

Journal of Language and Social Psychology

<http://jls.sagepub.com>

What Did You Just Call Me? European and American Ratings of the Valence of Ethnophaulisms

Diana R. Rice, Dominic Abrams, Constantina Badea, Gerd Bohner, Andrea Carnaghi, Lyudmila I. Dementi, Kevin Durkin, Bea Ehmann, Gordon Hodson, Dogan Kokdemir, Jaume Masip, Aidan Moran, Margit E. Oswald, Jaap W. Ouwerkerk, Rolf Reber, Jonathan Schroeder, Katerina Tasiopoulou and Jerzy Trzebinski

Journal of Language and Social Psychology 2010; 29; 117 originally published online Dec 16, 2009;

DOI: 10.1177/0261927X09351696

The online version of this article can be found at:
<http://jls.sagepub.com/cgi/content/abstract/29/1/117>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

Additional services and information for *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://jls.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://jls.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations <http://jls.sagepub.com/cgi/content/refs/29/1/117>

What Did You Just Call Me? European and American Ratings of the Valence of Ethnophaulisms

Diana R. Rice,¹ Dominic Abrams,² Constantina Badea,³
Gerd Bohner,⁴ Andrea Carnaghi,⁵ Lyudmila I. Dementi,⁶
Kevin Durkin,⁷ Bea Ehmann,⁸ Gordon Hodson,⁹
Dogan Kokdemir,¹⁰ Jaume Masip,¹¹ Aidan Moran,¹²
Margit E. Oswald,¹³ Jaap W. Ouwerkerk,¹⁴ Rolf Reber,¹⁵
Jonathan Schroeder,¹⁶ Katerina Tasiopoulou,²
and Jerzy Trzebinski¹⁷

Abstract

Previous work has examined the relative valence (positivity or negativity) of ethnophaulisms (ethnic slurs) targeting European immigrants to the United States. However, this relied on contemporary judgments made by American researchers. The present study examined valence judgments made by citizens from the countries examined in previous work. Citizens of 17 European nations who were fluent in

¹Geneva College, Beaver Falls, PA, USA

²University of Kent at Canterbury, Canterbury, UK

³Université Lille-3, Villeneuve d'Ascq Cedex, France

⁴Universität Bielefeld, Bielefeld, Germany

⁵Università de Padova, Padova, Italy

⁶Omsk State University, Omsk, Russia

⁷University of Strathclyde, Glasgow Scotland

⁸Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Budapest, Hungary

⁹Brock University, St. Catharines, Ontario Canada

¹⁰Baskent University, Ankara, Turkey

¹¹Universidad de Salamanca, Salamanca, Spain

¹²University College, Dublin, Ireland

¹³Universität Bern, Bern, Switzerland

¹⁴VU University Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands

¹⁵University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

¹⁶University of Exeter, Exeter, UK

¹⁷Warsaw School of Social Psychology, Warsaw, Poland

Corresponding Author:

Diana Rice, Department of Psychology, Geneva College, 3200 College Avenue, Beaver Falls, PA 15010, USA
Email: drrice@geneva.edu

English rated ethnophaulisms targeting their own group as well as ethnophaulisms targeting immigrants from England. American students rated ethnophaulisms for all 17 European nations, providing a comparison from members of the host society. Ratings made by the European judges were (a) consistent with those made by the American students and (b) internally consistent for raters' own country and for the common target group of the English. Following discussion of relevant methodological issues, the authors examine the theoretical significance of their results.

Keywords

Europeans, ethnophaulisms, ethnic slurs, valence, complexity

Ethnophaulisms (Roback, 1944) are verbal ethnic slurs to refer to out-groups. Popular media reports continue to highlight the use of ethnophaulisms in intergroup conflicts (e.g., B. Carter & Steinberg, 2007; Theodore, 2006), thereby showing the enduring nature and contemporary relevance of such derogatory slurs. Schneider, Hitlan, and Radhakrishnan (2000) reported that more than 20% of their sample of 572 people acknowledged having heard ethnophaulisms directed toward their own ethnic group.

Ethnophaulisms serve as a marker of stereotype and prejudice directed toward members of the targeted group; they are "collective representations which stand as symbols of the groups themselves" (A. A. Carter, 1944, p. 243). Carnaghi and Maass (2007) elaborated that, for both in-group and out-group members, both simple category labels and negative derogatory labels served to prime stereotypes. However, out-group members were more heavily targeted when the negative labels were used. Ethnophaulisms thus serve to reinforce simplified views of ethnic out-groups.

