

Analyzing The Concept Of Minority Influence In Group Decision-Making Through "12 Angry Men" Film

Grup Kararlarında Azınlık Etkisi Kavramının "12 Kızgın Adam" Filmi Üzerinden İncelenmesi

Zeynep KAPTAN 

İstanbul Üniversitesi

Abstract

The aim of this study examines the group dynamics and decision-making process in the movie "12 Angry Men" through micro-level critical discourse analysis. It explores the influence of a member within the group on collective decisions and the impact of the first advocate in face-to-face group discussions. The leadership behavior of Henry, the main character of the movie, influences the group despite being in a minority position, providing a platform for discussion. By addressing different topics, Henry creates differences of opinion among the majority, thereby understanding the thinking of each member and shaping their speech. Henry's position in the group can be explained by his minority influence, as he is initially only one who doesn't comply with the majority by voting "not guilty." However, he consistently adheres to his decision, leading to a change in the group's thoughts and votes. This study provides an important example for understanding the complexity of group dynamics and communication while highlighting the role of leadership in minority influence.

Keywords: Minority Influence, Decision-Making, Critical Discourse Analysis

Özet

Bu çalışmanın amacı, "12 Kızgın Adam" filmindeki grup dinamiklerini ve karar alma sürecini mikro düzeyde eleştirel söylem analizi yoluyla incelemektir. Grup içindeki bir üyenin kolektif kararlar üzerindeki etkisini ve yüz yüze grup tartışmalarında ilk savunucunun etkisini araştırıyor. Filmin ana karakteri Henry'nin liderlik davranışı, azınlıkta olmasına rağmen grubu etkilemekte ve tartışma ortamı yaratmaktadır. Henry, farklı konuları ele alarak çoğunluk arasında fikir ayrılıkları yaratıyor, böylece her üyenin düşüncesini anlıyor ve konuşmalarını şekillendiriyor. Henry'nin gruptaki konumu azınlık etkisiyle açıklanabilir, çünkü kendisi başlangıçta "suçsuz" oyu vererek çoğunluğa uymayan tek kişidir. Ancak kararına sürekli bağlı kalması grubun düşüncelerinde ve oylarında değişikliğe yol açar. Bu çalışma, liderliğin azınlık etkisindeki rolünü vurgularken, grup dinamikleri ve iletişimin karmaşıklığını anlamak için önemli bir örnek sunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Azınlık Etkisi, Karar Verme, Eleştirel Söylem Analizi

Atif için (how to cite): Kaptan, Z. (2023) Analyzing The Concept Of Minority Influence In Group Decision-Making Through "12 Angry Men" Film. *Fenerbahçe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. (2023);3(2), 195-214

1. Introduction

While individuals are influenced by the characteristics of the group in which they are situated, they also strive to project their own attributes onto the group. This interaction provides insight into the psychological and socio-cultural traits exhibited consciously, semi-consciously, or unconsciously by group members, as well as their practices. Researching these specified topics is crucial for understanding group members' behaviors and the underlying causes of such behaviors (Geyer, 2017).

Among the methods available for obtaining scientific insights about a particular audience (group) in the realm of social sciences, focus group interviews stand out. Focus group interviews emerge as a qualitative data collection technique extensively employed in action research in recent years. The primary objective of these interviews is to delve into participants' perspectives, lives, interests, experiences, trends, thoughts, perceptions, emotions, attitudes, and habits in a comprehensive and multidimensional manner (Bowling, 2002; Gibbs, 1997; Kitzinger, 1994, Krueger, 1994; Stewart and Shamdasani, 1990). The emphasis is on fostering an environment where participants feel comfortable freely expressing their viewpoints. A significant advantage of focus group discussions is the generation of novel and diverse ideas through group interaction and dynamics (Kitzinger, 1994;1995). As a result of reciprocal interactions, participants evoke emotions and thoughts in each other's minds (Kitzinger, 1994), contributing to a rich exchange of information. The method aims to overcome barriers like group conformity, social approval, and societal expectations, aiming to capture participants' genuine perceptions, emotions, and thoughts.

