

Del 1. (Vektes med 60% av den samlede karakteren).

Vennligst besvar **tre av de fire** kortsvarsoppgavene nedenfor (Inntil 350 ord for hver av oppgavene):

- 1) På en stor barneskole som består av flere klasser for hvert årskull har det blitt avdekket at elevene ikke etablerer vennskap utenfor den spesifikke klassen de går i. For å forbedre det sosiale skolemiljøet har lærerne forsøkt å etablere konkurranse mellom klassene hvor det tildeles små belønninger gjennom skoleåret, og det blir arrangert en pizzafest for klassen som presterer best ved slutten av året. I stedet for å forbedre det sosiale miljøet ved skolen ble det avdekket at dette har medført aggressiv atferd og til og med fysiske konfrontasjoner mellom elever fra forskjellige klasser. Hva er den teoretiske forklaringen for hvorfor dette inntraff, og hva kan skolen gjøre for å få slutt på konfrontasjonene og forbedre det sosiale miljøet?
- 2) Du og vennen din Petter har en krangel fordi han kom tre timer for sent til middagsfesten din og han er sur fordi det ikke er mat igjen. Du sier at det er uforskammet at han alltid kaster bort andres tid, og hvis han ikke vil gå glipp av ting bør han forsøke å gjøre endringer slik at han ikke alltid kommer for sent. Petter blir svært fornærmet av dette og mener han har oppnådd perfekt selvinnsikt gjennom introspeksjon, og siden han tilgir seg selv for å komme for sent bør ingen andre bruke dette mot ham. Diskuter kort selvinnsikt («*self-knowledge*») og introspeksjon, og vurder om du støtter eller avviser Petters mening.
- 3) Du har lest gjennom noen tilfeldige nyhetsartikler på nettet. For øyeblikket leser du kommentarfeltet til en artikkel om nylig økning i Korona-relatert vold i Nordterritoriet i Australia. Du leser at en person argumenterer sterkt for at aggresjon er en følge av arv og ikke miljø, så alt en trenger å gjøre for å løse problemet er å identifisere de som er aggressive fra naturens side og fengsle de på livstid. Det hevdes videre at det ville vært enkelt å identifisere de som er aggressive fordi en kun leter etter personer som føler et behov for å skade andre. Du nevner dette til din kjæreste som interessert ber deg forklare temaet. Forklar i kontekst hva det du har lest i kommentarfeltet omhandler og om (og i så fall hvordan) det er korrekt eller feil.
- 4) Du og vennen din Mari er på en fest sammen. Mari er en svært vennlig og varm person som står nær mange andre mennesker, og alltid synes å være rolig rundt andre. I løpet av festen prøver en fremmed person seg på Mari, og hun går vekk fra ham mens hun rynker på ansiktet. Dere hører begge at en venn av han (en annen fremmed) fortelle ham at avvisningen ikke er hans egen feil, men at Mari «tydelig har en engstelig-ambivalent tilknytningsstil». Kort tid etter forlater du og Mari festen sammen. Mari vet at du studerer psykologi, og av interesse ber hun deg forklare hva som ble ment og om du er enig i bedømmelsen av hennes tilknytningsstil. Gjør kort rede for tilknytningsteori og definer deretter hver av tilknytningsstilene. Basert på det du vet om Mari ut fra teksten over hvilken tilknytningsstil tror du passer best til henne?

Del 2 (Vektes med 40% av den samlede karakteren).

Vennligst besvar **én av de to** drøftingsoppgavene nedenfor (Det er ingen ordbegrensning):

- 1) Sosial kognisjon er sentralt i sosialpsykologien, og påvirker hvordan vi interagerer med vårt sosiale miljø, inklusivt hvordan vi bedømmer andre mennesker. Definer kort hva

sosial kognisjon er og diskuter faktorer som kan medføre sosiale feilbedømmelser. Diskuter deretter kort hvordan sosial skjema og heuristikker guider sosial kognisjon. På basis av denne kunnskapen, hvilket råd ville du gitt til noen som ønsker å minimere risikoen for at kognitiv «bias» påvirker deres sosiale kognisjon.

