Marek Krawiec

Language as a mirror od cultural sterotypes : an ethnolinguistic perspective

Marek Krawiec
Państwowa Wyższa Szkoła Zawodowa im. Angelusa Silesiusa w Wałbrzychu,
Wyższa Szkoła Filologiczna we Wrocławiu

LANGUAGE AS A MIRROR
OF CULTURAL STEREOTYPES –
AN ETHNOLINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

Key words: language, stereotypes, ethnic others, linguistic mirroring of cultural stereotypes, linguistic worldview

In the considerations on language and stereotypes it is necessary to emphasize first that language is a useful means of reflecting one's thoughts, beliefs and attitudes towards fragments of the surrounding cultural reality. Such a perspective has a lot to do with the hypothesis of linguistic relativity advocated by Edward Sapir [1964] and Benjamin Whorf [1956], who contended that language and culture cannot be analysed in isolation and that language constitutes a part of culture and that culture constitutes a part of language. By pointing to this interaction the two scholars promulgated the theory of a linguistic system in the description and representation of human experience and understanding of the world [as reported in Anusiewicz, Dąbrowska and Fleischer 2000; Brown 1994; Hinkel 1999; Koniewicz 1997; Morciniec 2007]. As a matter of fact, linguistic labels constitute a mode of expressing not only one's own reality but also opinions about other cultural milieus (natural, social and emotional), which are often seen from the critical and ethnocentric standpoint [Bartmiński 2007; Krawiec 2006; Szczęk 2002]. This subject is one of the issues related to the linguistic aspect of stereotypes which is discussed in the following paper.

Essentially, this article looks in more detail at what is involved from the linguistic point of view in stereotyping. The opinions of various linguists are featured here and some of the terminology introduced by them is clarified as well. Certain attention is also paid to the notion of a linguistic worldview which seems to play a significant role in stereotypes. However, it is impossible to discuss the process of linguistic mirroring of cultural stereotypes without making references

to cognitive aspects. Therefore, the following discussion is interspersed with issues of a linguistic, cultural as well as cognitive nature.

1. General note on language and its reflection of cultural stereotypes

Stereotyping is a notion which nowadays raises a great deal of interest among linguists [e.g. Bartmiński 1998, 2007; Panasiuk 1998; Quasthoff 1973, 1998], who particularly emphasize the role of language in the whole process of transforming mental pictures into more explicit forms. In fact, linguists are confronted with the task of describing stereotypes in such a way which would allow for viewing them as correlated with linguistic mental entities.

At this point it needs to be noted that apart from its graphical, phonological and syntactic character, language displays some socio-cultural features which make it a particularly important phenomenon of investigation in the field of social sciences. The basic functions of language reflected in this sphere refer to thinking, communicating and expressing one's and others' reality. It is argued that each language with its system of stereotypes, which includes judgements established in the lexicon and grammatical forms, is capable of interpreting reality in its own way. In this sense, language comes to be taken as a tool of documentation of the world, a tool providing knowledge, opinions and feelings that are fixed in the verbalized and often ready-to-use forms [Koniewicz 1997; Kurcz 1976, 2000; Morciniec 2007; Nycz 2002; Szarota 1996; Tokarski 1999].

With regard to this line of argumentation, it is worth quoting the opinion of Jerzy Bartmiński [1995, 1998, 1999, 2006, 2007] who points out that language, along with stereotypes, functions as a basis for consolidation of the group and as a device which records and at the same time models certain worldviews and social behaviours. In his framework, the linguistic stereotype (linguistic worldview) appears as a certain set of beliefs, more or less fixed in language, which depicts the traits of objects in the extralinguistic world. In fact, Bartmiński presents the stereotype as a reflection of the socio-cultural reality and as a specific viewpoint which finds expression via linguistic signs, especially lexical items, which allow for codification, interpretation, categorization and evaluation of the world one lives in. This reasoning seems to be based on the general assumption that the stereotype is both a mirror of culture and a component of language.