Ethnophaulisms have been demonstrated to vary both in valence (relative positivity or negativity of the portrayal) and in complexity (relative simplicity or complexity of the portrayal; Mullen & Leader, 2005; Mullen, Rozell, & Johnson, 2000, 2001). Archival data show that ethnophaulism complexity more clearly predicts treatment of ethnic immigrant groups, with groups who are the targets of simpler sets of ethnophaulisms being more likely to experience exclusion from the host society (Leader, Mullen, & Rice, 2009; Mullen, 2004; Mullen & Rice, 2003). But there is one important exception. When examining the responses of ethnic immigrants rather than the responses of the receiving or host society, it is ethnophaulism valence that more clearly predicts reactions. Mullen and Smyth (2004) found that ethnophaulism valence was inversely related to suicide rates of ethnic immigrants, such that the more negative the set of ethnophaulisms for a particular ethnic immigrant group, the higher their suicide rates on immigrating to America. Ethnophaulism complexity did not independently predict immigrant suicide rates. Thus, ethnophaulism complexity seems to best predict the responses of members of the host society, whereas ethnophaulism valence seems to best predict responses of the immigrants themselves.

One limitation of previous research is that valence ratings have been based on American perceptions of the valence of specific ethnophaulisms not on the immigrant

targets' own perceptions. Those valence ratings might thus not accurately reflect how immigrants understood and responded to the words directed to them in the wake of their arrival in the United States. Some reviewers have argued that current ratings of these archival data reveal little, if anything, about the treatment of European immigrants. The present effort, a survey of citizens from 17 European countries, directly addresses this concern.

To gain an initial understanding of people's reactions to ethnophaulisms that have been historically used to denigrate members of their own ethnic group, we examined several key issues regarding ethnophaulism valence. First, participants from 17 European countries assessed the valence of ethnophaulisms targeting their own ethnic group. These data were examined regarding interjudge reliability within each of the countries. Second, because participants might regard *any* ethnophaulism targeting members of their ethnic group as fundamentally negative, participants from 16 of the European countries also assessed the valence of ethnophaulisms targeting the English to provide a common reference point. Third, we compared ratings made by the targets of ethnophaulisms with ratings made by U.S. citizens, allowing us to answer the question of whether American citizens and European citizens agreed on the valence of the ethnophaulisms.

Method

Participants

Based on previous work (Mullen & Johnson, 1993, 1995), participants were asked to evaluate ethnophaulisms. We sampled 111 participants from 17 European countries (see Table 1). The authors asked students and acquaintances to participate in a study about European groups. To homogenize procedures across the countries and to be consistent with previous ethnophaulism research, we enlisted male participants aged between 17 and 27 years who were "native" citizens of their country and, to avoid the variability that might potentially be introduced through translation procedures, who were sufficiently fluent in English to complete the survey.

For comparative purposes, 14 American undergraduates also completed the surveys, rating all ethnophaulisms for all 17 European countries. All participants completed informed consent procedures particular to their institution.

Instruments

Surveys were generated for each country based on the relevant ethnophaulisms documented by Allen (1983). His work, compiling more than 1,000 terms used as hate speech in the United States over a 150-year time period, also reports the meaning and origin of the ethnophaulisms for each ethnic group. Thus, surveys for each country included all of the ethnophaulisms for that country, all of the ethnophaulisms for England, along with the meanings provided by Allen (1983). Participants rated each

Table 1. Mean Ethnophaulism Ratings by Country

Country	<i>n</i>	Number of Ethnophaulisms	Citizen Ratings (<i>SD</i>)	American Ratings (<i>SD</i>)	Ratings of English (<i>SD</i>)
England	5	20	4.31 (1.19)	4.65 (0.55)	—
France	8	7	4.30 (0.68)	4.04 (0.98)	4.37 (0.33)
Germany	5	33	3.74 (0.38)	3.91 (1.16)	4.37 (0.47)
Greece	8	5	3.08 (1.15)	2.96 (1.04)	4.58 (0.89)
Hungary	5	6	5.07 (1.99)	4.23 (1.20)	5.14 (0.81)
Ireland	8	55	3.40 (1.16)	4.31 (0.91)	4.17 (1.36)
Italy	6	45	4.00 (0.99)	3.62 (0.87)	4.19 (0.73)
Netherlands	7	14	3.63 (0.34)	3.77 (1.13)	3.83 (0.44)
Norway	5	12	4.40 (0.69)	3.86 (0.91)	4.29 (0.42)
Poland	6	11	3.41 (0.57)	3.55 (0.69)	4.22 (0.41)
Russia	5	9	3.04 (1.04)	3.80 (0.74)	4.44 (1.13)
Scotland	8	11	4.10 (0.82)	4.17 (1.09)	4.41 (0.87)
Spain	7	4	3.68 (1.12)	4.04 (0.95)	3.86 (0.89)
Sweden	5	17	4.67 (0.11)	3.63 (0.75)	4.23 (0.67)
Switzerland	5	3	5.07 (1.69)	3.69 (1.26)	4.96 (1.22)
Turkey	5	3	3.27 (2.22)	2.88 (1.14)	4.37 (0.85)
Wales	13	5	4.71 (1.79)	4.26 (0.90)	4.35 (1.13)

