Alcohol & Dehumanization: Understanding the Link

Authored by

mohammed looti

November 10, 2025

Introduction to Alcohol-Related Metadehumanization (ARM)

Alcohol-Related Metadehumanization (ARM) represents a specialized concept within social psychology and substance abuse research, focusing on the cognitive process by which an observer attributes fewer essential human qualities to another individual specifically because they are perceived to be under the influence of alcohol. This phenomenon is rooted in **metaperception**, which is the act of thinking about how others perceive oneself, but in the context of ARM, it refers to the observer's prediction or belief about the intoxicated target's capacity for complex human functioning. Unlike general dehumanization, which is often rooted in stable prejudice against a group, ARM is largely context-dependent and transient, activating specific cognitive schemas related to alcohol intoxication that strip the target of perceived agency, moral responsibility, and rational thought.

The core mechanism of ARM involves the categorization of the intoxicated individual as lacking qualities that distinguish humans from animals or machines. These qualities, often referred to as uniquely human characteristics (UHCs) like rationality, maturity, and moral sensibility, are deemed temporarily or severely impaired by the presence of alcohol. This perceived deficiency leads the observer to treat the intoxicated person differently, often resulting in reduced empathy, increased punitive attitudes, and a willingness to engage in aggressive or dismissive behaviors toward them. Understanding ARM is critical because it explains why individuals who are intoxicated are frequently victimized or treated with less dignity, irrespective of their baseline social status or relationship with the observer, highlighting a significant blind spot in social safety and ethical interaction.

Furthermore, ARM provides a powerful lens through which to examine the interplay between chemical effects, social norms, and cognitive biases. The perception of intoxication serves as a powerful heuristic, immediately signaling to the observer that the target is operating outside the normal parameters of social contract and emotional control. This signaling triggers a defensive psychological response in the observer, leading to the mental reduction of the intoxicated person's humanity as a form of moral disengagement, thereby justifying potential neglect or harm. It is this metaperceptive reduction of human status that differentiates ARM from simple negative stereotyping, positioning it as a fundamental cognitive shift in how the intoxicated are processed socially.

Theoretical Foundations and the Dual Nature of Dehumanization

The theoretical foundation of ARM rests heavily on Nick Haslam's influential model of dehumanization, which posits two distinct forms: **animalistic dehumanization** and **mechanistic dehumanization**. Animalistic dehumanization involves denying the target characteristics related to culture, refinement, and moral depth (e.g., treating them as savage, impulsive, or driven purely by

base instincts). Mechanistic dehumanization, conversely, involves denying the target characteristics related to consciousness, emotion, and individuality (e.g., treating them as cold, inert, or interchangeable cogs in a system). ARM frequently draws upon both forms, though often emphasizing the animalistic aspects due to the visible behavioral effects of intoxication.

When observing an intoxicated individual, the perception of impaired motor skills, emotional lability, and disinhibited behavior strongly aligns with the attributes denied in animalistic dehumanization. The observer perceives the person as having regressed to a more primal state, losing the uniquely human capacity for self-regulation and sophisticated social navigation. This immediate visual and behavioral evidence acts as a powerful cue, reinforcing the belief that the intoxicated person is currently operating outside the realm of adult, rational human interaction. Consequently, the observer may feel less compelled to adhere to standard rules of civility or moral consideration, viewing the target's distress or vulnerability as an inevitable consequence of their self-induced, animalistic state.

While less dominant than the animalistic form, mechanistic dehumanization also plays a subtle but significant role in ARM, particularly when the observer focuses on the perceived lack of cognitive function. The intoxicated person may be viewed as a broken machine or an object that is malfunctioning--a temporary automaton whose actions are predetermined and lack true conscious intent or will. This perspective can manifest in clinical settings or emergency situations where the intoxicated individual is treated impersonally, merely as a collection of symptoms or a logistical problem to be managed rather than a person requiring empathetic care. The dual nature of ARM, therefore, allows for a comprehensive explanation of the different ways observers cognitively distance themselves from the intoxicated target, whether by viewing them as beasts or broken objects.

