with hate speech in the environment is, the more accustomed to it people become, ceasing to perceive it as a serious social problem (Soral, Bilewicz, Winiewski, 2018).

All these reasons justify a necessity to academically address the issues of speech of contempt and speech of hate. The aim of this article is to attempt to understand and integrate motivational, cognitive and social determinants of speech of hate referring to classic social psychology studies on prejudices and stereotypes, show its psychosocial consequences and distinguish characteristic features which enable precise qualifying of a given message as this category of linguistic *usus*.

HATE SPEECH: CHARACTERISTICS

Hate speech can be defined as the use of language to insult, defame or arouse hatred towards a person or a group of people. It is a tool of spreading prejudices and discrimination based on such features as: race, ethnicity, nationality, sex, psychosexual orientation, world view, etc. It is directed against groups of a special type belonging to which, essentially, is not chosen. They are predominantly primary groups where participation is determined biologically (ethnicity, sex, skin colour, sexual preferences, etc.) or socially (language, citizenship, religion, etc.). According to Sergiusz Kowalski and Magdalena Tulli (2003), hate speech is not mostly addressed to particular individuals. Even if it affects a specific person, it happens through reducing this person to the role of a typical representative of the group and attributing its supposed characteristics and motives to them. It may lead to the so-called hate crime which consists in physical violence resulting from antisocial prejudices against a discriminated social group.

Hateful messages are often allusive and the language used is not neutral but highly emotional, loaded with meanings. As pointed out by Jadwiga Linde-Usiekniewicz (2019), ''incitement to hatred'' is not a specific type of speech act but a perlocutionary act (in Austin's sense) and due to this fact it may assume many various linguistic forms. Analysis of particular statements which are suspected of representing such incitement must therefore employ not only the elements of meaning which are directly described in dictionaries, but also those elements of meaning which are omitted in dictionaries, but determine the meaning of a particular statement. Only based on that, it is possible to specify the reference of a message, which may be crucial while deciding whether a perlocutionary act of incitement to hatred occurs. Due to the fact that it is impossible to specify a finite catalogue of expressions whose presence in a message would denote that we are dealing with incitement to hatred, or even determine that the sender's attitude is marked by incitement to hatred, it is necessary to separately analyse each statement and indicate the elements which substantiate a thesis about the sender's attitude.

Iwona Jakubowska-Branicka (2017) distinguishes four levels of this phenomenon:
- hate speech (in Polish: *hejt*), mostly referred to in the context of the Internet; it consists in describing attacked subjects with the use of foul language, swearwords and insults,
- negative labelling, i.e. addressing somebody offensively with the use of words that define belonging to a more or less socially discriminated group,
- dangerous speech, i.e. more or less direct incitement to violence and crime,
- hate narrations, i.e. stories about the world divided into the in-group and the out-group.

In the already classic research study, Jeff Greenberg and Tom Pyszczynski (1985) investigated the impact of racial and ethnic insults on the evaluation of people who came from minority groups. They concluded that overhearing of such offensive labels automatically activates negative feelings and beliefs associated with a given group. This also refers to people holding egalitarian views. To verify this hypothesis, they arranged debates between two discussants of different skin colour: white and black. All the other participants in the study were white, like the experimenters' collaborator who criticised the Afro-American either using ethnically derogatory comments ("There's no way that nigger won the debate."), or in an ethnically neutral way ("There's no way that pro debater won the debate."). As expected, the Afro-American was assessed as less skillful in discussing when the participants heard ethnic insults; on the other hand, ethnically neutral criticism did not influence the assessment. That means that hate speech and negative labels exert an enormous effect on the perception of particular social groups. What is more, if derogatory labels automatically trigger a network of associations, the use of them will bring negative associations and negative evaluation of the observed group even among the people who consciously do not agree with stereotypes.

