Attitudes toward Target Minority Groups

Authored by
mohammed looti

November 28, 2025

Defining Intergroup Attitudes and Target Groups

Attitudes toward target minority groups represent a crucial domain within social psychology, focusing intently on the evaluations, feelings, and behavioral intentions directed toward groups that occupy a subordinate social position, often defined by characteristics such as race, ethnicity, religion, sexual orientation, or disability status. These attitudes are complex psychological constructs, typically conceptualized as consisting of three interrelated components: the **cognitive component**, encompassing beliefs and generalized stereotypes; the **affective component**, involving emotions such as fear, anxiety, or dislike; and the **behavioral component**, which includes predispositions to act in a discriminatory manner. A key feature of these attitudes is their inherently intergroup nature; they are not merely personal preferences but are deeply embedded in the social structure and power dynamics existing between the dominant majority and the subordinate minority. The designation of a group as a "target minority" implies a history of systemic disadvantage, marginalization, and often, the experience of being the object of collective hostility or societal prejudice, making the comprehensive study of these specific attitudes essential for understanding social inequality and conflict within diverse societies and for formulating effective interventions.

The terminology used in this field is critical and requires precise differentiation between key concepts. **Stereotypes** constitute the cognitive element, representing generalized and often inaccurate beliefs about the characteristics of members of the target group. These mental shortcuts serve to simplify complex social reality but frequently lead to errors in judgment and rigid categorization. **Prejudice**, conversely, is the affective or evaluative component--a hostile or negative attitude toward a distinguishable group based solely on their membership in that group, rather than based on individual merit or behavior. Finally, **discrimination** is the tangible behavioral outcome, involving unfair or differential treatment of individuals based on their target group membership. While these three components are theoretically distinct and can be measured separately, they are empirically highly correlated; negative stereotypes often fuel prejudicial emotions, which in turn significantly increase the likelihood of discriminatory actions, demonstrating a unified psychological system that maintains bias across levels of analysis.

Target minority groups are defined not simply by numerical size but fundamentally by their relative lack of social power, status, and control over resources compared to the dominant group. This power differential is crucial because it contextualizes the nature and intensity of the prejudice experienced. Attitudes held by the dominant group often function to maintain the existing social hierarchy, providing a psychological justification for the unequal allocation of resources and opportunities that favor the ingroup. Research has shown that the specific nature of the target group--for example, whether the group is perceived as a primary threat due to competition for economic resources (e.g., some immigrant groups) or as deviating from traditional moral norms (e.g., certain religious or sexual minority groups)--significantly influences the content and intensity

of the negative attitudes directed toward them. Thus, analyzing attitudes toward minority groups requires a nuanced understanding sensitive to the historical context, the specific sociopolitical climate, and the unique cultural narratives surrounding each targeted population, moving beyond a monolithic view of "prejudice" to understand the sophisticated forms it assumes.

Theoretical Frameworks of Prejudice and Bias

Several foundational theoretical frameworks attempt to explain the origins and maintenance of negative attitudes toward target minority groups, drawing heavily from social, cognitive, and personality psychology. One of the earliest and most influential approaches is **Realistic Conflict Theory (RCT)**, which posits that prejudice arises directly from actual or perceived competition between groups for scarce, valued resources, such as economic opportunities, political power, or territory. When resources are genuinely limited or believed to be limited, the ingroup views the outgroup as a direct threat, leading to hostility, devaluation, and the development of negative stereotypes that function to justify the ingroup's efforts to defeat or subordinate the outgroup. This theory highlights the instrumental function of prejudice, suggesting it is often a response, albeit biased, to perceived zero-sum competition, though studies consistently show that the perception of threat frequently drives prejudice even in the absence of objective conflict, underscoring the role of subjective interpretation in driving intergroup attitudes.

In contrast to the material focus of RCT, **Social Identity Theory (SIT)** and its subsequent refinement, Self-Categorization Theory (SCT), emphasize the motivational need for positive self-esteem derived from membership in a social group. According to SIT, individuals strive to achieve or maintain a positive social identity. Since social identity is fundamentally derived from favorable comparisons between the ingroup and relevant outgroups, individuals are motivated to evaluate their ingroup positively and, consequently, often evaluate outgroups negatively, particularly those that threaten the ingroup's distinctiveness or status. This pervasive process, known as **ingroup bias or favoritism**, can lead to subtle or overt prejudice even in the absence of direct conflict or competition, simply because derogating the outgroup enhances the ingroup's perceived status and, by extension, the individual's own sense of self-worth. This framework powerfully explains why even the most trivial group distinctions, as demonstrated by the minimal group paradigm, can rapidly lead to differentiation, bias, and the formation of negative attitudes.

