



Effects of intergroup threat on mind, brain, and behavior

Linda W Chang, Amy R Krosch and Mina Cikara

Intergroup threat is one catalyst that shifts us from out-group disregard to out-group hostility. We review recent interdisciplinary research that explores the effects of intergroup threat on mind, brain, and behavior. A rapidly growing literature indicates that several types of intergroup threat — for example, realistic threats such as competition and resource scarcity — have significant effects on empathy toward, perceptual judgments of, and cognitive representations of out-group members. We also briefly consider the emerging research assessing biological markers of intergroup threat sensitivity. Converging evidence from psychology and neuroscience may help to elucidate the precise pathways by which intergroup threat creates subtle discrimination as well as overt conflict.

Address

Harvard University, USA

Corresponding author: Cikara, Mina (mcikara@fas.harvard.edu)

Current Opinion in Psychology 2016, **11**:69–73

This review comes from a themed issue on **Intergroup relations**

Edited by **Jolanda Jetten** and **Nyla R. Branscombe**

For a complete overview see the [Issue](#) and the [Editorial](#)

Available online 16th June 2016

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.06.004>

2352-250X/© 2016 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Introduction

Stereotypes and attitudes toward all social groups change over time — for better and for worse [1]. Much of the research on intergroup bias focuses on the primacy of in-group favoritism as a motivating force of intergroup bias in behavior and evaluation [2–4]. However, not all out-groups are equivalent, therefore this approach cannot predict how we respond to distinct out-groups. Intergroup threat predicts which groups become targets of indifference versus overt antagonism [5]: that is, threat is one catalyst that shifts us from out-group disregard to out-group hostility [6,7]. Of course, several other factors predict hostility — dislike, a history of conflict — however, we focus on intergroup threat here in order to highlight recent advances examining the effects of threat on mind, brain, and behavior.

Intergroup threat stems from many distinct sources, including the most basic form of threat, physical harm. For the last 50 years, social psychologists have explored more abstract and nuanced forms of threat that arise in intergroup contexts

and by virtue of one's social identity. The foundational Realistic Group Conflict Theory (RGCT) proposed that competition for access to limited resources engenders conflict between groups [8,9]. RGCT has been extended to emphasize that *perception* of threat (in addition to actual threat) is sufficient to ignite and sustain conflict [10]. Even more recent research reveals that threat does not even need to be linked to social identity or groups per se to have significant consequences for intergroup dynamics. Instead, threat can be a feature of the environment (e.g., resource scarcity), which then impacts perceptions of out-groups and their members. In complement, Symbolic Threat Theory [11] posits that intergroup conflict results from conflicting values and beliefs rather than from competition over resources. Thus, groups who consume resources or threaten one's general welfare pose realistic threats whereas groups whose values and ideologies are at odds with our own pose symbolic threats. Social Identity Theory [12] predicts yet another class of threats driven by group membership: being lumped in with a group against one's will, one's group being denied distinctiveness or value, and one's status in a group being questioned [13]. Here we review recent research examining the impact of a subset of the threats outlined above: specifically, realistic threats including competition and resource scarcity.

As soon as a person or group is seen as threatening a distinct suite of motivations, emotions, and behaviors are initiated. But which mediating processes best explain the relationship between threat and intergroup hostility? The bulk of past theorizing and research on intergroup threat has focused on negative attitudes toward, and assessments of minority group members ([10] for a meta-analysis see [14]). However, negative appraisals — both explicit attitudes and implicit associations — are not always highly correlated with discriminatory behavior [15,16]. Thus, intergroup threat researchers have recently expanded their investigations to include emotion, perceptual judgments, and cognitive representation as processes through which intergroup threat exacerbates intergroup discrimination and hostility.

Empathy

Across racial, political, and minimal group boundaries, people feel less empathy for threatening out-groups relative to neutral out-groups and in-group targets [17,18,19**]: we term this difference the 'intergroup empathy bias.' This is evidenced in physiological indicators as well as self-report. For example, participants exhibited sensorimotor contagion (indexed by evoked motor potentials in participants' hand muscles) when watching a racial in-group member's hand — even a *purple hand* — being

pricked by a pin. However, this response was absent when they saw a racial out-group members' hand being pricked [20]. In another example, Israelis and Arabs reported feeling similar degrees of compassion for in-group members and South Americans experiencing emotional and physical suffering, but markedly less compassion for members of their respective conflict out-group [21]. Note in both cases, that the empathy bias emerges only in response to threatening out-groups.