Note: Ratings were based on a 9-point Likert-type scale where 1 = Negative and 9 = Positive.

ethnophaulism, on Likert-type scales, for how emotionally negative (a rating of 1) or positive (a rating of 9) it was to them.

Procedures

Colleagues from each country solicited 5 to 13 male participants to complete the surveys. Participants completed the surveys for the English and then for their own group. The American sample rated all ethnophaulisms for all 17 European groups.

Results and Discussion

Overall, European participants rated the ethnophaulisms as negative, $M = 4.16$, $SD = 0.96$, difference from neutral value of 5: $t(110) = 9.09$, $p < .001$ (see Table 1). However, this overall mean does not take into account potential differences in the actual valence of ethnophaulisms for individual nations. Intraclass correlations for judges from each country are presented in Table 2. The judges were strongly ($r = .77$) and significantly reliable ($Z = 7.60$, $p < .001$) in rating ethnophaulisms targeting their own country.

Thus, European judges were consistent in rating ethnophaulisms targeting their own countries and generally described them as somewhat negative. These ratings are consistent with previous work in this area (e.g., Mullen, 2001), which also

Table 2. Intraclass Correlation Coefficients for European Nations

Country	Own Country	England
England	.770	—
France	.790	.741
Germany	.714	.431
Greece	.940	.798
Hungary	.670	.499
Ireland	.808	.614
Italy	.522	.551
Netherlands	.826	.821
Norway	.822	.081
Poland	.831	.427
Russia	.782	.660
Scotland	.775	.881
Spain	.693	.630
Sweden	.810	.458
Switzerland	.536	.759
Turkey	.817	.675
Wales	.720	.886
United States	—	.842

found overall ratings of ethnophaulisms just slightly below the midpoint of the scale. However, we note that ethnophaulisms at the midpoint of the 9-point rating scale still have the potential to elicit the harmful consequences outlined earlier. Even use of group names is sufficient to activate stereotypes (Carnaghi & Maass, 2007), and the “neutral” ethnophaulisms examined here are more negative than group names.

To examine correspondence across countries in judgments of valence for the target group of England, we examined the intraclass correlations among European judges based on their ratings of the ethnophaulisms targeting the English (see Table 2). The judges were moderately ($r = .66$) and significantly reliable ($Z = 6.23, p < .001$) in rating ethnophaulisms targeting the common group of England, again indicating agreement regarding the valence of ethnophaulisms targeting the English.

Although non-English European raters rated ethnophaulisms targeting the English as slightly negative ($M = 4.34, SD = 0.88$), it is important to note that they rated ethnophaulisms for the English more positively than they rated ethnophaulisms for themselves. There was a significant ($Z = 3.50, p < .001$), moderate ($\bar{r}_{\text{Fisher}} = .45, r = .42$) tendency for ratings of ethnophaulisms directed at an individual’s nation to be rated more negatively than ethnophaulisms directed at the English.

Comparing ratings of the common reference group of the English with own-group ratings confirms that our participants were not unequivocally rating all ethnophaulisms as negative. An alternative interpretation might be that membership in a targeted group leads a person to evaluate ethnophaulisms targeting his own group more negatively than ethnophaulisms targeting another group. It is clear that group membership

generally leads to in-group favoritism (Brewer, 1979). This could lead to heightened perceptions of in-group positivity or to heightened sensitivity to ethnic slurs directed at one's in-group (Hornsey, Oppes, & Svensson, 2002). However, this in-group bias may not fully explain the present data, as American raters (who were not members of any targeted group) also evaluated ethnophaulisms for the English more positively than ethnophaulisms for other European groups. It is possible, then, that ethnophaulisms for the English are less negative than for other European groups.