In the context of this study, a critical discourse analysis will be applied to examine the decision-making process within the group dynamic of the film "12 Angry Men." Notably, Henry Fonda's character, a prominent actor in the film and arguably the main character, stands out as the sole individual within the group. Initially, Fonda's character faces attempts by others to assimilate him into the group's collective influence. However, his resolve and courage ultimately enable him to assert his impact. Through a skeptical and probing approach, he unveils the genuine motives hidden beneath the biases held by fellow jury members. Furthermore, his scrutiny extends to uncovering the underlying reasons behind their anger. Symbolically, Henry Fonda's character is the sole individual depicted wearing white in the film. By the film's conclusion, only two jury members' names become known to the audience, signifying their pivotal role in the decision-making process. This narrative choice is deliberate, as it underscores that the story unfolds not through individual identities but through character representations. The author's intention is for each character to symbolize broader societal facets rather than being viewed merely as distinct individuals.

2. Methodology

In the methodology of the study, the effect of Henry Fonda's character on the decision-making process in the group dynamics in the movie "12 Angry Men" was discussed and the symbolic representations of this character were used. The primary objectives are to make a critical analysis of the role and influence of Henry Fonda's character in the group and to examine the symbolic representations of the film and the social aspects conveyed through the characters. During the data collection and selection phase, certain scenes of the movie were studied, and scenes and dialogues focusing specifically on Henry Fonda's character were selected for analysis. Critical discourse analysis was used to delve deeper into the text and analyze the use of language, symbols, themes and power relations in the text. The following steps were followed during this analysis: By dividing the film into parts, the content of each scene or dialogue was examined. By analyzing the language use and symbols, information was obtained about the emotional states, power dynamics and relationships of the characters. The main themes of the film were determined, such as justice, prejudice, power and individual courage. The impact of the decision-making process on the minority group and how it fits into the social context were evaluated.

3. Results

According to the findings of the study, the influence of the minority is closely related to consistency and resilience. Consistency in the views of minority members is one of the cornerstones of the influence-making process. This consistency includes resisting pressure from other group members and protecting their ideas. Just as Henry does in the film, taking a neutral stance and defending his ideas despite pressure from members of the group forms the basis of minority influence. With his determination and belief, Henry increased his influence by defending his ideas at every stage. It is also important to create a discussion platform to increase the influence of the minority. Henry takes the views of each member by exhibiting leadership behavior and creates differences of opinion within the group by tackling different issues. This helps group members to understand their way of thinking and to communicate effectively considering their personality traits. This method stands out as an effective strategy to increase the

influence of the minority. Flexibility and compromise are critical factors for increasing minority influence. A flexible and conciliatory stance by minority members may increase the likelihood of the majority changing their views. The ability to compromise and cooperate plays an important role in increasing minority influence. Henry's flexibility and conciliatory stance strengthened his capacity to influence the views of the majority. Recognition and identification are important in order to increase the influence of the minority. If the majority can care about and identify with the views of the minority, the influence of the minority can be more effective. Henry increased the influence of the few as a leader who took his views seriously and often sought to identify. This study emphasized the importance of leadership behavior by examining the main factors of the minority influencing the majority process. Elements such as consistency, platforming for discussion, flexibility and compromise, and recognition determine strategies that can be used to increase minority influence. Henry's leadership behavior illustrates how these factors can be applied effectively. This study makes an important contribution to understanding and managing the minority influencing the majority process.