More contemporary frameworks address the subtle, often hidden, and frequently ambivalent nature of modern prejudice. Theories such as **Aversive Racism** suggest that many contemporary dominant group individuals genuinely endorse and hold egalitarian values, yet simultaneously harbor unconscious negative feelings or discomfort toward minority groups, largely due to unexamined cultural conditioning. When discriminatory actions can be easily rationalized by non-racial factors or when social norms regarding non-prejudice are weak or ambiguous, these negative feelings surface, leading to subtle avoidance, emotional withdrawal, or less favorable

treatment in ways that the individual can deny are based on prejudice. Similarly, **Ambivalent Prejudice Theory** suggests that attitudes toward target groups are often complexly mixed, involving both genuinely positive and genuinely negative beliefs (e.g., pity mixed with contempt or admiration mixed with resentment), leading to unstable and inconsistent behavioral reactions. This theoretical shift acknowledges that overt, hostile prejudice has become largely socially unacceptable in many Western societies, necessitating frameworks that capture the sophisticated, often hidden, expressions of bias that characterize modern intergroup relations and continue to perpetuate systemic inequalities.

The Cognitive Mechanisms of Stereotyping

The cognitive component of attitudes toward target minority groups--stereotyping--is fundamentally rooted in the human demand for cognitive efficiency and simplification. The social world presents an immense amount of complex, constantly changing information, and the brain manages this overload by utilizing categorization processes. Social categorization involves sorting people into groups (ingroups and outgroups), which subsequently activates associated schemas or stereotypes. These stereotypes function as effective mental shortcuts, allowing individuals to make rapid judgments and predictions about members of the target group without expending significant cognitive resources on detailed, effortful individual assessment. While categorization itself is a necessary and neutral cognitive process, the content of the activated stereotypes is almost always biased, reflecting cultural narratives and historical power dynamics that portray target groups negatively, simplistically, or monolithically, thereby reinforcing the negative evaluative component of prejudice.

Several specific cognitive biases rigorously perpetuate stereotyping and ensure its persistence. The **Outgroup Homogeneity Effect** is a robust finding demonstrating that individuals tend to perceive members of an outgroup as being much more similar to one another ("they are all alike") than members of their ingroup, who are viewed as varied, diverse, and unique individuals. This effect diminishes the perceived individuality of target group members, making it cognitively easier to apply generalized, negative stereotypes and ignore counter-stereotypical evidence when it arises. Furthermore, the mechanism of **illusory correlation** plays a significant, often unconscious role, wherein individuals overestimate the association between two statistically infrequent events, specifically the co-occurrence of a minority group (which is numerically less frequent) and negative behaviors (which are also statistically less frequent than positive or neutral behaviors). Because both occurrences are distinctive, they draw disproportionate cognitive attention, leading to the false perception that the minority group is particularly prone to negative actions, thereby cementing negative stereotypes.

The remarkable persistence of stereotypes is further explained by the mechanisms of selective attention, interpretation, and memory processes. Once a stereotype is activated, it acts as a

powerful perceptual filter, guiding attention toward information that confirms the stereotype and defensively deflecting attention away from information that contradicts it. When compelling counter-stereotypical information is encountered, individuals often engage in **subtyping**, which involves creating a special, non-representative category for the exception ("She's the exception," or "He's not like the others"), effectively isolating the contradictory evidence and thereby protecting the general stereotype from necessary revision. This cognitive rigidity ensures that even prolonged, high-quality positive contact with target group members may fail to significantly alter the underlying negative generalized attitude. Crucially, research confirms that stereotypes are often activated automatically and unconsciously upon encountering a group member, meaning that even individuals genuinely committed to egalitarianism may experience subtle, unintended biases in judgment and behavior, demonstrating the powerful and insidious nature of these entrenched cognitive structures in maintaining intergroup attitudes.