According to Jakubowska-Branicka (2013), hate narrations are particularly dangerous as they promote hateful vision of the world. They may result in depriving the members of a discriminated group of fundamental social norms, activating the mechanism of dehumanisation and negative emotions. Specific features of hate narrations were described by Michał Głowiński (2007). Their basic defining feature is a Manichaean view of the world, with an absolute division into the favoured in-group and the discriminated out-group. This leads to "a linguistic intergroup bias", described by Anne Maass (1999), which consists in an abstract depiction of behaviour and events showing in-group members in a good light, and the members of out-groups in a bad light. The abstract depiction usually uses categories referring to permanent features which may be manifested in the future and in different situations. And the reverse, negative behaviours of the in-group and positive behaviours of out-groups are more often described with the use of relatively concrete categories, allowing generalisations which only slightly go beyond a given behaviour. Another consequence of a polarised vision of the world is conspiracy theories because "the others" not only represent evil, but also actively spread it. In hate narrations the world is consistently notional; there are no particular individuals but only representatives of the sides, and reality is subject to biased interpretation. Incitement to hatred is beyond any moral reflection because it equals spreading the truth and, thus, is morally legitimate.

Therefore, hate speech can be regarded as a new tool of expressing and sustaining social prejudices. It is exceptionally dangerous; it creates a certain picture of reality whose sender mostly stays unpunished and anonymous (Juza, 2015;

Chetty, Alathur, 2018). Thus, the question arises: who is the person prone to producing such statements and what circumstances are conducive to them?

HATE SPEECH: DETERMINANTS

The analysis of demographic variables conducted by the Centre for Research on Prejudice at the University of Warsaw (Winiewski et al., 2017) enabled indicating groups of people who most often use hate speech. It is more commonly used by men than women, it is more frequent among young people than the old and it is related to a lower level of education. The people of political right-wing sympathies more frequently reported using rhetorics offensive to minorities; this relation was particularly visible among young people. On the other hand, no significant differences between people living in small and big towns were observed; also the level of religiosity proved to be insignificant.

To identify the mechanism responsible for differences between the groups it is necessary to look at various socio-psychological factors. Psychological determinants of using hate speech can be connected both with individual variables of personality and the variables related to a person's views on social order. Social situation, especially generating a sense of danger and insecurity, may also be of importance.

The classic literature of social psychology stresses the role of authoritarian personality which includes such traits as: conventionalism, authoritarian aggression, superstition and stereotypy, hostility and projectivity (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, Sanfor, 1950). Nowadays, authoritarianism is connected with the type of world perception, especially socio-political world, rather than the structure of personality (Kossowska, 2005; Radkiewicz, 2012). It is noted that in situations of threat, alienation and helplessness, the acceptance of those ideas which offer a sense of power and security and reduce anxiety rises. Marek Błażewicz (2017) examined the relationships between induced insecurity of the Self, authoritarianism, group identification and attitudes towards immigrants. Experimentally induced insecurity of the Self caused an authoritarian response and activated negative attitudes. At the same time, group identification prevented negative reactions toward strangers. A certain continuation of the idea of authoritarianism is the concept of right-wing authoritarianism. According to Bob Altemeyer (1996), an individual who has high scores on the scale of right-wing authoritarianism is characterised by authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression and conventionalism. Authoritarian aggression allows the use of force and violence against the people who do not comply with rules set by authorities. Conventionalism is an attitude focused on obeying established norms. It includes strict rules concerning sexuality, sexual roles and national tradition. In the studies, right-wing authoritarianism very often correlated with prejudices (Ekeham-

mar, Akrami, Gylje, Zakrisson, 2004; McFarland, 2010; Crawford, Brandt, Inbar, Mallinas, 2016). The authors connect these facts with the sense of danger felt by authoritarian people, which is related to the fear of losing position and the reduced importance of traditional values and existing social order.