Another opinion to be mentioned here is that stereotypes are commonly shared images expressed in the form of words and sentences which refer to certain groups of people. Such a view is held, for instance, by Uta Quasthoff [1973, 1998], who particularly underlines the verbal facet of stereotypes.

At this point it is worth acknowledging the role of Walter Lippmann, who first noticed the link between stereotypes and language. He pointed out in his

well-known publication (*Public Opinion*, 1922) that words such as Mexico, Japan or alien induce certain associations which are not necessarily consistent with the meanings of these words [Telus 1998: 136], as may be shown in the following example:

> Englishman
> (1) meaning – 'someone who comes from England' [Summers 1995: 450];
> (2) associations – 'elegant, intelligent, phlegmatic, level-headed, stand-offish, home-loving and tea-drinking person with a bowler and an umbrella' [Byram, Cain 1998; Chantry 2002; Kmiecik 2003; Krawiec 2007; Siek-Piskozub 1993].

To these linguistic considerations, one should add the observation of Gordon Allport [1954, as quoted in Telus 1998: 136] who suggests, for example, that the name of a group brings to one's mind defining, probable or even false features of a specific category of people, which is a view corresponding to Lippmann's remark. The same reflection is brought out by Adam Schaff [1981: 86–87], who maintains that a stereotype is closely connected with a word or expression which in a specific context functions as an impulse activating the content of the stereotype.

The concept of verbalization in stereotyping is also highlighted by Anna Dąbrowska [1998: 278], Jolanta Dyoniziak [2002: 77], Magda Nycz [2002: 170] and Zbigniew Greń [2001: 67–68], whose reports and observations substantiate the important role of linguistic forms (e.g. lexicalized metaphors, phrases, proverbs) in the transmission of stereotypes about others and in the creation of a specific semantic field called a linguistic worldview.

The above mentioned comments and explanatory remarks agree in affirming that due to the process of transformation of a mental stereotype (which exists in one's head) into a linguistic one, individuals are able to express what they think about and how they see certain people, objects and phenomena.

In this discussion it is worth emphasizing that mental stereotypes appear not only in the form of linguistic expressions but also in individual and social behaviour, customs, habits and art, that is, in cultural stereotypes which may also be reflected in language [Grzegorczyk 1997: 287; Tołstaja 1998: 100]. In fact, verbalization of cultural stereotypes viewed as mental patterns plays an important role in expressing social (cultural) reality [Szczęk 2002: 232].

A corresponding opinion on this issue is presented by Teun van Dijk [1996], who argues that preconceptions about cultural categorization, differentiation and negativization of others, which appear in the form of prejudices, stereotypes or prevalent negative stories, are expressed in everyday conversations, news reports, political and corporate discourse and educational materials. According to him, such underlying social cognitions of many ingroup members are manifested in private as well as public texts and talks. Van Dijk's claim is that texts and talks are forms of media which function as surface expression and social enactment of many social as well as personal cognitions. In his further considerations, he points out that all structures of discourse, graphical, phonological, syntactic, stylistic,

pragmatic and interactional/conversational, may be geared towards emphasizing negative traits of "them" and positive traits of "us", or vice versa.

Yet, there is another perspective which should be incorporated in the discussion on language and stereotypes. This perspective mainly deals with language seen as a stimulator of the process of stereotyping. An interesting observation in this regard is given, for instance, by Joyce Valdes [1996: 2], who maintains that it is very natural to associate a given group of people and their stereotypical traits of appearance, behaviour and thinking patterns with the language which is spoken by them. As Valdes indicates, by saying, for instance, "I love French – it's so musical and expressive", one in fact relies on the common stereotype that peeks out from his mind and which presents a French man/woman as a person who speaks in pleasing notes with sparkling eyes and communicative gestures. This example illustrates that a language designation induces certain associations which are kept in one's mind and activated whenever the name of the language is brought into focus.