Affective Components: Fear, Anxiety, and Hostility

While cognition provides the structural framework for intergroup attitudes, the affective components--the emotions experienced in relation to target minority groups--provide the intense motivational and energetic force behind prejudice and subsequent discrimination. These emotions span a broad range, from explicit hostility, anger, and resentment to more subtle, internalized feelings of discomfort, social anxiety, or paternalistic pity. **Intergroup anxiety** is a particularly pervasive phenomenon, referring to the discomfort, tension, and apprehension felt by members of the dominant group during anticipated or actual interactions with members of a target minority group. This anxiety often stems from the fear of acting inappropriately, appearing overtly prejudiced, being perceived as racist, or being rejected by the outgroup member. This intergroup anxiety frequently leads to avoidance of intergroup contact, which, ironically, prevents the accumulation of positive, individuating information that is necessary to challenge existing stereotypes and effectively reduce overall prejudice.

The specific emotions elicited are often systematically determined by the perceived nature and intensity of the threat posed by the target group, as elegantly outlined in the **Stereotype Content Model (SCM)**. The SCM proposes that target groups are primarily judged along two fundamental dimensions: **warmth** (perceived as friendly, trustworthy, and good-natured) and **competence** (perceived as capable, skilled, and effective). Target groups perceived as low in both warmth and competence often elicit strong emotions of contempt and disgust, which are associated with motivations for active exclusion, neglect, or even active harm. Conversely, groups perceived as high in competence but low in warmth (e.g., certain high-achieving professional or immigrant groups) often elicit feelings of envy and resentment, which can fuel efforts to undermine their success or promote discriminatory policies against them. Finally, groups perceived as high in warmth but low in competence (e.g., elderly people or certain disabled groups) often elicit pity, which, while not overtly hostile, frequently leads to paternalistic discrimination, limiting their

autonomy and opportunities based on the assumption of their incompetence.

The role of strong moral emotions, particularly anger, fear, and disgust, cannot be overstated in understanding intense negative attitudes. Anger often arises when the target group is perceived as actively violating cherished ingroup norms or posing a direct, tangible threat to ingroup resources, identity, or safety. Disgust, often linked to perceptions of impurity, contamination, or moral deviance, is a powerful exclusionary emotion that psychologically motivates social distance and rejection, often driving attitudes toward marginalized groups perceived as violating social order. These intense negative affects are frequently amplified through processes of social learning and cultural transmission, where they become automatically associated with the target group through persistent negative media representation, inflammatory political rhetoric, and consistent peer influence. Once these intense negative emotions are established, they are highly resistant to rational, cognitive counter-argumentation, demonstrating conclusively that prejudice is not merely a cognitive error but a deeply rooted, resilient emotional response that requires affective, and not just factual, intervention for successful reduction and change.

Behavioral Manifestations: Discrimination and Microaggressions

The ultimate and most damaging consequence of negative attitudes toward target minority groups is the manifestation of discriminatory behavior, which spans a wide continuum from overt acts of hostility and violence to subtle, systemic disadvantages embedded in institutional practices. **Discrimination** involves differential treatment based solely on group membership, encompassing actions that disadvantage minority individuals in critical life domains such as employment, housing, access to quality education, and interactions within the justice system. While explicit, overt, and aggressive discrimination has significantly decreased in many societies due to robust legal sanctions and changing social norms, more subtle and insidious forms of institutional and interpersonal discrimination persist. These subtle biases are often shielded by seemingly neutral organizational policies or occur in ambiguous social settings where bias can operate implicitly, making it difficult to detect, challenge, and prove.

A critical modern behavioral manifestation of subtle prejudice is the pervasive phenomenon of **microaggressions**. These are defined as brief, commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative slights, insults, and invalidations toward target minority groups. The typology of microaggressions includes microinsults (communications that convey rudeness and insensitivity and demean a person's heritage or identity), microassaults (explicit racial derogations, though often disguised or occurring privately), and microinvalidations (communications that actively exclude, negate, or nullify the psychological thoughts, feelings, or experiential reality of target group members, such as telling a minority individual they are "too sensitive"). While individually these acts may seem minor or trivial to the perpetrator, the cumulative effect of chronic

microaggressions on the psychological well-being and physical health of minority individuals is substantial, contributing to chronic stress, vigilance, and the perpetuation of a hostile social environment, demonstrating precisely how subtle bias translates into measurable, real-world harm.