3.1. "12 Angry Men" Film Analysis

"12 Angry Men" revolves around the efforts of a jury member to persuade the other eleven jurors that the defendant is innocent during the trial and focuses on the interactions within the group (Bal & Avcu, 2023). The film, which tells the decision of a court jury at the decision stage, starts with the judge giving the 12-person jury time to decide after the trial ends. The jury will put an end to the case, which is spoken in court and resulted in execution. The jury has to make the decision, whether positive or negative, unanimously. The jury casts their votes shortly after assembling in the room, with everyone except the 8th member (Henry Fonda) voting in favor of the boy's execution. Notably, Henry Fonda stands out in his white suit. He articulates, "I cannot raise my hand and send a boy to death," (Rose, 1996) emphasizing the need to consider the intricacies of the legal system, including the death penalty, trial proceedings, and the defence processes. There is only one thing in the minds of all members; He is to make the decision right away, take his money and go home. As the 8th member's exit disturbs the other 11 members, the nerves are stretched in the room and the discussion begins on the evidence. There is only one reason why the 8th member, who does not know whether the boy is actually guilty or not, gives "no" a vote; Reasonable doubt. What if the boy is not guilty? It does not matter to 11 members that a person will die at the beginning of the film. The film mediates genuine discussions and approaches on racism, social attitude, insensitivity, violence, old age, death and life through their mindset.

Professions and Personality Traits of Actors in the Film¹

Foreman:	Aged 35, this individual assumes the role of an assistant coach for a high school football team. He possesses a diminutive and somewhat trivial demeanor, initially displaying caution towards, and later, admiration for the power he wields. He carries himself with a rather formal demeanor. While not exceptionally intelligent, he exhibits determination and persistence in his pursuits.
Juror # 2:	Age of 38. Employed as a bank clerk. Portrays a mild and tentative demeanor, facing challenges in upholding personal viewpoints. Prone to being influenced readily, often embracing the stance of the most recent individual in conversation.
Juror #3:	In his forties, this individual holds the position of being the head of a messenger service. He exudes a remarkable and potent strength, coupled with an unwavering determination that manifests in an intense and pronounced expression of his beliefs. Embedded within his character is a hint of sadistic inclination. This humorless individual displays a notable intolerance for viewpoints divergent from his own, and he is well-acquainted with imposing his desires and perspectives onto those around him.
Juror #4:	At the age of 50, he serves as a stockbroker. Possessing both affluence and a notable standing, he is adept at articulation, consistently projecting a polished image. There's a sense of subtle superiority he holds over the fellow jurors. His primary focus remains fixated on the factual aspects of the case, and he expresses a deep dismay towards the conduct exhibited by his peers. Continuously engaged in self-grooming, he frequently tends to his appearance – combing his hair, tidying his nails, and the like.
Juror #5:	At 25 years of age, he works as a mechanic. Portraying an innocence and profound apprehension, he emerges as a young man deeply committed to his responsibilities

¹ *Twelve Angry Men by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft – February 14, 1996

within this case. However, he struggles to voice his thoughts when those older than him dominate the conversation.