On the basis of what has been presented so far, it may be inferred that language's role as a social and ethnic index is to be particularly highlighted in the discussion of stereotypes. In fact, language placed in this context appears to be seen not only as a medium by means of which people can impose labels and categories on others, but also as the stimulator which enables individuals to associate stereotypical features with certain ethnic and social groups. Therefore, it can be claimed that through linguistic signs, which are labels of mental and cultural stereotypes, people reveal their knowledge and express their attitudes towards the socio-cultural reality surrounding them [Grzegorczyk 1997: 287; Krawiec 2006: 195]. Bearing in mind the above mentioned observations and implications, we can recognize the overall framework of linguistic codification in stereotypes, which in the subsequent section is presented with regard to the three important aspects: formal, cognitive and pragmatic.

2. Three aspects of linguistic codification in stereotypes

New developments in linguistics, in particular the rise of the cognitive approach, marked a turning point in the interpretation of stereotypes expressed in language. Some linguists, among others Wojciech Chlebda [1998: 32], highlight the fact that linguistic codification in stereotypes includes the following three aspects:
– formal (structural) aspect, which refers to the verbal features of a stereotype, in-
  cluding its rhythmical character;
– cognitive aspect, based on the existence of a certain mental construct which in-
  cludes typical, conventional and culturally oriented judgements, beliefs and ide-
  as about the object or phenomenon;

– pragmatic aspect, related to a causing force which prompts a stereotype to drive
human reactions and behaviours. This is in accordance with the view of Jerome
Bruner [1971, as cited in Chlebda 1998: 38], who points out that people act in
the categories of concepts codified in language.

Chlebda [1998: 32], in his considerations on this issue, puts forward three
basic assumptions of the linguistic approach to stereotyping. The assumptions,
which can be formulated on the strength of the three aspects enumerated above,
present stereotypes as:
– reproductive word clusters (lingual stereotypes);
– specific mental constructs (mental stereotypes);
– specific mental constructs deeply rooted in the consciousness through a lingui-
stic sign (linguo-mental stereotypes).

An important point made by Chlebda [1998: 32–33] in this regard is that all
the above nuances should be treated as essential elements in the discussion of
stereotypes from the linguistic perspective. However, the above mentioned points
are not the only form of contribution to the description of the role of language in
stereotyping. Additionally, there are the explanations, for example, which discuss
linguistic forms of stereotype exposure. These explanations are presented in the
forthcoming part.

3. Stereotype and its linguistic forms of exposure

Since stereotypes (mental constructs) about ethnic others are interrelated
with language, it seems legitimate to study their linguistic forms of exposure,
such as words, phrases and sentences. Most linguists [e.g. Bartmiński 1998,
2007; Dąbrowska 1998; Quasthoff 1973, 1998] acknowledge that stereotypes
appear in the form of expressions which are an efficient and effective means of
transmitting one's beliefs and judgements about outgroup members. These often
poorly assessed beliefs are, in fact, passed on in a group by means of linguistic
configurations which serve stereotyping processes through relatively simple
semantic forms (in each language one may easily encounter similar expressions
to the Polish *ocyganić* 'to cheat' – used to characterize Gypsies, *czeski film*
'confusion' – featured through the words 'Czech' and 'film', or *Francja elegancja*
'something beautiful and charming' – referring to the image of 'France elegance')
or via more descriptive and complex structures [Boski 2001: 178; Greń 2001: 69;
Nycz 2002: 169f.; Wojciszke 2002: 70].

In this area of consideration it is necessary to quote first the opinion of Jerzy
Bartmiński and Jolanta Panasiuk [1993: 373], who note that linguistic forms of
exposition are undoubtedly an important basis for identification of commonly
held stereotypes which exist in the social consciousness. In such forms one may

distinguish a number of elements which allow people to present opinions and judgements about "different others".