- 2) Aina, Stian og Sara er dine venner. De er alle tre invitert til en gotisk fest hos en felles venn. Aina og Stian drar på festen, men er skuffet over at Sara ikke dukket opp. Påfølgende dag ringer de henne og spør hvorfor hun ikke var der, hvorpå hun svarer at hun ikke er «gotisk» og derfor ikke var velkommen. Aina og Stian diskuterer dette med henne, og sier at alle egentlig vet at hun er gotisk basert på hennes musikksmak og klesstil. Sara er helt uenig i dette og sier hun er en punker, og at Aina og Stian allerede burde vært klar over dette og dessuten vil alle punkevennene hennes bekrefte at hun er en punker. Etter samtalen forteller Aina til Stian at hun nå har fått et mer negativt bilde av Sara. Basert på din kunnskap om sosialpsykologi, definer sosial identitet og betydningen av inngrupper og utgrupper. Diskuter også hvilke prosesser som er involvert knyttet til at Aina og Stian antar at Sara er gotisk, mens Sara mener at de to burde vite at hun er en punker. Gitt informasjon du har, hvorfor tror du Aina har endret oppfatning av Sara?

SENSURVEILEDNING

Emnekode og navn: PSY1014/PSYPRO4114	Semester / År / Eksamenstype: Spring Semester/2021/ Skriftlig eksamen, 4 timer
<p style="text-align: center;">Oppgave:</p> <p>Home exam in Social Psychology 1 (PSY1014/PSYPRO4114) This exam contains two sections; a short answer section and an essay section. Please follow the listed instructions. NB! Please note that all aids are allowed on the home exam. It is stated that the candidates should identify relevant studies with names of authors and years (but no reference list is required).</p> <p>Part 1. (Weighted by 60% of the total grade). Please answer three of the four short answer questions below (Up to 350 words for each of the questions):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) In a large primary school with multiple classes for each year level, it was noticed that students were not making friends outside of those in their specific class. In an attempt to foster school spirit, the teachers tried to initiate competitions between the classes, with small rewards throughout and the best performing class in each year level getting a pizza party at the end of the semester. It quickly became clear that instead of bringing everyone together, this has led to aggressive behaviour between students from different classes, and recently even physical fighting. What is the theoretical basis for why this happened, and what could the school do to stop the fighting and make everyone get along?2) You are having an argument with your friend, Petter, because he turned up three hours late to your dinner party and is upset that no food is left for him. You say that he's rude for always wasting everyone's time, and that if he didn't want to miss out, he should try working on himself so he isn't always so late to things. He takes serious offense to this, stating that he has achieved perfect self-enlightenment through introspection, and that, since his habitual lateness is something he is willing to forgive himself for, no one else should be allowed to use it against him. Briefly discuss self-knowledge and introspection, and consider whether you support or reject Petter's position.3) You have been reading through random newspaper articles online. You are currently reading the comments section on an article about a recent uptick in corona-related violence in the Northern Territories in Australia. You see someone passionately arguing that aggression is a matter of nature over nurture, so that all that would need to be done to solve the problem would be to identify those who are aggressive by nature and imprison them for life. They further argue that it would be easy to identify who is aggressive, because you just look for those who feel the need to hurt others. You mention this to your partner who, interested, asks you to explain the topic. Explain in context what the comment is talking about, and discuss whether (and how) it is correct or incorrect.4) You are with your friend Mari at a party. Mari is a very friendly and warm person who is close to a lot of people, and who always seems to be at ease around everyone. At the party, a stranger tries to hit on Mari, and she walks away from him with a frown. You both overhear a friend of his (another stranger) telling him that the rejection isn't his fault, because Mari 'clearly has an anxious-ambivalent attachment style'. You and Mari leave the party shortly thereafter. She knows you study psychology and, as a matter of interest, asks you to explain	

what they meant, and whether you agree with their judgement of her attachment style. Briefly explain Attachment Theory and then define each of the attachment styles. Based on what you know of Mari from the text above, which attachment style best fits her?