The application of this dual-axis model highlights that ARM is not monolithic. The specific context--such as the setting (a party versus a hospital), the severity of intoxication, and the observer's relationship with the target--will influence whether the observer defaults to animalistic attributions (e.g., viewing public drunkenness as inherently disgusting or shameful) or mechanistic attributions (e.g., viewing an unresponsive person as a medical device failure). Regardless of the specific manifestation, the common denominator is the attribution of reduced mental complexity and moral standing, which justifies differential and often detrimental treatment.

The Role of Alcohol Expectancies and Attribution

A crucial antecedent to ARM is the pervasive influence of **alcohol expectancies**--the culturally learned beliefs about how alcohol affects behavior, thought, and emotion. Societies hold powerful, often contradictory, schemas regarding intoxication. On one hand, alcohol is expected to lead to revelry, sociability, and disinhibition; on the other, it is expected to lead to irrationality, aggression,

and moral failure. When an observer witnesses behavior consistent with the negative stereotypes of intoxication, these expectancies are immediately confirmed, providing a ready-made cognitive justification for the perceived loss of humanity. The observer attributes the target's failings entirely to the substance, externalizing the behavior and minimizing the need for nuanced psychological assessment.

This attribution process is closely linked to the concept of perceived control. Because alcohol consumption is generally viewed as a voluntary choice, observers often assign high levels of personal responsibility for the resulting state of intoxication. This attribution of agency in the *cause* of the state allows the observer to morally justify the dehumanizing perception of the *consequences* of the state. If the target willingly chose to surrender their rational faculties, the observer feels less moral obligation toward them. This perception of self-inflicted vulnerability is a powerful driver of ARM, allowing the observer to maintain a psychological distance and absolve themselves of responsibility for intervening or offering support, especially if the target is deemed to have violated social norms regarding responsible drinking.

Furthermore, alcohol expectancies can create a self-fulfilling prophecy in social interactions. If an observer expects an intoxicated person to be irrational, unpredictable, and incapable of coherent communication, the observer will likely reduce the complexity of their own communicative efforts and display less patience. This reduction in quality interaction can prompt defensive or confused responses from the intoxicated person, which in turn reinforces the observer's initial dehumanizing metaperception. The cycle is maintained not purely by the chemical effects of the alcohol, but by the social construction of what it means to be drunk, a construction that systematically denies the intoxicated individual full personhood.

Psychological Mechanisms Underlying ARM

Several key psychological mechanisms underpin the manifestation of Alcohol-Related Metadehumanization. One primary mechanism is the perceived loss of **Theory of Mind (ToM)** capacity in the intoxicated individual. ToM is the ability to attribute mental states--beliefs, intents, desires, and knowledge--to oneself and others. When observing an intoxicated person, the observer often perceives a severe reduction in the target's ability to maintain complex mental states or accurately understand social cues. Consequently, the observer reduces the cognitive resources they dedicate to understanding the target's perspective, treating them instead as a simplified, reactive entity whose actions are predictable and non-intentional, thus facilitating mechanistic dehumanization.

Another critical mechanism is the perceived reduction in **Moral Status and Agency**. Full human status is typically associated with the capacity for moral reasoning and the ability to exercise free will and self-control. Intoxication visibly compromises these capacities. The observer perceives the

intoxicated person as having forfeited their moral agency, meaning they are less capable of distinguishing right from wrong and controlling their impulses. This perceived moral deficiency makes it easier for the observer to categorize the target as subhuman, allowing for the activation of moral exclusion principles. Once morally excluded, the target falls outside the observer's sphere of moral concern, making acts of neglect or hostility less psychologically costly for the observer.