- Juror #6:** In his early thirties, he earns a living as a housepainter. He epitomizes integrity, yet carries a demeanor of limited intellectual agility, arriving at conclusions gradually and with meticulous consideration. His struggle lies in generating affirmative viewpoints, but he is inclined to attentively absorb and ultimately embrace perspectives put forth by others that resonate with him.
- Juror #7:** At the age of 42, he works as a salesman. Sporting a boisterous, attention-grabbing demeanor, he embodies the archetype of an exuberant, overly friendly salesperson. His priorities seem to extend beyond the confines of jury duty. Swift to exhibit bursts of anger and rapid in forming uninformed opinions, he readily ventures into realms of which he possesses scant knowledge. This individual exudes a bullying disposition, and beneath it, a distinct streak of cowardice becomes apparent.
- Juror #8:** In his early forties, he practices as an architect. Radiating a serene and contemplative aura, he embodies thoughtfulness and gentleness. His character is defined by a propensity to perceive multiple facets of every issue and an unwavering quest for the truth. His inner strength is imbued with a sense of compassion. Above all, his driving force is a relentless commitment to upholding justice, and he is determined to fiercely advocate for its realization.
- Juror #9:** At the age of 70, he is in retirement. Displaying a demeanor of meekness and gentleness, he embodies the characteristics of an elderly individual who has long surrendered to the challenges of life and now exists in a state of quiet anticipation for the end. He possesses a clear self-awareness and laments the passage of time when he could have exhibited courage without seeking refuge in the shield of his advanced years. His actions, such as taking pills when he becomes agitated, clearly indicate the presence of a heart condition.
- Juror #10:** At 46 years of age, he exudes an aura of anger and bitterness. His presence seems to incite conflict almost immediately upon encountering others. Characterized as a bigot, he holds a disdainful attitude toward nearly all human lives except his own. His perspective reflects a sense of aimlessness and hopelessness, aware that his life lacks direction and purpose. His current state is compounded by a severe cold, evident through constant nose blowing, sniffing from a Benzedrine inhaler, and similar gestures.
- Juror #11:** At 48 years of age, he practices the trade of a watchmaker. Having fled Europe as a refugee, he arrived in this country in 1941. His speech carries an accent, and his demeanor reflects a sense of shame and humility, often appearing confused and submissive in the presence of others. However, his inner drive is rooted in a sincere desire to pursue justice, motivated by the considerable injustices he himself has endured.
- Juror #12:** At 30 years of age, he works in the field of advertising. He embodies the image of a polished and intelligent advertising professional, one who perceives human beings through the lens of percentages, graphs, and surveys, lacking a genuine comprehension of human nature. This superficial individual carries a snobbish demeanor, yet strives to project an amiable persona. Throughout the film, he idly sketches on a notepad.

In this part of the study, which is about film analysis, critical discourse analysis is used. This analysis has been used to determine decision-making in the group structure of films and the decision-making process of the minority effect within a group.

"Critical discourse analysis is a kind of discourse analytical research that examines (Pomerleau, 2021) the method of reproducing and counteracting social power abuse, dominance and inequality in the social and political context." (Van Dijk, 2001). Van Dijk underscores the necessity of dissecting a discourse into two distinct components: macro and micro structures, as they draw sustenance from both the overarching societal framework and individual interactions. The macro structure encapsulates abstract and cross-institutional connections, while the micro level delves into personal interactions and the dialogues that unfold within these interactions (Van Dijk, 2015). Van Dijk's analytical approach centers on the convergence of these two levels, allowing for a comprehensive examination of discourse.

"Language utilization, discourse, verbal exchanges, and communication pertain to the micro stratum of social organization. Meanwhile, concepts such as power, authority, and disparities among societal factions typically inhabit the foundational layer of analysis. Critical Discourse Analysis, in theory, aims to traverse the divide between micro and macro methodologies—a structural demarcation within the realm of sociology." (Van Dijk, 2001). In line with this definition, each discourse text undergoes scrutiny through both macro and micro structural analysis. Within this analysis, all facets of discourse, including phonetic elements, lexicon, syntactical formations, and semantic nuances, are evaluated within the micro structure. Conversely, within the macro structure, attention is directed towards the overarching motif, thematic arrangement, and subject matter of the text (Devran, 2010).

According to the critical discourse analysis that will be applied in this paper, the formal features of the film at micro level -that is, its words, sentence structures and meanings- were examined.

4. MICRO STRUCTURE

In the critical analysis of discourse, the microstructure pertains to the formal arrangement. It involves an examination of the discourse style within the micro-level, exploring how a given subject is approached and articulated in distinct manners (Devran, 2010). The micro level of a text, according to Van Dijk, is based on one-to-one relationships between actors in society, as every discourse spreads within a more detailed network of micro-relationships (Van Dijk, 2015). According to Ankaraligil, Van Dijk's critical discourse analysis tries to analyze the relationship between "contextual dimensions, socio-cultural factors, cognitive processes, and structural definitions such as style" and the discourse that emerged in this communication network (Ankaraligil, 2008). In this section, the formal dimensions and details of the "12 Angry Men" film will be evaluated in the context of decision-making in the group structure of micro-level dialogues, monologues, specific words, and word groups used.