Studies on authoritarianism encouraged Milton Rokeach (1960) to develop a tool to measure it which would enable grasping various aspects of non-ideological authoritarianism, i.e. manifesting itself irrespective of political beliefs. These studies resulted not only in the introduction of a new scale to measure non-ideological authoritarianism but also the notion of dogmatism, which was intended to describe the mind of a non-ideologically authoritarian person. The main trait of such mentality is a closed system of convictions and its immunity to change, of which consequence is, for example, a tendency to perceive reality in a simplified and stereotypical way. Dogmatism is also connected with orientation to social dominance, defined as orientation to rivalry with other social groups, dominance over them and an aversion to social equality (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, Malle, 1994; Ekehammar et al., 2004; McFarland, 2010). Another related construct is the need for cognitive closure, which consists in the pursuit of possessing firm knowledge and an aversion to ambiguity (Kruglanski, Webster, 1996). It is conducive to favouring the in-group and downgrading out-groups (Shah, Kruglanski, Thompson, 1998). One of the studies measured the need for cognitive closure along with right-wing authoritarianism, orientation to social dominance, racism and conservative beliefs. It occurred that the need for cognitive closure has influence on racism and conservative views. On the other hand, right-wing authoritarianism and, partly, orientation to social dominance serve in this relationship as mediators (Van Hiel, Pandelaere, Duriez, 2004).

In recent years, it has been possible to observe growing interest in the relationship between an individual's control and intergroup relationships (Kofta, Narkiewicz-Jodko, Kobyliński, 2011). The subject of intense discussions is mainly the role of control in the processes of identification with the in-group, in the relationships of interdependence with other groups and in the processes of stereotypisation and creation of intergroup prejudices (cf. Fritsche, Jonas, Fankhänel, 2008; Rutjens, Loseman, 2010; Sullivan, Landau, Rothschild, 2010). The latter processes are encouraged by control deprivation and its external character (Kofta et al., 2011).

All these classic concepts, which refer to the determining factors of stereotypisation in an individual, highlight a significant role of mental distress in the activation of tendencies to stereotypically perceive social groups. It leads to the deterioration of intergroup relationships, producing negative emotions (primarily anxiety), and strengthening stereotypisation and tendencies to favour the in-group (Kofta, Bilewicz, 2011). Negative emotions can also perform a function of peculiar stimulus promoting a specific way of thinking about out-groups (Niedenthal,

Krauth-Gruber, Ric, 2006). According to Albert Bandura (2007), aggression stands the highest chance of direct expression when parallelism of the two phenomena occurs: experiencing negative emotions (anger, a sense of harm, anxiety) that generates the inclination for hostile and aggressive behaviour, and a certain system of convictions about the social world which weakens moral and social restraints preventing expression of this inclination. This system is a belief about "a threatening world", an ideological, social anxiety, i.e. a permanent conviction that the world order of an individual is threatened.

The above-presented, brief literature review justifies a necessity to adopt a multidimensional model of the determining factors of hate speech, containing motivational, cognitive and social variables. Psychological determinants of using hate speech may be related to the control of emotions and the level of self-esteem, the formal structure of convictions and the way of processing information, as well as to the variables connected with an individual's views on social order. Social context also plays an important role in stronger stereotypisation and the tendency to favour the in-group.

HATE SPEECH: CONSEQUENCES

Hate speech carries a number of negative consequences on many levels. On the individual level it may lead to a significant deterioration in the psychosocial functioning of minority members. Laura Leets and Howard Giles (1999) indicate that reactions to harmful speech are similar to those which occur after traumatic experiences. As a result of the loss of dignity, strong emotional reactions appear: depression, anger and sadness. After some time, the representatives of minorities try to understand what happened to them, putting all the blame on the majority group. With time, the victims start to feel hatred and grief and in some cases physical and mental aggression occurs, which can be manifested, for example, in hooligan acts. However, in most cases negative emotions are suppressed and may lead to major depression, learned helplessness, and various forms of escape from problems in the form of drug addiction or alcoholism. Hate speech can also give rise to the acts of self-aggression, including self-mutilation and suicidal attempts (Mullen, Smyth, 2004), considerably hindering integration of a given group with the majority (Mullen, Rice, 2003). Not only does hate speech leave a trauma in discriminated people, but also changes the way in which minority groups are perceived by the rest of the society. Previously tolerant people after contact with verbal aggression may change their attitude towards discriminated groups, assuming that if they are evaluated as such by the majority, they must be to some extent responsible for the unfriendliness that they encounter. This illusion can be explained by "the belief in a just world": the victims of violence seem to be guilty of what happened to them. The studies (Fasoli, Paladino, Carnaghi, Jetten, Bastian, Bain,