Swietłana Prochorowa [1998: 239], for example, claims that for the purpose of stereotyping, metaphors and similes serve as a set of linguistic clichés, widely and automatically used by members of a given linguistic community [see also Tokarski 1998: 76; Wlaźnik 2002: 114].

Scholars [e.g. Bokszański 1997; Nycz 2002; Quasthoff 1998] also emphasize that stereotypes usually comprise a set of trait adjectives which are incorporated into sentences of the sort: "Xs are such and such", as the following examples indicate it: "Italian people are passionate" [Magill 1995: 1364] or "Jews are smart, aggressive, grasping and materialistic" [Taylor 1981: 102]. A common link here is the repetition of the same words or grammatical structures ("Xs are such and such") into which certain words are slotted and accommodated. It is essential to point out, however, that such generic sentences as mentioned above reflect typical features of a category rather than characteristic traits of the individual member of the category.

Crucial to this discussion is the view of Teun van Dijk [1996: 56–57], who argues that the prominence and relevance of some issues existing in the social mind may be communicatively enhanced by rhetorical figures (exaggeration, hyperbole, repetition), lexicalization (selecting negative words) or syntactic patterns which, for example, place the subject group in the first, topical position of an active voice sentence. Besides, as he emphasizes, contrasted semantic, stylistic or rhetorical structures may express "us – them" polarization in all ethnic representations, with personal pronouns being reserved for designating group membership and solidarity.

Other comments on this issue are made by Ida Kurcz [2000: 207], who highlights the role of nouns, adjectives and verbs in the linguistic presentation of people and their behaviour. Within her frame of reference, verbs function as linguistic portrayals of one's behaviours and actions, adjectives constitute a class of items used to specify characteristic features of a group of people, whereas nouns serve as the markers which separate a particular category from the other ones.

With regard to linguistic forms of exposure, it is worth quoting another view of Kurcz [2000] who maintains that emotionally loaded stereotypical beliefs about social, ethnic and racial groups are often expressed by means of nominal forms, the examples of which are given below: *Nigger* (in English), *asfalt*, *czarnuch* (in Polish, negative connotation) for an African, *szkop*, *szwab* (in Polish, negative) for a German, *pepik* (in Polish) for a Czech, *Polacke* (German, negative) for a Pole, *Pommy* (in Australian English, negative) for a Briton [Boski 2001; Greń 2001; Grzegorczyk 1997; Radłowski and Wojtczak 1994; Strybel 1997; Summers 1995; Szarota 1996; Szczęk 2002].

Roberta L. Klatzky, Susan M. Andersen and John Murray [1990, as cited in Kurcz 2000: 207–208] assume that noun categories are of better assistance in stereotyping processes than adjectives, for they denote at once whole clusters of features, including among others the aspects of the character, physical appearance and typical behaviour of the group in question. According to this line of reasoning, stereotypes – expressed in the form of fixed nominal labels – carry more information with them and rely on a more extensive net of attributes than those stereotypical beliefs which are mainly conveyed by means of adjectives.

It needs to be noted here that the above mentioned linguistic means of representation of others often comprise derogatory and insulting labels, that is to say, abusive names which people use in order to reinforce negative stereotypes about other socio-cultural groups. With regard to this point, it is worth emphasizing that verbalization of negative attitudes towards outgroup members is predominantly manifested in the form of graffiti or in various types of conversational remarks, which are meant to present a particular group of people in an unfavourable way. Douglas T. Kenrick, Steven L. Neuberg and Robert B. Cialdini [2002] argue that the use of negative designations and its consequences mostly depend on the features of the subject who is verbally referred to and on the system of prejudicial beliefs of the person who is engaged in the process of creating pictures of ethnic others. In their considerations on this issue, they point to a series of experiments conducted by some researchers [e.g. Greenberg and Pyszczyński 1985; Katz, Wackenhut and Hass 1986; Simon and Greenberg 1996] who have proven that verbally expressed labels do not, however, influence all people in the same way. Elaborating further on this finding, Kenrick, Neuberg and Cialdini indicate that a significant influence of verbal labels is particularly visible among people who develop an extensive network of prejudices and biased conceptions and who can easily activate and employ such labels in speech.

