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Abstract
This research aims at analysing the expression of both overt and covert forms of xenophobia in native citizens' discourse by adopting an integrated analytical approach that combines discourse and cognitive analysis. In particular, we are interested in detecting those discursive strategies that appear to be of crucial importance to the expression of xenophobic thinking and in examining the role exerted in concrete social contexts by cognitive mechanisms in shaping the inner "logic" of xenophobic discourse. To this purpose, 20 in-depth interviews were administered to adult residents from two districts in Milan. Verbatim transcripts are analysed in 3 steps: a) computer-aided quantitative and qualitative data analysis; b) discourse analysis; c) cognitive analysis.
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Introduction
The spread of explicit and implicit forms of xenophobia is being more and more documented in international research studies with regard to the emergence of social and political movements which support an anti-immigration position and to the cross-national diffusion of such a position in European public opinion (see Rydgren, 2003, 2004; Van der Valk, 2002; EUMC 2001a, 2001b, 2002). As Zick, Pettigrew and Wagner (2008) show, prejudice and discrimination directed at immigrants are a widespread phenomena across Europe and several cross-European surveys support this conclusion. European public opinion has responded to immigration flows in diverse ways ranging from full acceptance to prejudice, discrimination, and violence (Pettigrew, 1998a, 1998b; Pettigrew et al., 1998). Immigration has generally been framed as a problem and it has often been perceived as a threat by the native population. Theories of prejudice and discrimination attempt to uncover the psychological mechanisms that explain individual readiness to feel threatened by and to exclude ethnic groups. One major research tradition focuses on blatant and subtle prejudice (Pettigrew & Meertens, 1985); threat is regarded here as one of the two components that explain blatant prejudice. Research shows that it is the perceived - and not the actual - proportion of immigrants that is the critical predictor of threat and anti-immigrant opinions (see, Semyonov, Raijman, Tov, & Schmidt, 2004). According to the integrated threat theory of prejudice (Stephan, Ybarra & Bachman, 1999; Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, & Tur Kaspa, 1998), four types of threat (realistic, symbolic, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes) cause prejudice. Realistic threats consist of threats to the very existence of the in-group, threats to the political and economic power of the in-group, and threats to the physical well-being of the in-group or its members. It is important to emphasize that it is the subjectively perceived threats posed by the other group that are
the most relevant to causing prejudice. Symbolic threats arise because of perceived group differences in morals, values, norms, standards, beliefs, and attitudes. Symbolic threats are threats to the in-group’s worldview. Out-groups that adhere to different worldviews threaten the in-group’s worldview and are disliked as a consequence. People often feel threatened during interactions with out-group members because they are worried about being rejected, embarrassed, ridiculed, or exploited (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). The anxiety elicited by these feelings of threat can lead in-group members to dislike out-group members. Several studies have shown that intergroup anxiety is related to prejudice (Britt, Bonecki, Vescio, Biernat & Brown, 1996; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan et al., 1999). Negative stereotypes are implied threats to the in-group.

2. Theoretical background

As Van Dijk (2000) points out, discourse plays a crucial role in the reproduction and legitimation of prejudice, xenophobia, ethnic dominance and exclusion. There is a rich selection of studies describing the structure and function of xenophobic discourse (Van Dijk, 1984; Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Reisigl & Wodak, 2001), its diffusion through the mass media (van Dijk, 1991; Wodak & Matouscheck, 1993; Jäger & Link, 1993) and its semantic organization in political discourse (Van Dijk, 1997; Van der Valk, 2002, 2003).

Discourse about ‘foreigners’ can be regarded as a symbolic resource which is used in group identity negotiation (Gotsbacher, 2001). ‘Others’ (i.e. foreigners) are viewed as ‘different’ and, in many cases, as ‘outsiders’ or even as ‘enemies’ (Savic, 2005; Colombo & Senatore, 2003).

Xenophobia implies a sense of menace, fear, danger, unsafety and the perception of risk both at the individual level and for the in-group. Our aim is to analyse how xenophobia is expressed in discourse: are all immigrants talked about as dangerous? Or else, only some of them are talked about as dangerous? Is any distinction established among different ethnic groups? Is any distinction established among different contexts where intergroup contacts take place? Which sort of risks are referred to? How do people argue in support of these risks?