Overall, American participants rated the ethnophaulisms as slightly negative, $M = 3.84$, $SD = 0.70$; difference from neutral value of 5: $t(13) = 6.13$, $p < .001$ (see Table 1). Citizen ratings of ethnophaulisms directed at members of their country were not different from American student ratings of those nations ($Z = -.81$, $p = .7921$, $\bar{Z}_{\text{Fisher}} = .05$, $\bar{r} = -.05$). Of the 17 European target countries included in the database, only one (Sweden) had an average rating significantly different from the American ratings, and citizens of Sweden rated ethnophaulisms directed toward their citizens more positively ($M = 4.67$, $SD = 0.11$) than did the American students, $M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.75$; $t(17) = 3.02$, $p = .0077$.

These findings demonstrate that American raters and European raters are consistent and compatible in their ratings of ethnophaulisms for European ethnic immigrant groups. This provides external validation for previous work in which valence judgments were made by contemporary American researchers. It also suggests that European immigrants likely understood the valence of ethnophaulisms targeting them in ways quite similar to those of Americans: Both immigrants and members of the host society likely understood the negativity of the words directed at the immigrants.

The ratings generated by our sample of European citizens provide a contemporary picture of how relatively negative or positive ethnophaulisms are. The valence ratings of 111 European participants for the words historically (and in some cases, presently) used to denigrate members of their own groups provide us with a database of hate speech (see Appendix for a complete list of ethnophaulisms and valence ratings). Taking into account words in common usage for 150 years of America's immigration history, this database captures ratings for approximately 80% to 90% of all American immigration. In seeking to understand the negative consequences of these ethnophaulisms, we can now more precisely assess how group members evaluate the words used to describe their own group. This provides a valuable tool for future researchers interested in the antecedents and consequences of the use of ethnophaulisms.

Concerns With the Data

One of the major advantages of our sample (namely, its small, homogeneous nature) is also a limitation. Because the sample from each European nation consisted of male English-speaking citizens, our results may not fully represent the variety of potential responses to ethnophaulisms targeting immigrants from these nations. However, the marked consistency in their responses lends confidence that similar valence judgments would be obtained from other members of these ethnic groups.

Another potential concern raised by several of the authors of this article addresses their participants' lack of familiarity with some of the ethnophaulisms targeting their own groups. Anecdotally, several noted participants' difficulty in rating words they had not heard before, whereas none in the American sample expressed any confusion about the terms they rated. However, we believe that such unfamiliarity of the European participants more closely approximates the conditions of the original immigrants experiencing the ethnophaulisms: Newly arrived at the United States, they may not have fully comprehended the words being used to address them, while still understanding the negativity connoted. The marked consistency between European and American judges indicates that ethnophaulism valence may be communicated regardless of actual familiarity with the terms being used.

Conclusion

The present study provides validation of previous work examining the valence of ethnophaulisms targeting European immigrants. The authors found that native citizens of these targeted countries agreed on the valence of ethnophaulisms targeting their own country, agreed that ethnophaulisms targeting their own nation were more negative than ethnophaulisms targeting the common reference group of England, and agreed with American ratings of the valence of ethnophaulisms targeting their own country. These findings confirm that future researchers interested in affective or cognitive responses to ethnophaulisms can reliably use the same terms with both majority and minority ethnic participants.

Appendix

List of Ethnophaulisms by Country, in Order of Negativity (Lower Values Indicate More Negative Valence Ratings)

Country	M (SD)
England	
Roineck (from the Afrikaans <i>rooinek</i> for redneck)	1.80 (0.45)
Bug (originally Irish usage, for bugs introduced by the English)	2.60 (1.14)
WASC (acronym for White Anglo-Saxon Catholic)	3.00 (1.00)
Godam (from French slang, mocking the English curse)	3.40 (1.82)
Lime-juicer (from the lime juice historically served on British ships)	3.60 (1.52)
Joan-bull	3.80 (1.30)
John-bull	3.80 (1.30)
Limey (from lime-juicer)	3.80 (1.92)
Islander	4.20 (1.92)
Bimshah (a variant of West Indian name for resident of Barbados)	4.40 (1.52)
Corkney (a double pun on accent and alleged drinking habits)	4.40 (1.52)
Tommy	4.60 (1.67)
Englisher	4.60 (2.07)