The last aspect to be mentioned in this area refers to the formation of stereotypes according to the kinetic habits of the human articulatory apparatus. Taking this aspect into consideration, Chlebda [1998: 36–37] points out that such rhythmical factors as the number of syllables or intonation patterns have a great influence on articulation, memorization and reproduction of stereotypes in speech.

On the basis of the above discussion, we may essentially stress the importance of linguistic forms which are employed for the expression of commonly held stereotypical beliefs and judgements about ethnic others. These forms, as scholars emphasize, comprise individual items such as nouns (e.g. *Pommy*, *snail-eater*), verbs (e.g. in Polish *ocyganić* 'to cheat somebody', in English *to Jew somebody down* 'to bargain over the price') or adjectives (e.g. *mean*, *romantic*), as well as more extended structures which refer, for instance, to such sentences as: "Xs are such and such", "Xs like this and this", "Xs do that and that" [Awdiejew 1998: 56; Bartmiński 1995: 259; Bokszański 1997: 45; Greń 2001: 69; Nycz 2002: 169–170]. Such a variety of means contributes to the mirroring of widely spread

stereotypical conceptions whose linguistic facet cannot be, however, presented thoroughly without making references to the emotional aspect, which is an issue to be described in the subsequent section.

4. Emotional aspect in linguistic stereotypes about ethnic others

At this point it must be stressed that almost all expressions of a given language which refer to ethnic others are usually emotionally laden. The emotional character of stereotypical statements is manifested at different levels of language:
– phonetically, through intonation and accent;
– morphologically, for example: in Australian English through diminutives which are formed by adding the suffix *-ie* to a given word (e.g. the diminutive *Darkie* is an offensive term used to refer to a 'black person');
– lexically, mainly through colloquial or even vulgar words such as *szkop*, *szwab* (in Polish) for a German, *Polacke* (in German), *Polak/polacque/polack* (in French) for Pole, *Pommy* (in Australian English) for a Briton or *Nazi prat* (in British English) for a German [Bartmiński 1998; Boski 2001; Greń 2001; Grzegorczyk 1997; Nowak 1998; Nycz 2002; Strybel 1997; Szarota 1996].

In fact, at each of the three levels one may clearly accentuate his negative or positive attitudes towards members of other cultures and social groups. These attitudes and emotions are expressed by a complex combination of cues which mainly rely on the verbal forms of representation [McCarthy 1996: 108–109].

In order to mirror faithfully one's attitudes towards groups of people or objects, each of the linguistic stereotypes requires the use of such phonetic phenomena as stress, pitch, length or intonation. The point here is that these forms of accentuation may convey information about the speaker's feelings and emotions with regard to the object or person in question. Shifting the intonation pattern in the utterance, highlighting a given word of the sentence by extra stress, or deviating from an expected pitch contour are a few of the methods of expressing attitudes towards different ethnic groups [Nowak 1998: 201; Waniek-Klimczak 1993: 40–41]. Thus, the sentence "Germans are industrious and disciplined" may be interpreted in a variety of ways, depending on the stress, intonation and duration. It may be uttered, among other ways, as a compliment, reproach, or as admiration or contempt for the orderly world of Germans.

However, the insinuation behind utterances that people produce with reference to other socio-cultural groups depends mostly on lexical items and their meanings [Bartmiński 1995, 1998, 2007; Kurcz 2000]. For example, the word *industrious* used in the sentence above evokes rather positive connotations, contrary to the word *lazy*, which is generally viewed as negative in tone. It is assumed that lexical items, used to describe the perceived image of others, provide the users with

an insight into relationships between socio-cultural groups which usually differ considerably in their patterns of thinking, behaving and evaluating the world [Dąbrowska 1998].