Part 2 (Weighted by 40% of the total grade).

Please answer **one of the two** discussion questions below (There is no word limit):

1) Social cognition is central to social psychology, influencing how we interact with our social environments, including in how we assess others. Briefly define social cognition, and discuss factors that can lead to us making mistakes in our social judgements. Then briefly discuss how social schemas and heuristics guide social cognition. Based on this knowledge, what advice would you give to someone seeking to minimise the risk of cognitive biases affecting their social cognition?

2) Aina, Stian, and Sara are friends. They are all invited to a 'goth only' party at a mutual friends house. Aina and Stian go, but are disappointed that Sara didn't come. They call her the next day and ask her why she wasn't there, to which she replies she isn't a goth so wasn't welcome. Aina and Stian argue with her, saying that 'everyone knows she really is' a goth, based on her music and clothing tastes, but Sara completely disagrees, saying she is a punk and that firstly Aina and Stian should have known that, and secondly Sara's punk friends would back her up her being punk. After the call, Aina confides in Stian that she now thinks less of Sara. Based on your knowledge of social psychology, define social identity and the role of in-groups and out-groups, and discuss what processes were involved with both the assumption from Aina and Stian that Sara is a goth, and in the assumption from Sara that Aina and Stian knew she is a punk. Given this knowledge, why would Aina's opinion of Sara change?

Relevant pensumlitteratur:

Gilovich, Keltner, Chen & Nisbett (2019) Social Psychology, Norton, Chapters 1–10, and 12–14. Chapter 11 has been replaced by Chapter 11 in Sutton & Douglas (2020) which the students have a copy (pdf) of.

Eksamenskrav:

Three questions from the first part (**Short answer questions, weighted 60%**) must be answered. One of the three may be a stroke (F), and the candidate will still be able to get a grade in this part if the other two assignments are generally well answered (C or better). If the chosen **essay (which is weighted 40%)** is not passed, the student will receive the grade stroke (F) regardless of the result in the first part.

The essay (no word limitation) is evaluated according to the following four dimensions: (1) content, (2) argumentation, (3) organization, and (4) to a certain extent style / format.

1. CONTENTS

Does the student present relevant theory and research (material) from the textbook (the literature)?

Is the material presented correctly?

Does the student integrate different theories and research?

Does the student critically evaluate the material?

Does the student show understanding of the field?

2. ARGUMENTATION

Was the argument developed and critically analyzed?

Is the argument logically consistent?

Have significant counter-arguments been taken into account?

3. ORGANIZATION

Is it a systematic development of ideas that leads to a conclusion without derailments from the topic?

Is the answer well structured and generally understandable?

4. STYLE / FORMAT

Formulation ability: linguistic style and grammar (but not simple typos)

Does the student critically evaluate the material?

Does the student show understanding of the field?

Specific examiner guide for the individual tasks

Part 1 (short answer questions)

1) What's being asked for here is Realistic Group Conflict Theory (Sherif, 1966), based off an example similar to the Robber's Cave study (Chapter 11 [pages 464-466] of the secondary text, supplied to students on Blackboard). Realistic Group Conflict Theory states that competition between groups for finite resources (in this case, the rewards and pizza party) leads to intergroup stereotypes, antagonism, and conflict, with groups having incompatible goals as one group obtaining the resource by definition prevents the other groups from obtaining it.