2015) show that the very exposure to speech hate strengthens the inclination for dehumanisation and also causes that after some time it is no longer considered offensive, shocking or violating social standards. Such conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the studies on desensitisation to violent images (Carnagey, Anderson, 2003; Allen, Anderson, Bushman, 2018). They prove that frequent observation of violent scenes after some time results in regarding them as less harmful or even increases the tendency to use violence. Wiktor Soral, Michał Bilewicz and Mikołaj Winiewski (2018) came to similar conclusions: frequent and repetitive exposure to hate speech leads to desensitisation to this form of verbal violence and subsequently to lower evaluations of the victims and greater distancing, thus, increasing out-group prejudice.

Not only does contact with hate speech shape individual attitudes, but also the views on how the state should solve social problems. In this sense hate speech may become a factor shaping the political reality in a society. The research study conducted by Winiewski and collaborators (2017) showed that contact with anti-immigrant hate speech – arousing fear and hatred – may reduce readiness to help immigrants and refugees, and encourage stronger support for the use of violence and surveillance by the state. Therefore, frequent contact with hate speech results in a higher level of prejudices and the tendency to discriminate against minority groups, a lower tendency to observe social norms, stronger support for the use of violence by the state and political radicalisation. These relationships are particularly conspicuous among young people, who are most exposed to contact with hate speech (Bera, 2019). Obviously, it is difficult to unambiguously state whether speech hate leads to social changes, or whether it is a consequence of them. However, it is definitely their vital element serving to communicate prejudices against minorities, as a result, producing a number of changes among its receivers. As pointed out by Bilewicz (2015), "the whole society is losing, and Poland – as a country which allows such words – clearly starts to be treated as a place hostile to people of different skin colour, nationality or sexual orientation" (p. 27).

FINAL THOUGHTS

I am writing this article during the worldwide COVID-19 pandemic. All the time the number of infections and deaths caused by the virus is increasing. Humanity is gripped by chaos, a sense of danger and insecurity. The borders between countries have been closed and again "the outsider" became a category that arouses fear and aggression. "Fear of the virus automatically recovered the simplest, atavistic conviction that some strangers are to blame and it is them who always bring a threat from somewhere", writes Olga Tokarczuk (2020) in a press article "Okno".

As noted by Bilewicz (2020), the fact that a real or imagined threat by pathogens leads to increased prejudices is quite explicable. As a way of protection

against the threat, people alienate themselves from out-groups, close in their own communities and sometimes begin to discriminate against all those who bring associations with the disease. It is proved both by academic research and historical examples. In the middle of the 15th century, the French town of Arras was struck by the plague which killed a fifth of its residents. Soon, the town witnessed witch hunts, slaughters of Jews; it was drowning in "inquisitional madness" (Bilewicz, 2020). After years of studies, Mark Schaller, Douglas Kenrick, Rebecca Neel, and Steven Neuberg (2017) stated that the presence of pathogens in the surroundings increases ethnocentrism (attachment to the in-group and an aversion toward the out-group), strengthens conservatism, decreases openness to experience, solidifies family bonds and religious faith. The very recollection of a thought about germs increases an aversion among the subjects toward culturally distant immigrants. During the Ebola virus epidemic, the United States recorded a considerable increase in homophobia. The studies by Julie Huang, Alexandra Sedlovskaya, Joshua Ackerman, and John Bargh (2011) showed that among people who have been vaccinated against influenza and protect themselves against the disease with regular handwashing the awareness of the epidemic does not lead to an increase in prejudices and xenophobia. Therefore, it seems that prejudices indeed represent a kind of automatic psychological defence against the risk of infection. As pointed out by Bilewicz (2020), this defence is unconscious and excessive. When the risk decreases, so does the proneness to prejudices.