In addition to reductions in empathy, people also express counter-empathy (e.g., pleasure in response to out-group misfortune) when out-groups are threatening [18]. Building on RGCT and the Stereotype Content Model [5], we tested whether overt competition between teams as a form of threat is sufficient to generate both empathic and counter-empathic intergroup bias. Indeed, fans from rival baseball teams (Boston Red Sox and New York Yankees) reported pleasure and exhibited activity in the ventral striatum (a region associated with unexpected reward registration) when watching their own teams do well and their rivals fail [22]. This increased ventral striatum response to a rival's suffering was associated with an increased desire to harm rival team fans. In another fMRI study we found that participants exhibited greater activation of anterior insula in response to stereotypically competitive, high-status group members' good fortunes (e.g., a picture of an investment banker/business woman/Asian man accompanied by the event 'won \$5'). Increased anterior insula activity is typically associated with experiencing and perceiving others' *pain* in empathy studies, thus one interpretation is that this signal represents a counter-empathic response. Indeed, increased anterior insula in response to positive events correlated with a willingness to harm those same competitive, high-status targets [23]. Finally, using facial electromyography, we have found that participants smiled more when negative events happened to stereotypically competitive, high-status group members relative to other targets [24]. These findings suggest that explicit competition, but also stereotypes that merely include attributions of competitiveness are sufficient to generate threat and to moderate empathic responding in intergroup contexts.

The intergroup empathy bias persists among arbitrary groups created in the lab, so long as the groups are in competition. Moments after being randomly assigned to teams, participants exhibited greater *Schadenfreude* (pleasure in response to others' bad fortunes) and *Glückschmerz* (displeasure in response to others' good fortune) toward out-group members as compared to in-group members when their respective groups were in competition for a \$1 bonus [25*]. This difference was significantly attenuated, however, when the groups' outcomes were independent (i.e., each group could earn the bonus).

This intergroup empathy bias is consequential because it predicts hostility as well as decreases in pro-social

behavior [26]. We have found, for example, that the larger American participants' empathy gap between American and Arab targets, the lower their donations to Arab charities [27]. Moreover, intergroup empathy bias predicted donation behaviors a week later, above and beyond group identification, highlighting the importance of empathy as a proximal motivator of helping behavior (or the absence thereof). Though intergroup empathy research has garnered a great deal of interest as of late, there are several lower-level processes that operate completely outside of perceivers' awareness which are nevertheless subject to the moderating influence of intergroup threat, to which we turn now.

Representation and perceptual judgments

Group categorization typically unfolds quickly and effortlessly. However, as proposed by Self-Categorization Theory, categorization can shift dynamically as a function of bottom-up sensory information and top-down social goals and motivations [28,29]. That is, rather than social goals merely dictating how members of groups are treated, a growing body of research suggests that social goals can alter whether people categorize targets as belonging to one social category versus another — even social categories that are visually identifiable and typically regarded as fixed (e.g., gender and race).

In the case of realistic threats, group-protection and self-protection goals can shift decision makers' group boundaries to become more circumscribed: that is, to exclude higher proportions of ambiguous targets from the in-group. For example, when economic resources are threatened, non-Black decision makers are more likely to categorize mixed-race targets as Black than White [30,31**]. Using a psychophysical measure of subjective race perception (i.e., point of subjective equality), we found that subjects' race categorization threshold was lowered to include more mixed-race faces in the category Black when (i) participants reported greater concern about economic competition between Blacks and Whites and (ii) participants were non-consciously primed with scarcity (vs. neutral or negative concepts) [31**]. Similarly, threats of physical danger (e.g., facial expressions of anger, movement toward participants) make decision makers more likely to categorize ambiguous targets as out-group members in both racial and minimal group contexts [32]. Threatening, racially ambiguous figures are also more likely to be denied in-group characteristics (e.g., 'whiteness' for White participants; [33**]). Importantly, these effects are amplified to the extent that perceivers are sensitive to such threats or exhibit greater concern with enforcing status boundaries (we return to this moderator below). Thus, threat can exacerbate discrimination and inequality indirectly by increasing the number of targets who are categorized as out-group.