In order to answer these questions we attempt at developing an integrated approach that combines discourse analysis and cognitive analysis. The major assumption of discourse analysis is that the phenomena of interest in social and psychological research are constituted in and through discourse. In this framework, xenophobia and prejudice can be regarded as discourse objects; these objects are intersubjectively and prejudice can be regarded as a discourse object; these objects are intersubjectively constructed in order to lend meaning to social experience. The term “intersubjective” refers here to the idea that subjectivity is socially elaborated: this means that interpretative resources are already available in culture and organised linguistically. In this perspective, xenophobic discourse can be regarded as a means to position oneself within the context in relation to all the other agents and to construct different forms of social relation. Discourse provides with conceptual repertoires with which we can represent ourselves and others. Different linguistic procedures are used to construct a “we-group” through particular acts of reference that simultaneously imply a distancing from the “other”. The accomplishment and negotiation of prejudiced/unprejudiced identities has been documented through several studies (see, Edwards, 2003; Rapley, 2001) as well as the processes through which those designated as ‘Others’ are represented in discourse (Augustinson, Tuffin & Rapley, 1999; Tileaga, 2006; Verkuyten, 1998a, 1998b, 2001; Wetherell & Potter, 1992; Wodak & Matouscheck, 1993). In talk about ‘foreigners’, the concept of community is rethorically used to refer to national identity in order to make problematic the out-group identity when integration and acculturation are at issue (Tileaga, 2006).

Discourse-oriented studies focus on the semantic organization of xenophobic discourse and on relevant discursive strategies such as self- and other presentation and social actors description. We focus here on how these strategies are performed in order to discursively construct a sense of menace when talking about ethnic groups and intergroup relations in different contexts. In order to analyse how people attain internal coherence, and get convinced of the correctness of their arguments we combine discourse and cognitive analysis.

A few studies (see, Rydgren, 2004) deal with the inner logic of xenophobic beliefs and the role exerted by sampling biases in information gathering (e.g., illusory correlations), common fallacious thinking tendencies (e.g., analogisms or similarity-based heuristic thinking, confirmation biases, deductive use of inductive schemata). A cognitive analysis of xenophobia would take into account:
1) illusory correlations, that is perceiving associations between variables that are not associated. For example: “Most immigrants I heard of were dangerous people; hence, being an immigrant is a symptom for dangerousness”. In this example the fallacy is two-fold. First, a sampling bias: I heard only about some immigrants, and, because in my group there was some reason to speak about them and no reason to speak about many others, it is likely that they were not a random sample from their population. Second, a pseudodiagnosticity bias: that is, the tendency to consider diagnostic for dangerousness the rate of dangerous immigrant, without comparing it to the rate of dangerous non-immigrant (see, Cheng e Holyoak, 1995; Cheng e Novick, 1990; Holyoak, Koh, Nisbett, 1989; Holland, Holyoak, Nisbett, Thagard, 1986; Mandel e Lehman, 1998; Hamilton, Dugan, Trolier, 1985; Fiedler, 2000);

2) some analogical strategies, according to which properties of an individual are generalized to a different individual bearing some resemblance to the former. For example: “Jules is an immigrant, and he’s a criminal; Jim is an immigrant, then he’s likely to be a criminal, too” (see, Cherubini, 2005);

3) some fallacious logical schemata, like the “affirmation of the consequent”: for example, “people with low intelligence get unqualified jobs; immigrants get unqualified jobs; therefore, immigrants have low intelligence” (see, Cherubini, 2005);4) Various “confirmation biases”, a family of thinking strategies that bias individuals toward a systematic confirmation of their opinions in the face of contrary or ambiguous evidence (see, Cherubini, Castelvecchio, & Cherubini, 2005; Nickerson, 1998; Poletiek, 1996; Snyder & Gangel, S. 1981; Snyder & Campbell, 1980);

3. Procedure

20 in-depth interviews were administered to residents from two districts in Milan [high vs low presence of foreign immigrants].

The interview addressed the issue of immigration and inter-ethnic relationships at 3 different levels implying growing distance between the interviewee and the object of the question:

micro. Questions about the school, the immigrant schoolmates of the subject`s siblings, and their parents: the interviewee is at a short distance from the object of the question, she/he should have more precise experiential and direct information;

meso. Questions about inter-ethnic relationships in the neighborhood: most knowledge is grounded on accidental encounters and indirect evidence, hence causing an intermediate distance between the interviewee and the object of the question;

macro. Questions about immigration in Italy in general: the interviewee is more distant from the object of the question and have little and sparse direct knowledge.

Verbatim transcripts were analysed in 3 steps: a) computer-aided content analysis; b) discourse analysis (semantic strategies, self- and other presentation, social actors description, rhetorical devices); c) cognitive analysis.