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

Country	M (SD)
Beefeater (from the fame of English roast beef; name for warder in tower of London)	4.80 (1.79)
Bull-lion	5.00 (2.35)
Johnny	5.20 (1.79)
Britisher	5.20 (1.92)
Chirper (Especially for a Cockney)	5.80 (2.17)
Briton (applied to Englishmen in Connecticut)	6.00 (1.58)
Cockney	6.20 (1.64)
France	
Frog	3.25 (0.89)
Jean-Potage	3.25 (1.04)
Jean	4.38 (1.06)
Dee-donk (probably from the sound of <i>dis donc</i> , "Hey, tell me")	4.50 (1.07)
Parleyvoo (from French <i>parlez-vous</i>)	4.88 (1.36)
Mounseer (from French <i>monsieur</i> , mister)	4.88 (1.55)
Frencher	5.00 (0.76)
Germany	
Nazi	1.20 (0.45)
Dummer-head (from German <i>dummkopf</i> , blockhead, simpleton)	2.20 (0.84)
Cabbage-head (slang for stupid person)	2.40 (1.67)
Honyock (specifically used in Nebraska)	2.75 (0.96)
Goon	2.80 (0.84)
Sauerkraut	2.80 (0.84)
Sausage	2.80 (0.84)
Hans-wurst	2.80 (1.30)
Hun	2.80 (1.30)
Bucket-head	2.80 (1.80)
Busher (perhaps a variant of <i>boche</i>)	3.00 (0.71)
Boche (from <i>alboche</i> , a contraction of French <i>Allemand</i> + <i>caboche</i> , or German blockhead)	3.00 (0.82)
Iroquois-of-Europe	3.20 (0.45)
Prussian (an allusion to military aggressiveness)	3.20 (1.30)
Johnny-squarehead	3.40 (1.67)
Vaterländer	3.60 (1.52)
Pretzel	3.80 (0.84)
Hop-head (probably an allusion to hops in German beer)	4.00 (0.71)
Jerry (from either English slang for chamber pot or the first syllable of German)	4.00 (1.22)
Hitlander	4.20 (1.30)
Kamerad (from German <i>Kamerad</i> , mate, supposedly the call of surrendering soldiers)	4.20 (2.05)
Gretchen (feminine)	4.20 (2.17)
Metzel (perhaps from the German-American dish, metzel-soup)	4.40 (0.89)
Heinie (from the diminutive form of <i>Heinrich</i>)	4.40 (1.95)

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

Country	M (SD)
Fritz	4.60 (1.82)
Hans	4.60 (1.82)
Fräulein (feminine)	4.80 (1.92)
Turner (from Turnverein, the athletic or gymnastic societies of German-Americans)	5.00 (0.71)
Cousin-Michael (from <i>der deutsche Michel</i> , the German peasantry)	5.00 (1.41)
Dutch	5.00 (1.58)
Hohenzollern (from the name of the former royal family of Germany)	5.20 (0.84)
Limburger	5.20 (1.30)
Rhinelanders	5.60 (0.55)
Greece	
Asshole-bandit (from stories about buggery)	1.50 (0.53)
Grikola (from <i>agricola</i> , farmer)	2.13 (1.13)
Greaseball	2.50 (1.31)
Marble-head (reference to marble statuary of ancient Greece)	4.13 (2.10)
Johnny	5.13 (1.81)
Hungary	
Hungry (apparently a pun on <i>Hungary</i>)	2.80 (1.79)
Bohunk (a blend of Bohemian and Hungarian)	4.40 (3.21)
Hunk	5.00 (3.78)
Hun (from a shortening of <i>Hungarian</i>)	5.20 (0.77)
Horwat (probably from a surname)	6.40 (0.89)
Goulash	6.60 (2.88)
Ireland	
Bog-rat	1.57 (1.13)
Wog (an American extension of the Britishism)	1.63 (0.74)
Whiskey-Mick	1.86 (0.90)
Bog-trotter	2.00 (1.53)
Potato-eater	2.13 (1.13)
Paddywhack (an allusion to loss of temper and fighting)	2.13 (1.36)
Bogger	2.25 (1.16)
Bog-lander	2.29 (1.25)
Shanty-Irish	2.33 (1.37)
Turf-cutter	2.43 (1.40)
Surly-boy	2.50 (1.76)
Spud	2.50 (1.77)
Peat-bogger	2.83 (1.47)
Peat-digger	2.83 (1.60)
Paddy (from <i>Padraig</i> , the Gaelic form of <i>Patrick</i>)	2.88 (2.10)
Boiled dinner	3.00 (1.67)
Redshanks (from an allusion to the color of bare legs reddened by exposure)	3.00 (1.91)
Flannel-mouth (an allusion to blarney, or thick speech from a brogue or drink)	3.33 (1.86)