In addition to altering *who* is seen as an in-group or out-group member, intergroup threat can also shift *how* we

represent and perceive in-group and out-group members, in ways that justify discrimination against them. For example, we used a reverse correlation image classification paradigm to obtain visual renderings of White decision makers' mental representations of Black recipients in either an economic threat or control condition [31**]. In the task, participants viewed a series of face pairs. We generated each face by overlaying different patterns of noise over the same base face (this noise created variation in physiognomy and skin tone). For each pair, participants had to indicate which one they thought was 'Black.' Afterwards, we averaged the images selected as 'Black', separately for the scarcity and control conditions. We found that when resources were threatened, White decision makers represented Black recipients as darker and more stereotypically Black (as judged by independent raters), two features strongly related to discrimination [34]. Furthermore, when we used those image renderings to represent recipients in an allocation task with a new sample of participants, Black face representations that had been produced under economic threat (vs. control) received fewer economic resources. Thus, intergroup threat can increase discrimination by altering the perception of Black faces in ways that may justify unfair treatment in the minds of perceivers. Additional research supports the notion that threat alters representations of out-group members. For example, decision makers see biracial members of a threatening rival political party as having darker skin tone [35], and members of a realistically and symbolically threatening group (i.e., Moroccans to the Dutch) are represented as more criminal and less trustworthy [36].

Recent research suggests intergroup threat also impacts on-line visual processing, from the earliest moment a stimulus is encoded as a face to modulation of attention to that face. Although early face perception was once thought to be impenetrable to top-down influences (e.g., stereotypic associations) [37], recent research suggests that goals and motivations can influence the structural encoding of faces. For example, even *minimal* in-group faces (relative to out-group faces) tend to recruit greater N170 ERP component response, activity in the fusiform gyrus, and recognition behavior [38,39], all of which suggest in-group faces elicit greater face-processing resources than out-group faces.

In the context of threat, face processing can either be enhanced or attenuated depending on the goals of the perceiver and the nature of the task. On one hand, intergroup threat should enhance out-group processing in contexts where out-group members require vigilance or avoidance, because threat can help focus attentional resources. For example, danger primes (e.g., a gun) and threat associations increase attention to Black faces as compared to White faces [40,41]. Furthermore, people better remember and more deeply encode threatening

out-group faces [42,43] and out-group faces associated with threatening objects relative to controls [44*]. Contradictory evidence suggests decision makers might commit *fewer* processing resources to out-group targets during intergroup threat because neglecting them represents a means of protecting the in-group. For example, when resources are threatened (compared to a neutral condition), White decision makers encode Black recipients to a lesser degree than White recipients and the degree to which participants exhibit this encoding bias predicts anti-Black allocation biases [45*]. Clarifying the conditions under which threat generates increased rather than decreased processing is a ripe area for future research. Despite earlier beliefs that categorization, representation, and face-processing were impervious to top-down influence, this growing literature suggests intergroup threat is an important driver of low level cognitive and perceptual judgment processes with important implications for behavior.

Biological markers of threat sensitivity

As we noted above, the effects of threat on empathy, representation, and perception are moderated by individuals' sensitivity to intergroup threat. Several recent discoveries point to biological markers of this sensitivity. For example, the serotonin transporter gene polymorphism (5-HTTLPR) has been linked to threat reactivity in general. In one investigation, participants who had at least one short allele as compared to two long alleles of 5-HTTLPR, and had greater exposure to cues of out-group threat, were more biased and displayed more discriminatory behavior toward that threatening out-group [46]. This effect held both for diverse ethnic out-groups as well as arbitrarily-defined out-groups.

