

Minority Influence – Mark Scheme

Q1.

(a) [AO1 = 3]

1 mark for each of the following:

- Consistency
- Commitment
- Flexibility/non-dogmatic

Credit other relevant behaviours eg building up idiosyncrasy credits; appearance of objectivity; certainty of correctness/knowledgeable, creating cognitive conflict, showing self-sacrifice/augmentation, persistence, identification with the minority.

(b) [AO2 = 3]

1 mark for relevant application of each characteristic (no need to name again here but must be the behaviours identified in part (a) for credit).

If correct answer to part (a) then application must relate to behaviour named in part (a) for credit in part (b).

If incorrect answer to part (a) then can credit application in part (b) if a relevant, correct behaviour is named as part of the application.

If no answer to part (a) then can credit application in part (b) if a relevant, correct behaviour is named as part of the application.

Possible applications:

- Marcus could show consistency by keeping on repeating the same message about how great it would be to go travelling
- Marcus could show commitment by explaining how he is taking time and working hard to plan the travelling trip and saving for the trip
- Marcus could show flexibility by listening to the others and agree to going on a beach holiday at the end of the travelling trip

The application must relate explicitly to the content of the stem.

Credit other relevant applications.

Q2.

[AO2 = 6]

1 mark – for knowledge of each relevant reason/factor

Plus:

1 mark for each brief application to situation

Content/Application:

- Uniform – Presence of a uniform, in this case the instructor’s jacket, conveys legitimate authority, as in Milgram’s experiment where the experimenter had a lab coat.
- Proximity – standing up close means that people are more likely to follow instructions, as in Milgram’s experiment where the authority figure was more effective when in the same room
- Location – the use of the instructor’s office again conveys the force of legitimate authority as in the Milgram’s study where Yale was more likely to result in obedience than a downtown setting.

Credit other relevant ways/factors/variables eg Assuming responsibility – if the instructor makes it clear that he/she has ultimate responsibility that then divests recruits from personal responsibility and so they are likely to assume an agentic state.

Q3.

[AO2 = 6]

| Level | Mark | Description |
|-------|------|---|
| 3 | 5-6 | Knowledge of minority influence is clear and generally well detailed. Application to Jenny’s situation is mostly clear and effective. The answer is generally coherent with appropriate use of terminology. |
| 2 | 3-4 | Knowledge of minority influence is evident. There is some effective application to Jenny’s situation. The answer lacks clarity in places. Terminology is used appropriately on occasions. |
| 1 | 1-2 | Knowledge of minority influence is limited. Application to Jenny’s situation is either absent or inappropriate. The answer as a whole lacks clarity and has inaccuracies. Terminology is either absent or inappropriately used. |
| | 0 | No relevant content. |

Possible content:

- Jenny should demonstrate consistency by not deviating from her view that not grading work is a good idea despite social pressure – she could point out that this is a view that she has held throughout her teaching career
- Jenny should demonstrate commitment by placing herself at some risk / inconvenience – she may volunteer to field criticisms from students, parents, other departments, etc. This will draw more attention to her ‘cause’ (augmentation principle)
- Jenny should demonstrate flexibility by adapting her view / accepting other valid counterarguments. Perhaps some pieces of work could be ungraded but not all – for instance, grading mock exams but not homework
- over time, the rest of the department may become ‘converted’ (snowball effect) – for example, if Jenny’s students start to perform particularly well
- other valid points, e.g. persistence, confidence, social cryptoamnesia

Description of procedures of studies of minority influence is not creditworthy. Description of findings / conclusions may be creditworthy.

No application to Jenny’s situation maximum 2 marks.

[6]