Main results are summarized in the next section.

4. Results

4.1. Content analysis

A computer-aided content analysis was conducted with a recently developed software called T-Lab. This software analyzes the internal structure of a text through a series of statistical tools thus allowing for both a concise and global view of the corpus. The software automatically identifies and selects the units to be analyzed (lemmas in lexical correspondence analysis; lemmas and sentences in cluster analysis), Cluster analysis identifies significant clusters, each of which:

a) is composed of a set of sentences;

b) sentences included in each cluster are similar with regard to the co-occurrences of lemmas;

c) each sentence is indexed by the extra textual variable (i.e. the district).

By performing cluster analysis we aimed at uncovering the lexical composition and the semantic organization of interviewees’ discourse. Three clusters were identified (see graph 1 in the appendix)

The main factor allows for a distinction between cluster 2 that concerns the topic of inter-ethnic relation at school [to the right of the origin] and those containing lemmas referring to the neighbourhood
As in previous studies (see, Van Dijk, 2000), it was found that the overall semantic strategy underlying interviewees’ discourse is characterized by a positive self-presentation and a negative other-presentation strategy. Referential strategies are used to naming social actors (individuals and groups), to construct and represent them in discourse through social membership. Predicational strategies are used to labeling social actors more or less positively or negatively. In interviewees’ discourse the opposition in-group-out-group is emphasized and immigrants are frequently associated with problematic social phenomena, especially crime and delinquency.

The main semantic dimension emerging from the lexicon of cluster 1 refer to the macro-level and to cultural identity (“group”, “culture”, “identity”, “keep”, “value”). The out-group is portrayed as threatening the cultural identity of the in-group (symbolic menace).

Lemmas included in cluster 2 mainly refer to the school, that is to a microlevel context where inter-ethnic relations may occur (“children”, “teacher”, “classroom”). Inter-ethnic relations are described as supportive (“help”, “trust”, “support”). The most common term for the out-group is “foreigner”. Other terms for the out-group refer to ethnic groups (e.g. “Indians”, “Arab”, “South-Americans”). From the analysis of lemmas and sentences included in this cluster, it emerge that at this level (micro) the out-group is not represented as threatening. At the same time, the term “integration” clearly refers here to the idea of cultural assimilation.

Lemmas included in the cluster 3 refer to inter-ethnic relations at the meso-level, that is in the neighborhood (“street”, “house”, “live”). The presence of immigrants is associated to the idea of negative changes in quality of life in the neighbourhoods and to the perception of individual unsafety. (“dirt”, “degrade”, “damage”). Immigrants are categorized through a coherent set of oppositions: legal vs illegal, integrated vs non-integrated, male vs female immigrants. Two coherent sets of terms characterize this cluster: the first concerns the problem of control and regulation of immigration flows, the second concerns the feelings of general unsafety associated to illegal immigration and the increasing risk of crime. The lemmas “country”, “we”, “our” refer to the opposition between the in-group and the out-group. Immigrants are associated here to “crime” and “delinquency” (realistic menace) and, consequently, the need for control is invoked.

4.2. Referential and predicational strategies

As in previous studies (see, Van Dijk, 2000), it was found that the overall semantic strategy underlying interviewees’ discourse is characterized by a positive self-presentation and a negative other-presentation strategy. Referential strategies are used to naming social actors (individuals and groups), to construct and represent them in discourse through social membership. Predicational strategies are used to labeling social actors more or less positively or negatively. In interviewees’ discourse the opposition in-group-out-group is emphasized and immigrants are frequently associated with problematic social phenomena, especially crime and delinquency.

The most common terms for the out-group are “immigrants” and “foreigners”. The pronoun ‘we’ is used to refer to the Italian people, especially when the focus is on nationality. Italian citizens are specified and differentiated in the toponymical characterization ‘Italy’ and/or the ethnonymical designation ‘The Italians’. Nation-related references such as ‘the people’, ‘the country’, ‘our country’, frequently occur (cluster 1 and 3). Collective identity is invoked here as the “Other” is perceived as threatening the cultural identity of the ingroup.

The objective category of legal status is used to establish a fundamental division inside the general category “immigrants” between the legal residents and illegal ones, thus giving objective reasons for a rejection of the out-group. This group representation reinforces evaluations in terms of the opposition between the ‘good’ and the ‘bad’ immigrants; the latter are attributed negative traits and are explicitly associated to individual unsafety.