Furthermore, the translation of internal attitudes into external behavioral responses is highly sensitive to prevailing social norms and the perceived audience. Research on the expression of prejudice consistently shows that individuals are far more likely to express negative attitudes or engage in discriminatory behavior when they believe their actions are socially acceptable, or when they are surrounded by ingroup members who implicitly or explicitly share and endorse those biases. This finding highlights the critical importance of the socio-contextual environment in mediating the link between internal attitudes and external actions. The mere absence of overt discrimination does not necessarily signify the absence of negative underlying attitudes; rather, it often indicates the successful internalization of anti-prejudice norms, which may only suppress the behavior rather than fundamentally eliminate the underlying bias. Understanding the complexity of behavioral manifestations requires analyzing both the individual's internal cognitive and affective state and the prevailing social and institutional structures that either facilitate or constrain the expression of bias against target groups.

Measurement Challenges and Methodological Advances

Measuring attitudes toward target minority groups presents significant and persistent methodological challenges, primarily due to the pervasive influence of **social desirability bias**--the deeply ingrained tendency for respondents to report attitudes that align with prevailing social and moral norms, leading to the substantial underreporting of prejudice. Traditional explicit measures, such such as self-report questionnaires (e.g., scales assessing modern racism or sexism), capture consciously held beliefs and values but are increasingly criticized for failing to capture the subtle, unconscious biases that characterize modern prejudice, which often exists below the threshold of awareness or conscious control. To overcome this critical limitation, researchers have developed innovative implicit measures designed specifically to assess automatic, non-conscious associations between the target group and positive or negative attributes, thereby bypassing the individual's conscious control and self-monitoring.

The most prominent and widely used implicit measure is the **Implicit Association Test (IAT)**, which measures the strength of automatic associations between concepts (e.g., Black faces vs. White faces) and evaluations (e.g., Good vs. Bad). The IAT requires participants to rapidly categorize stimuli. A faster response time when pairing a target minority group with negative attributes, compared to pairing it with positive attributes, is consistently interpreted as evidence of an implicit negative attitude or bias. While the IAT has revolutionized the study of implicit bias, its predictive validity regarding specific, single discriminatory behaviors remains a subject of ongoing scientific debate, suggesting that implicit attitudes are complex and operate alongside explicit

intentions, working memory, and situational context. Other crucial implicit measures include the Affective Priming Task, which measures the speed with which negative words are recognized after exposure to a target group face, and physiological measures, such as galvanic skin response or functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), which assess emotional and neurological reactions to outgroup stimuli.

Methodological advancements have also focused on studying the context and subtlety of explicit bias. Techniques like the **bogus pipeline** (where participants are led to believe a highly accurate lie detector can verify their true attitudes) and the use of subtle, ambiguous scenarios (where discrimination can be easily rationalized by non-prejudicial factors) have allowed researchers to elicit more honest reports of explicit prejudice than standard surveys. Furthermore, observational behavioral measures, such as monitoring non-verbal cues (e.g., eye contact, seating distance, speech patterns) during structured intergroup interactions, provide indispensable data on subtle behavioral biases that are extremely difficult to capture through self-report alone. Integrating data from these diverse measurement approaches--explicit, implicit, physiological, and behavioral--is essential for constructing a comprehensive, multidimensional, and accurate understanding of the multifaceted nature of attitudes toward target minority groups in contemporary society.

Sociocultural and Contextual Influences on Attitude Formation

Attitudes toward target minority groups are never formed in isolation; they are profoundly shaped and reinforced by the surrounding sociocultural environment, including institutional structures, pervasive media representations, and prevailing political discourse. **Social learning theory** emphasizes that prejudice is significantly learned through processes of observation, imitation, and reinforcement from key socializing agents such as parents, peers, and broader cultural models. Children acquire stereotypes and negative emotional associations simply by observing the attitudes and behaviors of significant others, demonstrating the powerful and often unconscious intergenerational transmission of bias that solidifies attitudes early in development and makes them resistant to later change. Cultural norms dictate which groups are appropriate targets of humor, blame, or suspicion, thereby providing the necessary foundation for individual prejudice.