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

Country	M (SD)
Chaw (probably from slang <i>chaw</i> , a yokel)	3.33 (1.97)
Mike (from <i>Michael</i>)	3.43 (1.40)
Mulligan	3.43 (1.40)
Pat (short for <i>Patrick</i>)	3.43 (1.40)
Shoneen (from Gaelic <i>Seoinin</i> , diminutive of <i>Seon</i> , or John. Originally an upstart)	3.43 (2.23)
Girleen (feminine)	3.43 (2.30)
Murphy	3.50 (1.69)
Bridget (feminine)	3.50 (1.76)
Croppie	3.57 (1.81)
Ruddy-duck (perhaps because this species of North American bird is known as <i>paddywhack</i>)	3.67 (1.63)
Turkey	3.67 (1.65)
Flamed-mouth	3.67 (1.97)
Brogueener	3.67 (2.07)
Greenhorn	3.71 (1.89)
Saltwater-turkey (An immigrant who has "crossed the saltwater")	3.83 (1.60)
Greek	3.83 (1.83)
Teague	3.83 (1.83)
Patlander	3.83 (1.94)
Harp (probably from the national symbol)	3.83 (2.23)
Teddy (diminutive of Theodore)	3.86 (1.68)
Mick (from Michael)	3.88 (1.81)
Michael	4.00 (1.53)
Terrier (Perhaps jocular to suggest an Irish terrier dog. Also, slang for a tough man, a loafer)	4.00 (1.53)
Donovan	4.00 (1.55)
Bark	4.00 (1.67)
Dogan (probably from a surname)	4.00 (1.67)
Tad (diminutive of <i>Thaddeus</i>)	4.00 (1.73)
Shamrock	4.13 (1.89)
Turk (probably from Gaelic <i>torq</i> , boar, pig)	4.14 (1.46)
Patess (feminine)	4.14 (2.27)
Baytzimer (from Hebrew <i>bezim</i> for eggs, as the German <i>Irlander</i> sounds similar to <i>eirer</i> , or eggs)	4.33 (1.63)
Irisher	4.43 (2.15)
Emeralder (from the "Emerald Isle")	4.67 (2.07)
Mac (from prefix of many Irish surnames)	4.71 (1.98)
Son-of-Erin	4.71 (2.36)
Hibernian	5.00 (2.16)
Fighting-Irish	5.25 (2.38)
Italy	
Eyetalian (a deliberate mispronunciation)	2.83 (1.17)
Spahetti-bender	2.83 (1.33)

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

Country	M (SD)
Spag (shortened from <i>spaghetti</i>)	3.00 (1.26)
Mafia	3.17 (2.40)
Dingbat	3.33 (0.82)
Guin (shortened from <i>guinea</i>)	3.33 (1.03)
Tally (probably an alteration of <i>Italian</i>)	3.33 (1.03)
Gangster	3.33 (1.21)
Duke	3.33 (2.07)
Kike	3.50 (1.05)
Pinocchio (from Carlo Lorenzini's fairy tale)	3.50 (1.05)
Macaroni	3.50 (1.64)
Meatball	3.50 (1.87)
Eyetie	3.50 (1.97)
Pizon (probably from slang <i>paisano</i> , pal, comrade)	3.50 (2.43)
Organ-grinder	3.60 (1.34)
Guinea	3.67 (1.21)
Banana-peddler	3.67 (1.51)
Ginzo (probably from <i>guinea</i>)	3.67 (1.51)
Greaseball	3.67 (1.75)
Shike	3.67 (1.75)
Spig (probably from <i>spaghetti</i>)	3.83 (1.17)
Grape-stomper	3.83 (1.60)
Spaghetti	3.83 (1.60)
Lukschen (from Yiddish for "noodle," i.e., "spaghetti")	4.00 (1.10)
Poppie-squalie (possibly from the sound of the given name, <i>Pasqualie</i>)	4.00 (2.10)
Nickel-nose	4.00 (2.10)
Dago (from Spanish <i>Diego</i> , James)	4.00 (2.19)
Spic (probably from <i>spig</i>)	4.17 (1.33)
Hike (apparently modeled on <i>mike</i> , Irishman)	4.17 (1.47)
Gi-gi (used in Louisiana)	4.17 (1.60)
Wop (probably form of Neopolitan and Sicilian <i>guappo</i> , dude)	4.17 (2.64)
Ring-tail	4.33 (1.03)
Mediterranean-Irish	4.33 (2.25)
Greaser	4.50 (1.87)
Wino (perhaps alludes to use of table wine)	4.50 (2.53)
Walliyo (probably from Tuscan <i>guaglione</i> , boy)	4.50 (2.95)
Spigotty (probably from <i>spig</i> or directly from the sound of <i>spaghetti</i>)	4.67 (2.34)
Dino (probably diminutive for <i>Constantino</i>)	4.83 (1.33)
Italyite	5.00 (1.79)
Siciliano (<i>Sicilian</i> was newspaper code for all Italians)	5.17 (1.94)
Antonio	5.67 (1.21)
Tony	5.67 (1.51)
Carlo	5.83 (1.83)
Italiano	6.50 (1.52)