The activation of **Disgust and Contamination Aversion** is also a powerful driver, especially in cases involving extreme intoxication. Behaviors associated with severe intoxication--such as vomiting, poor hygiene, or loss of bodily control--trigger primitive emotional responses linked to contamination. Disgust is a strong emotion associated with the rejection of objects or individuals perceived as threats to physical purity or social order. By associating the intoxicated individual with contamination, the observer employs animalistic dehumanization, viewing the person as physically repugnant and socially dangerous, further motivating avoidance and social ostracization.

Finally, ARM serves a function of **Self-Enhancement and Social Distance Maintenance**. By mentally reducing the humanity of the intoxicated person, the observer reinforces their own sense of control, rationality, and moral superiority. This contrast effect helps the observer maintain a positive self-image and strengthens the perceived boundary between the observer (the rational, sober self) and the target (the irrational, flawed other). This social distancing is a protective mechanism that allows the observer to navigate the potentially unpredictable and disruptive presence of intoxication without threatening their own sense of order or safety.

Behavioral Consequences and Social Implications

The cognitive shift inherent in ARM translates directly into tangible, often harmful, behavioral consequences for the intoxicated individual and wider social dynamics. Perhaps the most significant consequence is the increased likelihood of **victim blaming and reduced help-seeking behavior**. When an intoxicated person is harmed or requires assistance, the observer, having already mentally reduced the person's humanity and agency, is more likely to attribute the negative outcome to the victim's own perceived recklessness rather than external circumstances or the perpetrator's actions.

This dehumanizing perception also strongly correlates with increased **aggression and reduced empathy**. Research indicates that observers who demonstrate higher levels of ARM are more willing to inflict punishment, use harsh language, or ignore the distress signals of an intoxicated person. This is particularly salient in contexts involving sexual violence, where ARM contributes to the pervasive belief that an intoxicated victim is less credible, less injured, or partially responsible for the assault because their perceived lack of control renders them less deserving of protection. The psychological license granted by ARM reduces the observer's moral inhibition against hostile actions.

The broad social implications of ARM are profound, touching on public policy, healthcare, and criminal justice. Specifically, ARM contributes to systemic bias in how society manages substance abuse issues.

Healthcare Disparities: Intoxicated patients may receive lower quality of care, delayed attention, or dismissive treatment from medical staff who perceive them mechanistically as burdens rather than individuals in need.

Legal and Judicial Bias: In criminal justice, the testimony or credibility of intoxicated witnesses or victims is often discounted due to the perceived lack of rational capacity, reinforcing the idea that they are less reliable sources of information.

Public Safety Neglect: ARM reduces the general public's willingness to intervene in situations where an intoxicated person is vulnerable (e.g., leaving an unresponsive person in a public space), thereby increasing risks of accidental harm or exposure to exploitation.

Measurement and Methodological Approaches

Measuring Alcohol-Related Metadehumanization requires specialized psychological tools that capture the observer's attribution of human characteristics to a target under specific conditions of intoxication. Since ARM is a metaperception, researchers must design instruments that probe beliefs about the target's internal state rather than just behavioral expectations. The primary methodological approach involves adapting established dehumanization scales to the context of alcohol consumption, typically using hypothetical scenarios or visual stimuli.

A common measurement technique involves presenting participants with vignettes describing an individual exhibiting signs of moderate to severe intoxication, followed by rating scales. These scales ask participants to assess the target on two main dimensions derived from the dual-axis model: human nature (HN) characteristics (e.g., warmth, curiosity, morality) and uniquely human (UH) characteristics (e.g., rationality, refinement, self-control). Lower ratings on these scales, especially on UH traits, indicate higher levels of ARM. Researchers often compare these ratings to baseline ratings of the same individual when sober, or to control scenarios involving non-alcohol-related impairment (e.g., fatigue or illness) to isolate the specific effect of the alcohol cue.

Experimental designs often employ visual stimuli, such as photographs or short video clips of actors portraying various stages of intoxication, followed by implicit association tests (IATs) or reaction time tasks. Implicit measures are particularly valuable because ARM, being socially undesirable, may be subject to conscious suppression when measured explicitly. IATs can reveal automatic associations between images of intoxicated individuals and non-human attributes (e.g., animal words or machine terminology), providing evidence of subconscious dehumanizing cognitions that influence behavior even if the observer denies explicit prejudice.