We can, therefore, expect the intensification of prejudices and hate speech as some of the psychosocial consequences of the pandemic. The Internet is already full of a seething hatred; in the media we are witnessing political wrangling, and Donald Trump calls COVID-19 "the Chinese virus". In Sydney (Australia), a student of a girls' school of Korean descent was forced to leave the dormitory only because two years before she visited China. Near Poltava in Ukraine there were riots when buses carrying the Chinese evacuated from the epicentre of the coronavirus entered one of the towns. The feeling of danger generates the need to find a scapegoat, leads to radicalisation and builds a social hierarchy (Kossowska, Szumowska, Szwed, 2018; Nycz, Obrębska, 2020). Germs also change the way of thinking about morality (Bastian et al., 2019). In the countries with a lower threat of pathogens, in general, people regard as immoral doing harm to others and unfair distribution of wealth. In the countries with a significant spread of pathogens, it is insulting religious and national symbols, insulting authorities, and non-normative sexual behaviour that are considered the most immoral.

So, it seems that the world after the coronavirus will not be the same. "With our own eyes, we are watching the demise of the civilisational paradigm which has been shaping us for the last 200 years: that we are masters of creation, we can do anything and the world belongs to us", to again quote Tokarczuk (2020). We are facing the threat of authoritarianism, radicalisation, and intensification of

prejudices against out-groups. All these maladies of the contemporary world will intensify when the fear of the virus is associated with a general sense of helplessness in the face of the scale of danger. It was not by accident that Bilewicz (2015) compared hate speech with an epidemic: as a carrier of stereotypes and prejudices, hate speech infects with them the rest of the society, which may be equated to the mechanism of the vicious circle: the more messages fraught with hatred in a society, the stronger prejudices. Let us hope that the coronavirus pandemic will not give rise to the pandemic of hate speech. Let it not become a social norm relativising the limits of freedom, including the freedom of speech and the limits of tolerance, also towards intolerance.

REFERENCES

Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J., Sanford, R.N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. Oxford: Harper.

Allen, J.J., Anderson, C.A., Bushman, B.J. (2018). The general aggression model. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 19*, 75–80.

Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The Authoritarian Specter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bandura, A. (2007). *Teoria społecznego uczenia się*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Bera, R. (2019). Mowa nienawiści źródłem przemocy i agresji. *Annales UMCS, 32*(3), 59–66.

Bilewicz, M. (2015). Polak mówi o Obcym – psychologia mowy nienawiści. *Remapping Europe,* 24–27. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/10815382/Polak_mówi_o_Obcym_-_psychologia_mowy_nienawiści (access: 1.03.2020).

Bilewicz, M. (2020). Koronawirus uprzedzeń i ksenofobii. Jak patogeny wpływają na poglądy? *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 7.03.

Błażewicz, M.A. (2017). *Autorytaryzm, niepewność Ja, identyfikacja grupowa i postawy wobec grupy obcej* (unpublished doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from: https://depotuw.ceon.pl/handle/item/2532?show=full (access: 1.03.2020).

Bastian, B., Vauclair, C., Loughnan, S., Bain, P., Ashokkumar, A., Becker, M., Bilewicz, M., Collier-Baker, E., Crespo, C., Eastwick, P., Fischer, R., Friese, M., Gomez, A., Guerra, V., Guevara Castellanos, J., Hanke, K., Hooper, N., Huang, L., Junqi, S., Karasawa, M. (2019). Explaining illness with evil: Pathogen prevalence fosters moral vitalism. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 286*(1914).

Carnagey, N.L., Anderson, C.A. (2003). Theory in the study of media violence. The general aggression model. In: D.A. Gentile (ed.), *Media Violence and Children* (pp. 87–106). Westport: Praeger.

Chetty, N., Alathur, S. (2018). Hate speech review in the context of online social networks. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 40*, 108–118.

Crawford, J., Brandt, M., Inbar, Y., Mallinas, S.R. (2016). Right-wing authoritarianism predicts prejudice equally toward "gay men and lesbians" and "homosexuals". *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *111*(2), 31–45.