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

Country	M (SD)
Netherlands	
Cabbage-head (slang for a stupid person)	2.29 (0.76)
Jankaas	3.14 (0.69)
Nic-frog	3.14 (0.69)
Knickerbocker	3.29 (0.49)
Black-Dutch	3.29 (0.76)
Butter-mouth	3.29 (0.76)
Frog-lander	3.29 (0.76)
Pickleherring	3.71 (1.38)
Copperhead (specifically for the Dutch in New York)	3.83 (0.75)
Wooden-shoe	4.00 (0.82)
Closh (from <i>Claus</i> , a nickname for <i>Nicholas</i>)	4.00 (0.89)
Hans	4.43 (0.79)
Frank	4.43 (0.98)
Dutcher	4.71 (0.76)
Norway	
Squarehead	1.40 (0.89)
Snooser (a variant of snoozer, a 19th c. term for a rascal)	3.00 (1.41)
Sowegian (probably from altered blend of Swede and Norwegian)	3.40 (2.51)
Scoop	4.00 (0.71)
Scoovy	4.20 (1.30)
Norsky	4.40 (1.34)
Ski-jumper	4.60 (1.82)
Herring-destroyer	4.80 (1.93)
Scandiwegian	5.00 (0.71)
Scandie	5.40 (1.14)
Skywegian	5.60 (1.34)
Viking	7.00 (1.22)
Poland	
Dumb-polack	1.17 (0.41)
Yak (likely from the slang for a stupid person)	1.83 (0.75)
Bohunk	2.67 (0.82)
Hunk	2.83 (0.75)
Polacker	3.00 (2.10)
Polack	3.17 (2.32)
Dyno (especially for a recent immigrant; perhaps from sound of Polish <i>dai-no</i> , "give")	3.33 (1.03)
Psecrev (same as Russian slur <i>psja-krev</i> , dog's blood)	3.50 (1.22)
Stashu (from the identical Polish given name, i.e., Stanley)	4.83 (1.47)
Pole	5.33 (2.07)
Poski (alteration of <i>polski</i> , Pole)	5.83 (1.83)
Russia	
Steppe-sister (Fem. A pun on <i>stepsister</i> and the Russian <i>Steppes</i>)	1.80 (0.45)
Cabbage-eater	1.80 (1.30)

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

Country	M (SD)
Candle-eater	2.00 (1.73)
Bohunk	2.20 (1.30)
Slob (from Al Capp's "Lower Slobovia," a snow-bound land where fur-clad people spoke with a burlesque Slavic accent)	2.60 (0.89)
Bear (from the national symbol)	2.60 (2.07)
Rooshkin	3.00 (2.00)
Ivan	5.00 (3.39)
Ruski	6.40 (2.19)
Scotland	
Pinch-penny	1.50 (0.53)
Mactavish	3.13 (1.46)
Kiltie (from the wearing of kilts)	3.25 (1.49)
Scotchy (Diminutive of Scotch)	3.50 (2.20)
Sammy (perhaps from British English term <i>sammy</i> , a fool)	3.63 (2.33)
Jock (Scottish English for country boy; also a nickname for <i>John</i>)	4.38 (2.45)
Blue-bonnet (from an early national costume of a flat bonnet of blue wool)	4.63 (1.77)
Saunders	4.75 (1.16)
Mack (probably from the prefixes <i>Mc-</i> and <i>-Mac-</i> in many Scottish surnames)	4.75 (2.12)
Sandy (an abbreviation and diminutive of <i>Alexander</i> , a popular given name)	5.25 (2.25)
Scotty (diminutive of <i>Scot</i>)	6.38 (1.60)
Spain	
Spinach (from the sound of <i>Spanish</i> and <i>Spanisher</i>)	2.71 (1.80)
Dago (corruption of Spanish <i>Diego</i> , James)	3.29 (1.11)
Jose	4.14 (2.12)
Spanisher	4.57 (0.79)
Sweden	
Herring-choker	2.40 (1.14)
Dumbsocks	2.60 (1.14)
Squarehead	2.80 (1.10)
Roundhead	3.20 (1.30)
Scandahoovian	3.75 (1.26)
Scandiwegian	4.60 (0.89)
Sowegian (probably an altered blend of Swede and Norwegian)	4.60 (0.89)
Olaf	4.80 (0.45)
Ole	4.80 (0.45)
Snooser (a variant of snoozer, a 19th century term for a rascal)	5.00 (0.82)
Scandie	5.40 (1.52)
Scoop	5.60 (0.89)
Scoovy	5.60 (0.89)
Silvertip	5.80 (0.84)
Viking	5.80 (2.17)
Swenska	6.20 (1.48)
Swede	6.40 (2.30)