In fact, through the use of linguistic stereotypes, members of an ingroup may express their dislike of an outgroup, as is demonstrated in the following sentences: "I do not like black people because they are lazy"; "I do not like Jews because they are stingy" [Magill 1995: 1027]. The general idea which comes to the fore here is that stereotypes are linguistic labels which are used by people to express disdain and antipathy towards different others [Szarota 1996: 67].

5. Concluding remarks

From the account provided above it becomes clear that linguistic representations of ethnic others are certain forms of tagging people and their cultural, social, economic, political and natural world which is approached and evaluated either from a positive or negative perspective.

The presented discussion on the nature of linguistic stereotypes shows that language plays an important role in the process of mirroring a particular nation's emotions and attitudes towards different others, as well as in projecting the relationships between the groups in question. Thus, the observations and implications gathered here lead to a very important conclusion, namely that the phonetic phenomena, the morphological processes and the meanings of lexical items assist in the mirroring of cultural stereotypes which are formulated and adopted by people with the aim of expressing feelings and emotions towards members of other socio-cultural groups. In fact, this and other aspects discussed above aim at revealing the linguistic facet of stereotypes, which requires from scholars interested in linguistic and cultural notions further investigations, observations and implications.

Bibliography

Allport, G.W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Garden City, NY, Doubleday Anchor.
Anusiewicz, J., Dąbrowska, A., Fleischer, M. (2000). *Językowy obraz świata i kultura. Projekt koncepcji badawczej*. Język a Kultura 13, 11–44.
Awdiejew, A. (1998). *Standardy semantyczne a znaczenie leksykalne*. Język a Kultura 12, 53–62.
Bartmiński, J. (1995). *Nasi sąsiedzi w oczach studentów*. In: T. Walas (ed.). *Narody i stereotypy*. Kraków, Międzynarodowe Centrum Kultury, 258–269.
Bartmiński, J. (1998). *Podstawy lingwistycznych badań nad stereotypem – na przykładzie stereotypu matki*. Język a Kultura 12, 63–83.
Bartmiński, J. (1999). *Punkt widzenia, perspektywa, językowy obraz świata*. In: J. Bartmiński (ed.). *Językowy obraz świata*. Lublin, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 103–120.

Bartmiński, J. (2006). *Językowe podstawy obrazu świata*. Lublin, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Bartmiński, J. (2007). *Stereotypy mieszkają w języku. Studia etnolingwistyczne*. Lublin, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej.

Bartmiński, J., Panasiuk, J. (1993). *Stereotypy językowe*. In: J. Bartmiński (ed.). *Językowy obraz świata*. Lublin, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Marii Curie-Skłodowskiej, 363–387.

Bokszański, Z. (1997). *Stereotypy a kultura*. Wrocław, Fundacja na Rzecz Nauki Polskiej.

Boski, P. (2001). *O stereotypach niestereotypowo, czyli jak badać wiedzę o kulturze grup społecznych i unikać ich stereotypów*. In: M. Kofta, A. Jasińska-Kania (eds.). *Stereotypy i uprzedzenia. Uwarunkowania psychologiczne i kulturowe*. Warszawa, Scholar, 164–213.

Brown, D.H. (1994). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

Bruner, J.S. (1971). *O poznawaniu. Szkice na lewą rękę*. Warszawa, Państwowy Instytut Wydawniczy.

Byram, M., Cain, A. (1998). *Civilisation/Cultural Studies: An Experiment in French and English Schools*. In: M. Byram, M. Fleming (eds.). *Language Learning in Intercultural Perspective: Approaches Through Drama and Ethnography*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 32–44.

Chantry, X. (2002). *Stereotypy i ich przekład w komiksie: Astérix chez les Bretons i jego wersja polska*. In: E. Skibińska, M. Cieński (eds.). *Język – stereotyp – przekład*. Wrocław, Dolnośląskie Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne, 45–55.