The core of this question requires students to identify that it is the competition for rewards at the heart of this conflict, and that activities in which students from all of the classes cooperate for mutual benefit are needed to overcome the conflict; simple contact between the classes is not enough, and punishments aimed at stopping the fighting won't be enough to remove the antagonism between groups. Students are likely to refer to the Robber's Cave study (Sherif, 1954; Sherif, 1961), where two groups of boys were randomly assigned to groups, went through a week of affiliation with their group members, followed by a week of competition between groups, and finally followed by a week of reconciliation between the groups. In the affiliation week, boys arrived and were divided into separate groups, staying at opposite ends of the camp in cabins located far apart, and engaging in fun recreational activities in ignorance of the existence of the other group, and making a group name and flags, developing the kind of ingroup attachment and cooperation theorised to underlie prejudice and intergroup conflict. In the competition week, the two groups were brought together to compete in a series of contests, with the winning group receiving a trophy as a group and prizes as individuals. Almost immediately conflict between the groups erupted, starting with taunts and name calling, but escalating to symbolic acts of violence (e.g., burning each other's flags), and eventually onto physical violence; on two previous attempts at this experiment, became so hostile and stressful that the experiment had to be stopped in this week due to ethical concerns. In the intergroup reconciliation week, experimenters tried to 'douse the flames of conflict. They attempted simple contact (merely increasing contact between the groups), which just worsened the conflict. They also attempted the introduction of superordinate goals, where each group retained a separate identity but were posed challenges that could only be solved in cooperation with the other group (e.g., repairing the camps water supply, pulling a broken-down truck out of mud using rope that had earlier been used in competitive tug-of-war). Superordinate goals worked extremely well, with members of each

group perceiving the other group far more positively following these activities compared to the previous week.

Comment: An answer that fails to identify Realistic Group Conflict Theory will usually receive an F, or will clearly reduce the grade, unless the reason for an alternative interpretation is very good. A basic good description of Realistic Group Conflict Theory and how cooperative exercises are needed to solve the problem will give a C. A good discussion of this theory, including why simple contact isn't enough to solve the problem, and/or the inclusion of Social Identity Theory could increase the grade.

2) What's being asked for here is a discussion of the social self, especially in terms of introspection, but allowing for the discussion of wider topics.

Introspection can be useful to some degree (e.g., insight into preferences, traits, emotions), but there are many biases connected to it, and it is not the only means of self-learning. People often go beyond what it is truly useful for to weave narratives that paint themselves in the best possible light, and for some traits others may be a better source of information (e.g., just how often you brag, etc.). Lack of self-awareness even when someone claims to embrace introspection may be due to the fact that we have strong motives for appearing in certain beneficial ways (Vazire, 2010). Further, research has found that introspection provides us with minimal insight into the reasons for the choices we make, attitude changes, and preferences we have (Nisbett & Wilson, 1977).

One topic it is likely for students to mention is self-schema. The point to look for here is the argument that self-schema affect our feelings, thoughts, and behaviours in specific contexts (Markus, 1977).

Another topic it is likely for students to mention is self-perception from social situations both concrete (family, friends, peers) and more abstract (cultural norms in cultures, social groups, or own gender), including references to family (e.g., as stated in the textbook, birth order affecting personality traits, and siblings taking on different familial roles to minimise conflicts). The point to look for here is arguments about the importance of 'the looking-glass self' (Cooley, 1902), where other people's reactions to us (whether they like/accept what we do or not) acts as a mirror by which we see ourselves, colouring our self-appraisals as we internalise what we *think* others think of us, not what they actually think of us.

Comment: An answer that fails to discuss introspection in the context of the social self will usually receive an F, or will clearly reduce the grade, unless the reason for an alternative interpretation is very good. A basic good description of introspection and the social self, and a rejection of Petter's position, will give a C. A good discussion of the social self, including a discussion of how introspection is just one, flawed, measure of self-knowledge, could increase the grade.

3) What's being asked here is for a discussion of how aggression is a multi-faceted thing, and that 1) it is a mix of nature AND nurture, and 2) the need to hurt others is not necessary for aggression to occur. In terms of the first, students should discuss how there is evidence that both are important (page 447 of the textbook). In terms of the second, students should discuss how there are two forms of aggression; hostile and instrumental.

For the nature vs. nurture debate, the main point to look for is the statement that both are important, but a secondary point to look for to raise the grade is the argument that, based on research (e.g., Caspi et al., 2002), while nature and nurture are both part of the picture, it appears that biological factors by themselves largely don't affect whether people commit violent crimes, with researchers concluding that natural factors require nurture elements (e.g., experiencing abuse as a child) in order to shape behaviour.