There is also a very rich literature examining the role of testosterone and oxytocin in organizing behavioral responses to threat, which has recently expanded to include responses to intergroup threat in particular. For example, testosterone increases generosity to in-group and punishment of the out-group in the ultimatum game resulting in increased group coherence, but only in competitive contexts [47,48**]. By several accounts, oxytocin also motivates aggressive behavior toward out-groups (i.e., pre-emptive strikes in economic games), but only when the out-group represents a threat to the in-group [49]). Both genetic and hormonal approaches build on animal models of social behavior [50] and represent the beginning of a new branch of intergroup neuroscience [[19**]; see also Matheson *et al.*, this issue]. This exciting work has the potential to elucidate more precise biological mechanisms that give rise to biased attitudes, emotions, and behaviors in the face of intergroup threat.

Conclusions

We have reviewed recent discoveries regarding the effects of competition, resource scarcity, and physical

threats on empathic responses, perceivers' judgments about whether or not a target represents an in-group or an out-group, and individuals' cognitive representations of said out-groups. These recent discoveries extend existing models, which mainly emphasize effects of intergroup threat on attitudes. Critically, these shifts in empathy, perceptual judgments, and representations interact with individual differences in sensitivity to threat and fuel discrimination and hostility toward threatening out-groups. Our hope is that research integrating emotion, cognition, and neuroscience will elucidate the precise pathways by which these processes facilitate discriminatory and anti-social behavior in both subtle and extreme intergroup conflict.

Conflict of interest

Nothing declared.

References and recommended reading

Papers of particular interest, published within the period of review, have been highlighted as:

- of special interest
- of outstanding interest

1. Bergsieker HB, Leslie LM, Constantine VS, Fiske ST: **Stereotyping by omission: eliminate the negative, accentuate the positive.** *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2012, **102**:1214-1238.
 2. Brewer MB: **The psychology of prejudice: ingroup love or outgroup hate?** *J Soc Issues* 1999, **55**:429-444.
 3. Balliet D, Wu J, De Dreu CKW: **Ingroup favoritism in cooperation: a meta-analysis.** *Psychol Bull* 2014, **140**:1556-1581.
 4. Hewstone M, Rubin M, Willis H: **Intergroup bias.** *Ann Rev Psychol* 2002, **53**:575-604.
 5. Cuddy AJ, Fiske ST, Glick P: **The BIAS map: behaviors from intergroup affect and stereotypes.** *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2007, **92**:631-648.
 6. Brewer MB: **In-group identification and intergroup conflict: when does in-group love become out-group hate?** In *Social Identity, Inter-group Conflict, and Conflict Reduction*. Edited by Ashmore RD, Jussim L, Wilder D. Oxford University Press; 2001:1-24.
 7. Mackie D, Hamilton D: *Affect, Cognition, and Stereotyping*. Academic Press; 1993.
 8. Sherif M: *Group Conflict and Co-operation: Their Social Psychology*. Routledge & K. Paul; 1966.
 9. LeVine RA, Campbell DT: *Ethnocentrism: Theories of Conflict, Ethnic Attitudes, and Group Behavior*. John Wiley & Sons; 1972.
 10. Esses VM, Jackson LM, Armstrong TL: **Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: an instrumental model of group conflict.** *J Soc Issues* 1998, **54**:699-724.
 11. Kinder DR, Sears DO: **Prejudice and politics: symbolic racism versus racial threats to the good life.** *J Pers Soc Psychol* 1981, **40**:414-431.
 12. Tajfel H, Turner JC: **An integrative theory of intergroup conflict.** In *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Edited by Austin WG, Worchel S. Brooks/Cole; 1979.
 13. Branscombe NR, Ellemers N, Spears R, Doosje B: **The context and content of social identity threat.** In *Social Identity: Context, Commitment, Content*. Edited by Ellemers N, Spears R, Doosje B. Blackwell Science; 1999.
 14. Riek BM, Mania EW, Gaertner SL: **Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: a meta-analytic review.** *Pers Soc Psychol Rev* 2006, **4**:336-353.
 15. Ajzen I, Cote NG: **Attitudes and the prediction of behavior.** In *Attitudes and Attitude Change*. Edited by Crano WD, Prislin R. Psychology Press; 2008:289-311.
 16. Talaska CA, Fiske ST, Chaiken S: **Legitimizing racial discrimination: emotions, not beliefs, best predict discrimination in a meta-analysis.** *Soc Justice Res* 2008, **21**:263-296.
 17. Batson CD, Ahmad NY: **Using empathy to improve intergroup attitudes and relations.** *Soc Issues Pol Rev* 2009, **3**:141-177.
 18. Cikara M, Bruneau EG, Saxe R: **Us and them: intergroup failures of empathy.** *Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 2011, **20**:149-153.
 19. Cikara M, Van Bavel JJ: **The neuroscience of intergroup relations: an integrative review.** *Perspect Psychol Sci* 2014, **9**:245-274.
- A recent review emphasizing the role of social psychological theory and functional relations between groups in social cognitive neuroscience. Includes summary table of relevant neuroscience research and future directions for researchers working at the intersection of intergroup relations and cognitive neuroscience.
20. Avenanti A, Sirigu A, Aglioti SM: **Racial bias reduces empathic sensorimotor resonance with other-race pain.** *Curr Biol* 2010, **20**:1018-1022.
 21. Bruneau EG, Dufour N, Saxe R: **Social cognition in members of conflict groups: behavioural and neural responses in Arabs, Israelis and South Americans to each other's misfortunes.** *Phil Trans Roy Soc B: Biol Sci* 2012, **367**:717-730.
 22. Cikara M, Botvinick MM, Fiske ST: **Us versus them social identity shapes neural responses to intergroup competition and harm.** *Psychol Sci* 2011, **22**:306-313.
 23. Cikara M, Fiske ST: **Bounded empathy: neural responses to outgroup targets' (mis)fortunes.** *J Cogn Neurosci* 2011, **23**:3791-3803.
 24. Cikara M, Fiske ST: **Stereotypes and schadenfreude affective and physiological markers of pleasure at outgroup misfortunes.** *Soc Psychol Pers Sci* 2012, **3**:63-71.
 25. Cikara M, Bruneau E, Van Bavel JJ, Saxe R: **Their pain gives us pleasure: how intergroup dynamics shape empathic failures and counter-empathic responses.** *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2014, **55**:110-125.
- A series of studies examining the role of competition in intergroup empathy bias among novel groups. Empathy bias against competitive out-groups was driven by out-group antipathy, not extraordinary in-group empathy, and persisted after one's in-group had defeated out-group competitors.
26. Johnson JD, Simmons CH, Jordav A, Maclean L, Taddei J, Thomas D, Dovidio JF, Reed W: **Rodney King and OJ revisited: the impact of race and defendant empathy induction on judicial decisions.** *J Appl Soc Psychol* 2002, **32**:1208-1223.
 27. Bruneau EG, Cikara M, Saxe R: **Intergroup empathy bias, not trait empathic concern, predicts out-group altruism.** In press.
 28. Turner JC, Oakes PJ, Haslam SA, McGarty C: **Self and collective: cognition and social context.** *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 1994, **20**:454-463.
 29. Freeman JB, Ambady N: **A dynamic interactive theory of person construal.** *Psychol Rev* 2011, **118**:247-279.
 30. Ho AK, Sidanius J, Cuddy AJ, Banaji MR: **Status boundary enforcement and the categorization of black-white biracials.** *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2013, **49**:940-943.
 31. Krosch AR, Amodio DM: **Economic scarcity alters the perception of race.** *Proc Nat Acad Sci* 2014, **111**:9079-9084.
- In the first two studies, decision makers who reported greater concern about economic competition between Black and White Americans or were non-consciously primed with scarcity (vs. neutral or negative concepts) required Black and White face morphs to contain less Black face content in order to be categorized as Black. In the second two studies, decision makers in a scarce (vs. neutral) resource context represented

Black recipients as darker and more stereotypically Black, which led to bias in the allocation of resources.