(continued)

Appendix (continued)

Country	M (SD)
Switzerland	
Colin-tampon (from the drumbeat of the Swiss guard)	4.40 (2.30)
Yodeller	5.20 (1.64)
Yodellander	5.60 (1.52)
Turkey	
Abdul	2.60 (1.82)
Arab	3.00 (2.83)
Infidel	4.20 (2.17)
Wales	
Waler	3.69 (1.60)
Cousin-Anne (wife of Welsh miner working in U.S.)	4.77 (2.09)
Welsher	4.85 (2.23)
Cousin-Jack (Welsh miner working in the United States)	5.08 (1.75)
Taffy (from the sound of <i>Daffydd</i> , David, the patron saint of Wales)	5.15 (2.48)

Acknowledgments

We wish to acknowledge our debt to Brian Mullen (died May 4, 2006) for his ideas and thoughtful comments during the collection of these data. Although he passed away before seeing the completion of this project, we are sure he would have appreciated the continuance of work he found intellectually fulfilling and ultimately of great societal import.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declared no potential conflicts of interests with respect to the authorship and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The authors received no financial support for the research and/or authorship of this article.

References

- Allen, I. L. (1983). *The language of ethnic conflict: Social organization and lexical culture*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Brewer, M. B. (1979). In-group bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive-motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 307-324.
- Carnaghi, A., & Maass, A. (2007). In-group and out-group perspectives in the use of derogatory group labels: Gay versus fag. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology*, 26, 142-156.
- Carter, A. A. (1944). Nicknames and minority groups. *Phylon*, 5, 241-245.
- Carter, B., & Steinberg, J. (2007, April 2). CBS drops Imus radio show over racial remark. *The New York Times*. Retrieved June 6, 2007, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2007/04/12/business/media/12cnd-imus.html?ei=5088&en=e6aacc917e46ed6b&ex=1334030400&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss&pagewanted=all>

- Hornsey, M. J., Oppes, T., & Svensson, A. (2002). "It's OK if we say it, but you can't": Responses to intergroup and intragroup criticism. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 32*, 293-307.
- Leader, T. I., Mullen, B., & Rice, D. R. (2009). Complexity and valence in ethnophaulisms and exclusion of ethnic outgroups: What puts the "hate" into hate speech? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*, 170-182.
- Mullen, B. (2001). Ethnophaulisms for ethnic immigrant groups. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 457-475.
- Mullen, B. (2004). Sticks and stones can break my bones, but ethnophaulisms can alter the portrayal of immigrants to children. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 250-260.
- Mullen, B., & Johnson, C. (1993). Cognitive representation in ethnophaulisms as a function of group size: The phenomenology of being in a group. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 296-304.
- Mullen, B., & Johnson, C. (1995). Cognitive representation in ethnophaulisms and illusory correlation in stereotyping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 420-433.
- Mullen, B., & Leader, T. I. (2005). Linguistic factors: Antilocutions, ethnonyms, ethnophaulisms, and other varieties of hate speech. In J. F. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.), *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (pp. 192-207). Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- 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., Rozell, D., & Johnson, C. (2000). Ethnophaulisms for ethnic immigrant groups: Cognitive representation of "the minority" and "the foreigner." *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 3*, 5-24.
- Mullen, B., Rozell, D., & Johnson, C. (2001). Ethnophaulisms for ethnic immigrant groups: The contributions of group size and familiarity. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 31*, 231-246.
- Mullen, B., & Smyth, J. M. (2004). Immigrant suicide rates as a function of ethnophaulisms: Hate speech predicts death. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 66*, 343-348.
- Roback, A. A. (1944). *A dictionary of international slurs*. Cambridge, MA: Sci-Art.
- Schneider, K. T., Hitlan, R. T., & Radhakrishanan, P. (2000). An examination of the nature and correlates of ethnic harassment experiences in multiple contexts. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 3-12.
- Theodore, L. (2006, April 5). Racial, ethnic slurs shock Geneva. *The Beaver County Times*, pp. A1, A7.

Bio

Diana R. Rice teaches at Geneva College. Her research interests include the influence of cognitive complexity on perceptions ingroup and outgroup members, as well as on intergroup behavior.