For the discussion of types of aggression, the main point to look for is a statement that while hostile aggression is more in line with the description provided in the article, instrumental aggression doesn't, as it is done in the service of other motives such as personal advancement or wealth acquisition. A secondary point to look for to raise the grade is a discussion of the situational determinants of aggression; the book provides examples such as hot weather, media violence, violent video games, social rejection, and income inequality (pages 445-456), and while any discussion of these factors is providing more context and should be able to lead to a higher grade, to get the really high grades here we would want a discussion of circumstances surrounding the pandemic as being a situational determinant, as the aggression in the question is specified to be corona-related.

Comment: An answer that fails to discuss aggression in context (especially an answer that, without discussion, says the comment is correct) will usually receive an F, or will clearly reduce the grade, unless the reason for an alternative interpretation is very good. A basic good description of nature and nurture, and a statement that the comment is incorrect, will give a C. A good discussion of aggression, including a discussion of why the comment is incorrect, could increase the grade. The discussion of factors relating to the pandemic as being a situational determinant of aggression, showing application of the theories presented rather than sticking purely to the book, should definitely raise the grade.

4) What's being asked here is for a brief synopsis of Attachment Theory, a quick rundown of attachment styles, and a judgement call on what attachment style Mari shows based on what the student knows of them. The three attachment styles students are likely to discuss are Secure, Avoidant, and Anxious-Ambivalent. Students may instead (or as well) discuss two dimensions of attachment rather than three styles (anxiety as a continuum plus avoidance as a continuum).

The definition of the secure attachment style should be e.g., "involves finding it relatively easy to get close to others, being comfortable to depend on others and to have others depend on you, and not often worrying about being abandoned or about someone getting too close".

The definition of the avoidant attachment style should be e.g., "involves being somewhat uncomfortable with being close to others, finding it difficult to trust people completely, finding it difficult to depend on others and to have them depend on you, being nervous when people get close to you, and often being uncomfortable with how close romantic partners wish to be with you".

The definition of the anxious-ambivalent attachment style should be e.g., "involves perceiving others as not wanting to get as close to you as you would like, worrying that your partner doesn't love you or won't stay with you, and wanting to completely merge identities with another person but knowing that this desire scares romantic partners away".

For discussions of dimensions, the anxiety dimension of attachment captures the degree to which a person is worried about rejection and abandonment by relationship partners, while the avoidance dimension of attachment captures the degree to which a person is comfortable or uncomfortable with intimacy and dependence on relationship partners. Under the dimensional approach, the secure attachment style can be seen as low anxiety, low avoidance, while the avoidant attachment style can be seen as low anxiety, high avoidance, and the anxious-ambivalent attachment style can be seen as high anxiety, low avoidance. However, since the question specifies attachment styles, if the student only discusses the dimensions (and therefore isn't using the dimensions as a method to expand upon attachment styles), it should normally receive a lower grade.

Comment: An answer that fails to identify the three attachment styles will usually receive an F, or will clearly reduce the grade, unless the reason for an alternative interpretation

is very good. Confusing the labels of the Avoidant and Anxious-Ambivalent attachment styles will lead to a reduction in grade, but is not necessarily enough to automatically get an F. Mari has a secure attachment style, as indicated by them being labelled as friendly and being close to a lot of people. A basic good description of the attachment styles, and a statement that Mari has a secure attachment style, will give a C. A good discussion of these styles, including a discussion of why Mari has a secure attachment style, could increase the grade. A discussion of these styles in the context of being dimensions is acceptable, and students who take this angle are still able to obtain high marks, as long as they still identify the styles and correctly identify where Mari sits within the dimensional approach.

Part 2 (essay questions)

1) This assignment in its entirety is covered by chapter 4 (pages 100-137) in the textbook. The examiner's guide for this assignment only gives a certain indication of the content of an answer, it is not exhaustive.