32. Miller SL, Maner JK, Becker DV: **Self-protective biases in group categorization: threat cues shape the psychological boundary between “us” and “them”**. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2010, **99**:62-77.
33. Kteily NS, Cotterill S, Sidanius J, Sheehy-Skeffington J, Bergh R: **“Not one of us”: predictors and consequences of denying ingroup characteristics to ambiguous targets**. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 2014, **40**:1-17.
 A series of studies examining the effect of SDO and RWA on perceptions of ambiguous targets. Exclusionary perceptions resulted in increased support for harsh out-group treatment and increased support for policies that prioritize the in-group over out-group.
34. Maddox KB: **Perspectives on racial phenotypicity bias**. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev* 2004, **8**:383-401.
35. Caruso EM, Mead NL, Balcells E: **Political partisanship influences perception of biracial candidates’ skin tone**. *Proc Nat Acad Sci* 2009, **106**:20168-20173.
36. Dotsch R, Wigboldus DH, Langner O, van Knippenberg A: **Ethnic out-group faces are biased in the prejudiced mind**. *Psychol Sci* 2008, **19**:978-980.
37. Bruce V, Young A: **Understanding face recognition**. *Br J Psychol* 1986, **77**:305-327.
38. Ratner KG, Amodio DM: **Seeing “us vs. them”: minimal group effects on the neural encoding of faces**. *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2013, **49**:298-301.
39. Van Bavel JJ, Packer DJ, Cunningham WA: **Modulation of the fusiform face area following minimal exposure to motivationally relevant faces: evidence of in-group enhancement (not out-group disregard)**. *J Cogn Neurosci* 2011, **23**:3343-3354.
40. Eberhardt JL, Goff PA, Purdie VJ, Davies PG: **Seeing black: race, crime, and visual processing**. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 2004, **87**:876-893.
41. Donders NC, Correll J, Wittenbrink B: **Danger stereotypes predict racially biased attentional allocation**. *J Exp Soc Psychol* 2008, **44**:1328-1333.
42. Ackerman JM, Shapiro JR, Neuberg SL, Kenrick DT, Becker DV, Griskevicius V, Maner JK, Schaller M: **They all look the same to me (unless they’re angry) from out-group homogeneity to out-group heterogeneity**. *Psychol Sci* 2006, **17**:836-840.
43. Ofan RH, Rubin N, Amodio DM: **Situation-based social anxiety enhances the neural processing of faces: evidence from an intergroup context**. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* 2014, **9**:1055-1061.
44. Krosch AR, Amodio DM: **Stereotypes alter the neural encoding of faces**. In press.
 Participants showed enhanced structural encoding of Black (but not White) faces primed with negative Black-stereotype images (i.e., guns), relative to non-stereotype images (i.e., tools), as indicated by the N170 index of temporo-occipital cortex activity and recognition accuracy.
45. Krosch AR, Amodio DM: **Perceptual dehumanization of Black faces promotes racial discrimination under economic stress**. In press.
 In two studies, decision makers in a scarce (vs. neutral) resource context exhibited diminished structural encoding of Black faces (vs. White) faces, indexed by the N170 ERP component and activity in the fusiform gyrus. Decreased processing of Black faces predicted anti-Black allocation biases in behavior.
46. Cheon BK, Livingston RW, Hong YY, Chiao JY: **Gene × environment interaction on intergroup bias: the role of 5-HTTLPR and perceived outgroup threat**. *Soc Cogn Affect Neurosci* 2014, **9**:1268-1275.
47. Diekhof EK, Wittmer S, Reimers L: **Does competition really bring out the worst? Testosterone, social distance and inter-male competition shape parochial altruism in human males**. *PLoS ONE* 2014, **9**:e98977.
48. Reimers L, Diekhof EK: **Testosterone is associated with cooperation during intergroup competition by enhancing parochial altruism**. *Front Neurosci* 2015, **9**:183.
 Participants played an intergroup Prisoner Dilemma game in neutral and competitive contexts. The competitive context accentuated increased in-group cooperation and decreased out-group cooperation. High testosterone levels correlated with increased in-group (i.e., parochial) cooperation in competitive context (vs. neutral context).
49. De Dreu CK, Greer LL, Handgraaf MJ, Shalvi S, Van Kleef GA, Baas M, Ten Velden FS, Van Dijk E, Feith SW: **The neuropeptide oxytocin regulates parochial altruism in intergroup conflict among humans**. *Science* 2010, **328**:408-1411.
50. Robinson GE, Fernald RD, Clayton DF: **Genes and social behavior**. *Science* 2008, **322**:896-900.