Cuper, J. (2019). *Przestępstwa z nienawiści w Polsce w 2018. Wybrane przypadki.* Fundacja Otwarty Dialog. Retrieved from: https://odfoundation.eu/a/9358,przestepstwa-z-nienawisci-w-polsce-w-2018-r-wybrane-przypadki/ (access: 15.02.2020).

Ekehammar, B., Akrami, N., Gylje, M., Zakrisson, I. (2004). What matters most to prejudice: Big five personality, social dominance orientation, or right-wing authoritarianism? *European Journal of Personality, 18*(6), 463–482.

Fasoli, F., Paladino, M.P., Carnaghi, A., Jetten, J., Bastian, B., Bain, P.G. (2015). Not "just words". Exposure to homophobic epithets leads to dehumanizing and physical distancing from gay men. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 46*(2), 237–248.

Fritsche, I., Jonas, E., Fankhänel, T. (2008). The role of control motivation in mortality salience effects on ingroup support and defense. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 524–541.

Głowiński, M. (2007). Retoryka nienawiści. *Nauka, 2*, 19–27.

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T. (1985). The effect of an overheard ethnic slur on evaluation of the target: How to spread a social disease. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 21*, 61–72.

Huang, J., Sedlovskaya, A., Ackerman, J., Bargh, J. (2011). Immunizing against prejudice: Effects of disease protection on attitudes toward out-groups. *Psychological Science, 22*(12), 1550–1556.

Jakubowska-Branicka, I. (2013). *O dogmatycznych narracjach. Studium nienawiści.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Trio.

Jakubowska-Branicka, I. (2017). Skąd się bierze mowa nienawiści i jak z nią walczyć? *Polityka,* 6.06.

Juza, M. (2015). Hejterstwo w komunikacji internetowej: charakterystyka zjawiska, przyczyny i sposoby przeciwdziałania. *Profilaktyka Społeczna i Resocjalizacja, 25*, 27–50.

Kofta, M., Bilewicz, M. (2011). *Wobec obcych. Zagrożenia psychologiczne a stosunki międzygrupowe.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Kofta, M., Narkiewicz-Jodko, W., Kobyliński, P. (2011). Deprywacja kontroli a poznanie i postawy międzygrupowe: znaczenie deficytów poznawczych i afektywnych. In: M. Kofta, M. Bilewicz (red.). *Wobec obcych. Zagrożenia psychologiczne a stosunki międzygrupowe* (pp. 74–99). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.

Kossowska, M., (2005). *Umysł niezmienny… Poznawcze mechanizmy sztywności.* Kraków: Wydawnictwo UJ.

Kossowska, M., Szumowska, E., Szwed, P. (2018). *Tolerancja w czasach niepewności.* Sopot: Wydawnictwo Smak Słowa.

Kowalski, S., Tulli, M. (2003). *Zamiast procesu. Raport o mowie nienawiści.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo ISP PAN.

Kruglanski, A.W., Webster, D.M. (1996). Motivated closing of the mind: "Seizing" and "freezing". *Psychological Review, 103*(2), 263–283.

Leets, L., Giles, H. (1999). Harmful speech in intergroup encounters: An organizational framework for communication research. *Annals of the International Communication Association, 22*(1), 91–137.

Linde-Usiekniewicz, J. (2019). Wybrane problemy rozpoznawania językowych cech „nawoływania do nienawiści". In: M. Zaśko-Zielińska, K. Kredens (red.), *Lingwistyka kryminalistyczna. Teoria i praktyka* (pp. 217–231). Wrocław: Wydawnictwo UW.

Maass, A. (1999). Linguistic intergroup bias: Stereotype perpetuation through language. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 31*, 79–121.

McFarland, S. (2010). Authoritarianism, social dominance, and other roots of generalized prejudice. *Political Psychology*, *31*(3), 453–477.

Mullen, B., Rice, D.R. (2003). Ethnophaulisms and exclusion. The behavioral consequences of cognitive representation of ethnic immigrant groups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 1056–1067.