The basic definition that can be expected is along the lines of 'social cognition is the way that people think about the social world and arrive at judgements that help them to interpret the past, understand the present, and predict the future'.

The factors that students have been taught that can lead to biases in social cognition are pluralistic ignorance, self-fulfilling prophecies, misleading second-hand information, information presentation, and confirmation bias. Students do not need to discuss all of these in depth, but should be able to demonstrate a good degree of knowledge of the factors that they do discuss.

The discussion of social schema should focus on social schema as knowledge structures that contain organised and stored knowledge, guiding our attention (which is selective) so that we ignore some things and focus on others. This affects our ability to store and retrieve information; it is easier to store and retrieve information that agrees with our existing schema than when it disagrees. As such, in terms of social cognition, schema guide our thoughts on a conscious and subconscious level, affecting the conclusions we make about others, as new information is interpreted in ways that are consistent with existing schema. Students may also discuss the dual-processing theories (labelled as two-processing theories in the textbook) of the intuitive system (rapid responses spring from automatic associations, schema sort and selects information in an often subconscious manner outside of the individual's control, meaning that schema are efficient systems that process a lot of information simultaneously and in parallel) and the rational system (slower and more controlled; well-thought-out thinking based on rules and conclusions, which performs one operation at a time (serial thinking) but is still based in our social schema; more time consuming).

The discussion of heuristics should focus on heuristics as mental shortcuts for solving problems (in contrast to 'biases', which represent errors). As such, they differ from schema in that schema are more associated with what topics a person might make decisions about, while heuristics are associated with how the decisions are made. Students should discuss both availability heuristics and representative heuristics, and may refer to availability heuristics as accessibility heuristics. In relation to availability heuristics, students are likely to discuss 'fluency' – the feeling of how difficult or easy it is to mentally process certain stimuli, with information that is processed more easily perceived more positively, and information that is more difficult to process seen more negatively and subjected to more scrutiny and consideration. As such, in terms of social cognition, availability heuristics make that which we are familiar with feel more positive than that we are unfamiliar with, regardless of the truth of a given social situation, leading us to make mistakes; for example, people often

overestimate their own contributions because it is easier to come up with examples of what they have done compared to examples of what others did, although notably this applies to both positive and negative outcomes. In relation to representative heuristics, students are likely to discuss that social cognition is affected based on the similarities between individuals and prototypes the observer has about members of the group(s) to which they are perceived to belong, which again can easily lead to mistakes; for example, we often ignore base-rate information, such as information about the relative frequency of incidents for members of different groups in a population. Ignoring relative frequency tends to lead us to draw the wrong conclusions about the people described, what they are doing, and how likely they are to succeed.

Finally, there is the question of what they would suggest for people to do to minimise the chance of cognitive biases. There are a lot of angles here that students could discuss. The core idea is the use of the rational system (while slow and cognitively expensive) to properly think through things before acting on them, although this is not the only approach, and with good argumentation I could see a good grade going to someone who does not mention it but brings up other excellent ideas.

2) This assignment in its entirety is covered by chapter 11 of both the secondary book (Sutton & Douglas, 2020; pages 450-492) and the textbook (pages 376-407). The examiner's guide for this assignment only gives a certain indication of the content of an answer, it is not exhaustive. The example specifically is intended to present a scenario in which members of a group erroneously assume someone to belong to their group and respond badly when informed otherwise, while the individual in the different group assumed that it was obvious that they belonged to different groups, with students asked to apply the knowledge they have picked up during the course.

The discussion of social identity should focus on our need to socially belong. As students are likely to have focused on the chapter from Sutton and Douglas, in relation to in-groups and out-groups, we should expect a discussion of outgroup homogeneity. Outgroup Homogeneity refers to the tendency to exaggerate similarities between outgroup members and differences between ingroup members (e.g., Quattrone & Jones, 1980; Simon, 1992). Under this approach, it is theorised to occur because people are firstly more familiar with their in-groups, and therefore are naturally able to call to mind more examples (Linville, Salovey, & Fischer, 1986; Linville, Fischer, & Salovey, 1989), and/or people are more likely to use exemplars when judging in-groups but category-level information when judging out-groups (Judd & Park, 1988; Park, Judd, & Ryan, 1991).