Chlebda, W. (1998). *Stereotyp jako jedność języka, myślenia i działania*. Język a Kultura 12, 31–41.

Dąbrowska, A. (1998). *Czy istnieje w podręcznikach języka polskiego dla cudzoziemców wyraźny obraz Polski i Polaków? (Próba znalezienia stereotypów)*. Język a Kultura 12, 278–295.

Dyoniziak, J. (2002). *Stereotyp kobiety w kontekście przekładu francuskich haseł reklamowych*. In: E. Skibińska, M. Cieński (eds.). *Język – stereotyp – przekład*. Wrocław, Dolnośląskie Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne, 77–83.

Greenberg, J., Pyszczyński, T. (1985). *Compensatory Self-Inflation: A Response to the Threat to Self-Regard of Public Failure*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 49, 273–280.

Greń, Z. (2001). *Stereotypy jako fenomeny językowe*. In: M. Kofta, A. Jasińska-Kania (eds.). *Stereotypy i uprzedzenia. Uwarunkowania psychologiczne i kulturowe*. Warszawa, Scholar, 67–79.

Grzegorczyk, A. (ed.) (1997). *Aktualizacje encyklopedyczne. Kultura – Sztuka*. Poznań, Wydawnictwo Kurpisz.

Hinkel, E. (ed.) (1999). *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Kenrick, D.T., Neuberg, S.L., Cialdini, R.B. (2002). *Psychologia społeczna*. Gdańsk, Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.

Kmiecik, A.P. (2003). *Europhile Rather than Anglocentric*. Języki Obce w Szkole 2, 129–131.

Koniewicz, D.M. (1997). *Aspects of cultural relativity in EFL handbooks*. Acta Universitatis Lodziensis. Folia Linguistica 36, 305–370.

Krawiec, M. (2006). *Ethnolinguistic Exemplification of Stereotyping: The Image of Poles Perceived by Foreigners*. In: K. Bogacki, A. Miatluk (eds.). *Semantic Relations in Language and Culture*. Białystok, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu w Białymstoku, 189–196.

Krawiec, M. (2007). *Metoda projektu w kształtowaniu świadomości kulturowej dzieci w wieku 10–13 lat. Wykorzystanie zasobów percepcyjno-asocjacyjnych uczniów do prezentacji treści kulturoznawczych na lekcji języka angielskiego*. Poliglota 1(5), 58–71.

Kurcz, I. (1976). *Psycholingwistyka. Przegląd problemów badawczych*. Warszawa, Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.

Kurcz, I. (2000). *Psychologia języka i komunikacji*. Warszawa, Scholar.

Lippmann, W. (1922). *Public Opinion*. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co.

Magiel, F.N. (ed.) (1995). *International Encyclopedia of Sociology*. Vol. 2. London, Fitzroy Deaborn Publishers.

McCarthy, M. (1996). *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Morciniec, N. (2007). *O językowym obrazie świata, czyli czym różnią się języki*. In: Z. Wąsik, A. Ciuk (eds.). *For the Love of the Embedded Word – in Society, Culture and Education*. Wrocław, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, 19–30.

Nowak, P. (1998). *Stereotyp odbiorcy w tekstach publicystycznych z lat pięćdziesiątych*. Język a Kultura 12, 197–205.

Nycz, M. (2002). *Etnonimia – stereotyp – przekład*. In: E. Skibińska, M. Cieński (eds.). *Język – stereotyp – przekład*. Wrocław, Dolnośląskie Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne, 169–177.

Panasiuk, J. (1998). *O zmienności stereotypów*. Język a Kultura 12, 84–98.

Prochorowa, S.M. (1998). *Stereotyp językowy Europejczyka w kontekście opozycji 'swój – obcy'*. Język a Kultura 12, 238–244.

Quasthoff, U. (1973). *Soziales Vorurteil und Kommunikation. Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Analyse des Stereotypes*. Frankfurt a. M., Athenäum.