Mullen, B., Smyth, J.M. (2004). Immigrant suicide rates as a function of ethnophaulisms: Hate speech predicts death. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 66*, 343–348.

Niedenthal, P.M., Krauth-Gruber, S., Ric, F. (2006). *Psychology of Emotion. Interpersonal, Experiential, and Cognitive Approaches.* New York: Psychology Press.

Nycz, A., Obrębska, M. (2020). Potrzeba mitu w czasach niepewności. In: M. Obrębska, A. Pankalla (red.). *Mity kultury współczesnej. Perspektywa psychoantropologiczna* (pp. 65–86). Poznań: Wydawnictwo Nauk Społecznych i Humanistycznych UAM.

Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M., Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(4), 741–763.

Radkiewicz, P. (2012). *Autorytaryzm a brzytwa Ockhama.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Scholar.

Rokeach, M. (1960). *The Open and Closed Mind.* New York: Basic Books.

Rutjens, B.T., Loseman, A. (2010). The society-supporting self: System justification and cultural worldview defense as different forms of self-regulation. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 13*, 241–250.

Schaller, M., Kenrick, D., Neel, R., Neuberg, S. (2017). Evolution and human motivation: A fundamental motives framework. *Social & Personality Psychology Compass, 11*(6), 1–15.

Shah, J.Y., Kruglanski, A.W., Thompson, E.P. (1998). Membership has its (epistemic) rewards: Need for closure effects on in-group bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(2), 383–393.

Soral, W., Bilewicz, M., Winiewski, M. (2018). Exposure to hate speech increases prejudice through desensitization. *Aggressive Behavior, 44*, 136–146.

Sullivan, D., Landau, M.J., Rothschild, Z.K. (2010). An existential function of enemyship: Evidence that people attribute influence to personal and political enemies to compensate for threats to control. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 434–449.

Tokarczuk, O. (2020). Okna. *Gazeta Wyborcza*, 4.04.

Van Hiel, A., Pandelaere, M., Duriez, B. (2004). The impact of need for closure on conservative beliefs and racism: Differential mediation by authoritarian submission and authoritarian dominance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(7), 824–837.

Winiewski, M., Hansen, K., Bilewicz, M., Soral, W., Świderska, A., Bulska, D. (2017). *Mowa nienawiści, mowa pogardy. Raport z badania przemocy werbalnej wobec grup mniejszościowych.* Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Sowa.

STRESZCZENIE

Mowa nienawiści definiowana jest jako przemoc werbalna wobec grup mniejszościowych. Jej emocjonalnym podłożem jest pogarda, która uruchamia gniew i wstręt, stąd uzasadnione wydaje się mówienie o „mowie pogardy i nienawiści" jako rozpowszechniającym się zjawisku społecznym, prowadzącym w efekcie do uogólnionego pogorszenia się postaw wobec mniejszości. Ekspozycja na mowę nienawiści prowadzi też do zjawiska desensytyzacji – im częstszy jest kontakt z mową nienawiści w otoczeniu, tym bardziej ludzie się z nią oswajają i przestają postrzegać mowę nienawiści jako poważny problem społeczny. Odgrywa ona ogromną rolę we współczesnym życiu społecznym, jest narzędziem w walce politycznej i debacie publicznej, wyklucza dialog i porozumienie. Wszystkie te powody uzasadniają konieczność naukowego zajęcia się problematyką mowy pogardy i nienawiści. Celem niniejszego artykułu jest próba zrozumienia i integracji motywacyjnych, poznawczych i społecznych uwarunkowań mowy nienawiści, odwołujących się do klasycznych badań z zakresu psychologii społecznej nad uprzedzeniami i stereotypami, a także pokazanie jej psychospołecznych konsekwencji oraz wyodrębnienie cech charakterystycznych, umożliwiających precyzyjne zakwalifikowanie danej wypowiedzi do tej kategorii uzusu językowego.

Słowa kluczowe: mowa nienawiści; grupy mniejszościowe; uprzedzenia społeczne; desensytyzacja