Students who go deeper into the discussion of social identity may focus on stereotypes and the concept of cognitive misers (Fiske & Taylor, 1991) to explain that there is not enough space, especially in working memory, to properly and uniquely 'take in' each individual, and group, fully as they come. As such, stereotypes can be seen as simplified heuristic understandings of groups and their members. From these stereotypes, we form prejudices (negative affective reactions towards a group and its members), which leads to discrimination based on group affiliation, with students referring to theories of attitude formation and change (Chapter 7 of the core textbook) to explain that prejudice and discrimination can be positive too, meaning that we discriminate in favour of our in-groups and discriminate against our out-groups (e.g., favouring members of your ingroup for receiving the biggest pieces of cake when you have been put in charge of handing it out at a party).

While a discussion of Outgroup Homogeneity and Attitude Formation may fulfil the needs of the essay if it is sufficiently compelling, it is likely that for a good grade, students need to discuss Social Identity Theory and/or Realistic Group Conflict Theory. This is because both Social Identity Theory (to a greater degree) and Realistic Group Conflict Theory (to a

lesser degree) allow for far more specific discussions of the processes involved in the situation described in the question.

Under Social Identity Theory, we accept the emotions and values of in-groups as our own. This leads us to adopt an 'us versus them' mentality, with 'us' being our in-groups, and 'them' being our out-groups. Once we have defined these in-groups and out-groups, a competition for positive social identity leads us to exaggerate the positive qualities of our in-groups, the negative qualities of our out-groups, differences between the groups, and similarities within your in-groups. Key to this discussion is the point that the process of exaggeration discussed above leads people to firstly see any criticism of their in-groups as personal attacks, eliciting emotional responses, and likely leading to the individual making personal attacks back in retaliation.

For students utilising Social Identity Theory in their answer, we would want to see the argument that Aina and Stian, based on the perception of Sara as a goth, exaggerate the similarities within their perceived in-group to allow Sara to be a punk. Further, Sara, exaggerating the differences between the punk in-group and goth out-group, doesn't see how Aina and Stian could have made that mistake. Finally, Sara enforcing the boundary of her being punk moves her from being in Aina and Stian's in-group to being in an out-group, suggesting that Aina's negative change in perception of Sara is due to Aina holding negative stereotypes of the punk out-group, especially in light of Sara's seeming rejection of the goth in-group, which might have damaged Aina's positive identity as a goth.

Under Realistic Group Conflict Theory (RGCT; Sherif, 1966), competition between groups for finite resources leads to intergroup stereotypes, antagonism, and conflict. Such competition creates incompatible goals for members of different groups because one group's success in obtaining those resources prevents the other group from obtaining them. Such conflicts of interest lead to the development of ingroup norms that foster negative reactions to the outgroup, backed by punishment and rejection of those ingroup members who deviate from those norms. Under this theory, negative beliefs and actions emerge when groups have conflicting interests, and specifically when one group's success blocks the other's goal attainment. RGCT includes a large number of specific predictions about the way in which clashing interests between groups influence both ingroup functioning and intergroup relations. For example, RGCT predicts that conflict with outgroups enhances ingroup solidarity. It also predicts that the more another group stands in the way of one's own group's attainment of desired goals, the greater the hostility created toward that other group.

For students utilising RGCT in their answer, we would want to see that Sara's enforcement of a boundary activates this conflict. As no explicit struggle for resources is mentioned here, students should identify that the 'resources' being fought over is 'positive social identity'. Failure to do so is likely to lead to a lower grade, since conflict is a requirement of the theory.

Karakterbeskrivelse:

<https://innsida.ntnu.no/wiki/-/wiki/Norsk/Karakterskalaen>

Faglærer / oppgavegiver:

Navn: Dr. Jonathan Kim

Sted / dato: Trondheim, 06.04.2021