4.3. Inferential structures

As an illustration of cognitive analysis, we report here the analysis of one excerpt from the first interview that – in its brevity – highlights a variety of cognitive mechanisms that build up the “logic” of that person’s attitude toward immigrants. It is an example of argumentation at the meso-level. Spontaneous misreading of clues, integrated with some commonsense general premises and with a fallacious deductive step, build up a case for immigrants’ dangerousness subjectively compelling, but lacking any conclusive evidence.

Excerpt 1, Subj1: I mean… I was never personally mistreated, or involved in arguments. What you see is broken bottles scattered all around the neighborhood, and drunk people wandering around.

This excerpt gives a glimpse of the many complex, yet fast and spontaneous, inferential passages that build up the background opinions that this person is reporting. We might assume that she begins with a useful, and true, general rule from previous knowledge:

1. Drunk people are dangerous
In the excerpt she mentions perceptually salient environmental clues, “broken bottles”. Why does she associate them to immigrants?

What is spontaneous is associating salient, distinctive, features with other salient, distinctive, features: the accumulating broken bottles are perceptively salient, and that immigrants tend to leave them around relatively more (but not absolutely more) than Italians is also perceptively salient: the resulting thought is, that if there’s a broken bottle around, it has been probably left by an immigrant: this is a typical illusory correlation.

On the grounds of this “perception” (but, as we saw, it is an inference, not a direct perception) subject 1 inductively concludes:

- Immigrants drink a lot of bottles

This is likely true, if we speak of the immigrants as a group: simply because the group is numerous (we previously estimated it at 4% of the population). But it hides a fallacy in the following – and rather spontaneous - step, known in logic as “distribution fallacy”. It consists in applying a property of an aggregate entity to each component of the aggregate entity (example: Americans are a rich people; Uncle Tom is an American; therefore, Uncle Tom is rich). In this context the fallacy allows the invalid conclusion:

*Each* immigrant drinks a lot of bottles. (Or its probabilistic equivalent: it is highly probable that an immigrant drinks a lot of bottles).

The following ring in the logical chain is retrieving another true general rule from previous knowledge:

4. Whoever drinks a lot gets drunk

From 3 and 4 she derives the conjecture, *convergent* with the social representation of immigrants:

5. Immigrants are drunkards.

She does not specify that they involve immigrants, but presumably she tacitly implies it.

This inductive evidence for 5 is an example of what is commonly known as “positive control”, a very strong tendency in human explicit hypotheses testing. When hypothesizing that X (“being an immigrant”) is associated to Y (“drinking a lot”), positive testing consists in focusing on X cases (immigrants), in order to detect those who are Y (drunk). If it detects a reasonable amount of X&Y cases (drunk immigrants) it concludes that the hypothesis is confirmed, without comparing them to X&not-Y cases (sober immigrants), and almost totally neglecting not-X cases (that is, the rate of drunkenness in non-immigrants). That is, positive control means focusing on X&Y confirmatory instances and not looking for, or underestimating, not-X & Y, X & not-Y, and not-X & not-Y instances.

Of course, 1 and 5 entails the *valid* conclusion (remember: valid does not mean true; it means true if *all the premises were also true*):

6. Immigrants are dangerous

Conclusion 6 is the “background knowledge”, or default general rule, backing all her following arguments. “Immigrant are dangerous” is also a *topos*, a frequent feature of the social representation of immigrants.

5. Discussion

The analysis shows that not all immigrants are talked about as dangerous and that different kinds of risks are invoked depending on the context. Arguments concerning individual unsafety are offered when talking about the presence of foreign immigrants in the neighbourhoods (meso-level) while threats for the in-group emerge when inter-ethnic relations are regarded at a macro-level.

People strive to build subjectively coherent arguments in order to support their xenophobic feelings.

Many of these arguments are rooted on known cognitive tendencies – potentially fallacious when dealing with social realities. Accordingly, those arguments are subjectively rational and self-persuading, conjuring up a subjective world where immigrants are an actual, objective threat.

Xenophobic feelings reflect only in part – if at all – objective risks conveyed by massive immigration; at the individual level, most of them spring from the interaction between the boundaries of the social environment and the constraints of human cognitive processes, and are diffused, reproduced and strengthened by shared discursive practices.