The methodological rigor in measuring ARM is vital for distinguishing it from general negative stereotyping or simple annoyance with drunken behavior. The process usually follows these steps:

Scenario Presentation: Participants are exposed to a clear cue indicating a target's intoxication level.

Trait Attribution: Participants rate the target on a battery of traits related to agency, experience, moral status, and rationality.

Behavioral Intent Measures: Participants indicate their likelihood of helping, punishing, or socially excluding the target.

Covariate Assessment: Researchers measure individual differences in participants, such as trait empathy, personal drinking habits, and general prejudice levels, to control for confounding factors.

Distinctions from Self-Dehumanization and Third-Party Dehumanization

It is crucial to differentiate Alcohol-Related Metadehumanization (ARM) from related concepts, specifically self-dehumanization and generalized third-party dehumanization. **Self-dehumanization** occurs when an individual perceives themselves as lacking human qualities, often as a result of shame, guilt, or self-objectification. While an intoxicated person might experience self-dehumanization (e.g., feeling like a "beast" or a "mess"), ARM is strictly focused on the *observer's* perception of the *intoxicated other*. The psychological functions are different: self-dehumanization is an internal affective response, whereas ARM is an external cognitive appraisal that facilitates moral exclusion.

ARM also differs significantly from generalized **Third-Party Dehumanization**, which is the process of denying human qualities to outgroups (e.g., ethnic minorities, political rivals) as a stable, ideological prejudice. General dehumanization serves to justify systemic oppression and violence against groups defined by immutable characteristics. ARM, conversely, is situational and context-bound; it is triggered by a temporary, behavioral state (intoxication) rather than a fixed group identity. Although an individual who is generally prejudiced might exhibit higher ARM, the mechanism is specific: the alcohol cue temporarily overrides the target's usual social categorization, reducing their perceived humanity regardless of their group membership.

The distinction lies in the perceived reversibility of the state. Because intoxication is temporary, the dehumanizing perception (ARM) is theoretically reversible once sobriety is achieved. In contrast, generalized third-party dehumanization targets essentialized characteristics, making the prejudice far more enduring and difficult to dismantle. However, the temporary nature of ARM does not make its consequences less severe; during the period of intoxication, the target is subjected to the same psychological outcomes--moral exclusion, reduced empathy, and increased risk of harm--that

characterize stable forms of dehumanization.

Interventions and Future Research Directions

Addressing Alcohol-Related Metadehumanization requires targeted interventions that challenge the rigid cognitive schemas linking intoxication with a loss of personhood. Educational programs aimed at reducing ARM should focus on two main areas: challenging negative alcohol expectancies and fostering empathy toward vulnerable states. Instead of focusing solely on the negative consequences of drinking, these programs should emphasize that an intoxicated person, while impaired, retains their fundamental human needs and dignity.

Effective interventions may involve perspective-taking exercises, where participants are asked to imagine themselves or a loved one in a state of severe intoxication and vulnerability. By shifting the perspective from judging the behavior to understanding the vulnerability, these exercises can counteract the moral exclusion inherent in ARM. Furthermore, training for professionals (e.g., medical personnel, security staff, university resident advisors) should explicitly address ARM, encouraging a focus on the humanity of the patient or client rather than treating them merely as a disruptive problem or a collection of chemical symptoms.

Future research must expand beyond scenario-based studies to examine ARM in naturalistic settings, utilizing ecological momentary assessment (EMA) to capture real-time perceptions during social events where alcohol is present. Researchers also need to explore cultural variations in ARM; while many Western cultures have strong negative expectancies regarding loss of control, other cultures may have different tolerance thresholds, potentially leading to varied manifestations of dehumanizing perceptions. Finally, longitudinal studies are needed to determine if chronic exposure to intoxication (either personally or observationally) desensitizes observers or, conversely, entrenches ARM as a stable cognitive bias.