Quasthoff, U. (1998). *Etnocentryczne przetwarzanie informacji. Ambiwalencja funkcji stereotypów w komunikacji międzykulturowej*. Język a Kultura 12, 11–30.

Radłowski, Z., Wojtczak, J. (1994). *Jak narody widzą siebie nawzajem. O Polakach w Europie*. Warszawa, Semper.

Sapir, E. (1964). *Culture, Language, and Personality: Selected Essays*. David G. Mandelbaum (ed.). Berkeley, CA, University of California Press.

Schaff, A. (1981). *Stereotypy a działanie ludzkie*. Warszawa, Książka i Wiedza.

Siek-Piskozub, T. (1993). *The English and the American in the Eyes of Poles*. Glottodidactica 21, 119–127.

Simon, L., Greenberg, J. (1996). *Further Progress in Understanding the Effects of Derogatory Ethnic Labels: The Role of Pre-Existing Attitudes Toward the Targeted Group*. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin 22, 1195–1204.

Strybel, R. (1997). *Loose & Casual or Slurred & Sloppy*. The World of English 2(29), 10–11.

Summers, D. (ed.) (1995). *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. Harlow, Essex, Longman.

Szarota, T. (1996). *Niemcy i Polacy. Wzajemne postrzeganie i stereotypy*. Warszawa, PWN.

Szczęk, J. (2002). *Problem przekładu na język polski stereotypów kulturowych utrwalonych w wybranych związkach frazeologicznych języka niemieckiego*. In: E. Skibińska, M. Cieński (eds.). *Język – stereotyp – przekład*. Wrocław, Dolnośląskie Wydawnictwo Edukacyjne, 231–240.

Taylor, S.E. (1981). *A Categorization Approach to Stereotyping*. In: D.L. Hamilton (ed.). *Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Intergroup Behavior*. Hillsdale, New Jersey, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 88–114.

Telus, M. (1998). *Stereotyp grupowy a predykacja*. Język a Kultura 12, 135–145.

Tokarski, R. (1998). *Biała brzoza, czarna ziemia, czyli o miejscu stereotypu w opisie języka*. Język a Kultura 12, 124–134.

Tołstaja, S. (1998). *Stereotyp w języku kultury*. Język a Kultura 12, 99–104.

Valdes, J.M. (1996). *Culture Bound: Bridging the Cultural Gap in Language Teaching*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Van Dijk, T.A. (1996). *Discourse, Racism and Ideology*. La Laguna, RCEI Ediciones.

Waniek-Klimczak, E. (1993). *Sounds*. In: B. Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk (ed.). *Ways to Language: An Introduction to Linguistics*. Łódź, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego, 24–60.

Whorf, B.L. (1956). *Language, Thought and Reality: Selected Writings of Benjamin Lee Whorf*. J.B. Carroll (ed.). Cambridge, MA, Technology Press of Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Wlaźnik, L. (2002). *Stéréotypes comme moyen de formation interculturelle*. In: T. Siek-Piskozub (ed.). *European Year of Languages 2001*. Poznań, Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza, 109–121.

Wojcieszke, B. (2002). *Człowiek wśród ludzi. Zarys psychologii społecznej*. Warszawa, Scholar.

Summary

Language as a Mirror of Cultural Stereotypes – an Ethnolinguistic Perspective

The article deals with the issue of mirroring stereotypes through language which is presented in this material as an important tool of reflecting opinions, beliefs and judgements about ethnic others. The paper discusses different linguistic means which help to express cultural stereotypes commonly held in societies. On the basis of the opinions, comments and observations of different scholars, the author of the article distinguishes items which are essential for linguistic reproduction of cultural (mental) stereotypes. In his account he demonstrates how closely stereotypes are linked with the linguistic signs in use. Although the paper examines the notion of stereotyping from a linguistic perspective, it also refers to the assumptions of the cognitive and cultural approaches to stereotyping.