6. Conclusions

The distinction between “foreigners and foreigners” outlined by the analysis of content in the first part can be seen, from cognitive perspective, as the macroscopic result of the different domains of application of the two human inferential systems: the explicit one, dealing with limited information and uncertain environments, and the implicit, experiential one, gathering and systematically processing, in an automatic way, pieces of evidence from well-known,
limited, relatively stable environments (see, De Neys, 2006; Sloman, 1996, 2002; Stanovich & West, 2000). In this section we will see some examples of their microscopic workings.

The question in the interviews were of two categories, depending on the “distance” of the interviewed from the target of the question:

Questions about the immigrant schoolmates of the subject’s siblings, and their parents: the interviewed is at a short distance from the object of the question, she/he should have more precise experiential, direct knowledge, and should recur less to explicit thinking strategies;

Questions about the immigrants in the neighbourhood, eventual problems connected to them, immigration in Italy in general, the importance of cultural identity, and the importance of inter-group contacts: the subjects are more distant from the objects of the questions and have little and sparse direct knowledge about them; furthermore, the objects of the questions are rapidly changing realities, likely not allowing the fine-tuning of the experiential system to them; accordingly, many answers to these questions should recruit explicit thinking strategies, including some erroneous or imprecise ones.

The neatest boundary between the categories of immigrants that our subjects depicted coincides with the different domains of application of the two human inferential systems. Indeed, a majority of subjects, with different degrees of intensity, arrived at or described some xenophobic conclusions concerning immigrants when responding to questions concerning their neighbourhood or immigration in Italy in general: questions whose answers mostly hinged on explicit thinking. By contrast, most of them described positively (again, with different degrees of intensity) the restricted and better known domain of their siblings’ immigrant classmates, and of their parents. They rarely used argumentation at all in doing this: mostly, they simply reported their positive impressions, and impressions are the direct results of implicit thinking processes applied to a familiar environment.

Moreover, our results suggest that when intergroup contact is not conceived as a generic and anonymous intersection of different ethnic groups in a neighbourhood, but as a structured relationship in a bounded social and physical space (the school) between members of different groups pursuing the same goal (an acceptable school for their children), it can foster a reciprocal knowledge based on a vast amount of direct experiences; this sort of experiential knowledge has more chances of being unbiased than conjectures based on explicit thinking. In this sort of situations, contact might effectively limit xenophobia. Unfortunately, this sort of experiential, inter-personal knowledge is specific, and it is hardly – if ever – generalized to larger groups and less known environments.
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Appendix

Graph 1. Distribution of clusters in the Cartesian plot

Cluster: N° 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAT</th>
<th>Lemes</th>
<th>CHI2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>keep</td>
<td>1688,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>identity</td>
<td>1420,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>characteristic</td>
<td>941,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>important</td>
<td>746,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>cultural</td>
<td>411,937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>exclude</td>
<td>286,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>group</td>
<td>234,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>contact</td>
<td>143,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>necessary</td>
<td>138,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>30,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>believe</td>
<td>29,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>value</td>
<td>8,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>different</td>
<td>7,819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>origin</td>
<td>4,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM</td>
<td>structure</td>
<td>4,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cluster: N° 2</td>
<td>Cluster: N° 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT LEMMAS</td>
<td>CAT Lemmas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM child</td>
<td>LEM person</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM classroom</td>
<td>LEM people</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM son</td>
<td>LEM rule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM parent</td>
<td>LEM live</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM compagno</td>
<td>LEM reside</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM attend</td>
<td>LEM situation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM foreign</td>
<td>LEM neighbourhood</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM primari</td>
<td>LEM street</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM relation</td>
<td>LEM respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM language</td>
<td>LEM zone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM teacher</td>
<td>LEM need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM chinese</td>
<td>LEM control</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM mother</td>
<td>LEM we</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM friendship</td>
<td>LEM our</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM family</td>
<td>LEM respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM school</td>
<td>LEM police</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM italian</td>
<td>LEM country</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM play</td>
<td>LEM delinquency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM support</td>
<td>LEM entry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM group</td>
<td>LEM law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM together</td>
<td>LEM life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM friend</td>
<td>LEM change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM egypitian</td>
<td>LEM right</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM El_Salvador</td>
<td>LEM immigration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM learning</td>
<td>LEM illegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM program</td>
<td>LEM steel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM origin</td>
<td>LEM dirty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM integrate</td>
<td>LEM urban decay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM Sri_Lanka</td>
<td>LEM discomfort</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM arab</td>
<td>LEM evening</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM skin</td>
<td>LEM increase</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEM Indian</td>
<td>LEM bother</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEM bad</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LEM delinquency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