The role of **institutional discrimination** is fundamentally critical, as deeply entrenched societal structures--such as segregated housing policies, unequal educational funding systems, and biased media ownership--can systematically disadvantage minority groups and, simultaneously, reinforce negative attitudes among the dominant group. For instance, media portrayals that disproportionately link target groups to crime, deviance, or dependence serve to psychologically justify existing economic and social inequalities and maintain negative stereotypes in the broader public consciousness. Furthermore, political rhetoric often utilizes explicit or implicit scapegoating mechanisms, directing public anxiety, economic frustration, or moral panic onto target minority groups, thereby legitimizing and amplifying existing prejudicial attitudes, particularly during times of

intense economic instability or rapid social change.

The concept of **system justification theory** further explains how individuals, regardless of their personal attitudes or even their group membership, are deeply motivated to defend and bolster the status quo and the existing social hierarchy. For dominant group members, this motivation reinforces the belief that the social system is inherently fair, legitimate, and desirable, which, in turn, requires accepting or rationalizing the subordinate and often disadvantaged position of target minority groups through belief systems like meritocracy and individual blame. This powerful systemic influence demonstrates conclusively that tackling negative attitudes requires not only targeted individual psychological interventions but also fundamental, structural changes to the institutional and cultural contexts that generate and sustain the ideological structures of inequality. The pervasive normalization of bias within a culture provides the necessary, often invisible, scaffolding for negative attitudes to persist even when individuals consciously and intellectually reject overt prejudice.

Strategies for Attitude Change and Intergroup Harmony

Given the cognitive complexity, emotional rooting, and systemic resilience of negative attitudes toward target minority groups, significant psychological and social effort is required for effective attitude change and the lasting promotion of intergroup harmony. One of the most historically significant and empirically tested strategies is the **Contact Hypothesis**, originally formulated by Gordon Allport in 1954. This hypothesis rigorously suggests that under specific optimal conditions, direct intergroup contact can substantially reduce prejudice. These optimal conditions, which must ideally be met simultaneously, include: 1) The establishment of **equal status** between the groups in the contact situation; 2) The presence of **common goals** that require interdependence; 3) Active **intergroup cooperation** without competition; and 4) Clear, explicit **support from institutional authorities**, law, or custom. When these stringent conditions are successfully met, contact facilitates the crucial process of decategorization (seeing outgroup members as unique individuals rather than group representatives) and the subsequent generalization of positive attitudes to the entire outgroup.

Building effectively upon the foundational principles of the contact hypothesis, models such as the **Jigsaw Classroom technique** have successfully employed structured interdependence to promote positive attitude change in educational settings. In this highly structured learning environment, students from diverse backgrounds are assigned interdependent parts of a lesson or project, requiring them to rely heavily on one another to master the material and achieve success. This technique successfully meets the contact criteria of equal status and common goals, transforming potentially competitive classroom environments into cooperative ones, leading demonstrably to reduced stereotyping, increased empathy, and improved academic performance among all students. Furthermore, psychological approaches focusing on **perspective-taking** and

empathy induction, which encourage individuals to mentally simulate the world and experiences from the target group member's point of view, have been shown to temporarily reduce implicit bias and increase helping behavior and positive evaluations toward the outgroup, largely by blurring the ingroup/outgroup boundaries.

Finally, effective long-term strategies for attitude change must address both explicit and implicit biases through targeted, differentiated interventions. For explicit attitudes, educational programs emphasizing critical thinking about the origins of stereotypes, confronting moral inconsistencies in one's own beliefs, and promoting awareness of historical injustices are vital for cognitive restructuring. For implicit bias, interventions often focus on controlled processing and the intentional practice of counter-stereotypical associations (e.g., repeatedly pairing positive concepts with the target group) or implementing robust institutional controls (such as using blinded evaluations in hiring or promotions) that remove the opportunity for automatic bias to influence critical decisions. Ultimately, achieving sustainable positive attitude change requires a multi-level approach: fostering positive, high-quality contact at the individual level, challenging and dismantling systemic inequalities at the institutional level, and actively promoting inclusive norms and superordinate shared identities at the societal level, thereby dismantling the cognitive, affective, and behavioral components of prejudice simultaneously.