4.1. The First Vote In The Film

At its core, decision-making entails the act of selecting from available choices. While this concept has been prevalent in the realm of International Politics for an extended period, a structured examination of this process emerged primarily in other fields like psychology and economics. Within the decision-making process, two crucial aspects warrant attention: perception and rationality. Perception, a psychological construct, holds significant sway over how decision makers interpret the information presented before them. Rationality, on the other hand, is a widely acknowledged notion suggesting that individuals will opt for rational behavior when navigating decisions. This research investigates if a group member's endorsement of a viewpoint within the group influences the group's decision-making process, or if the extent of the initial advocate's sway is shaped by the in-person group deliberation (Weisband, 1992). The film, which tells the decision of a court jury at the decision stage, starts with the judge giving the 12-person jury time to decide after the trial. The jury will put an end to the case, which is spoken in court and resulted in execution. The jury has to make the decision, whether positive or negative, unanimously.

For the jury to reach a verdict, all 12 jurors must unanimously agree on either a guilty or not guilty verdict. In other words, the vote should be 12 to 0.

Table 1

Distribution of The First Vote

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
1-3-4-7-10-12	8	2-5-6-9-11

Engaging in decision-making is an arduous and draining task. The process involves intricate exploration and assessment of alternative options, meticulously weighing the advantages and disadvantages of each. Investigating the benefits and drawbacks of decisions can be an exceptionally challenging endeavor. In the context of the film, Table 1 showcases the initial votes cast by the jury members during their first voting session. This initial vote is conducted openly, resulting in a unanimous decision reached swiftly by all jury members who are keen on adjourning the meeting. Some jurors are driven by the urgency of concluding the deliberation before the commencement of a baseball game. The decision-making process is subject to the influence of a myriad of circumstances. These circumstances can be categorized into distinct domains, encompassing biological, psychological, sociological, environmental, and organizational elements. A range of factors, such as the decision makers' perceptions,

interpretations, emotional states, value judgments, individual personalities, personal histories, aspirations, and anticipations, contribute significantly to shaping decisions (Lerner et al., 2014).

When the 1st jury member Martin BALSAM (foreman) decided to hold an open vote, the juries that raised their first hands with a confident attitude were 1-3-4-7-10 and 12 respectively, while the 2-5-6-9 and 11 majority. They raised their hands by looking at each other and other juries at the table, and they voted for the 'criminal'. People tend to act in accordance with social norms in most cases. Adaptation behavior is the tendency of people to accept and act according to the behavior or ideas put forward / determined by other group members. It shows that people tend to behave according to the opinion of the majority, even if they are aware, even in the most obvious mistakes, or they refrain from expressing what they think differently. However, few individuals are more resistant to showing compliance behavior and argue that they know it right.

In the first vote, Henry FONDA, the 8th jury member, prefers to use the game last. Henry does not use the statement that he is absolutely innocent, even if he voted without guilt. He supports prolonging the decision-making process by saying 'I don't know' instead of saying 'Guilty'. According to S. Moscovici, no group is completely homogeneous and always contains the potential for division. If members who think differently from the group continue to advocate these behaviors, attitudes or views consistently and consistently, they can reduce the impact of the majority and create new norms by creating division. This decision of Henry causes a conflict among the jury members, but at the same time, the 9th Jury member Mr. McAndle states that he can take time to speak and reach a common decision for 1 hour, even though he does not explicitly support Henry. After discussions after Henry did not vote for the "guilty", the 12th jury member suggested that it would make sense for all jury members to explain why they voted for the guilty in order to change Henry's mind. If you do not comply with the group and ignore norms, two things will likely happen. First, the group tries "to get you back to the flock" by contacting you more. Sarcastic comments and lengthy discussions will ensue as your friends attempt to understand why you are acting so strangely, aiming to bring you back in line with the group's expectations (Garfinkle, 1967).

First Thoughts of Jurors²

Foreman: Martin BALSAM	He's not expressing any ideas.
Juror # 2: John FIEDLER	He thinks if he wasn't guilty, they wouldn't have judged him.
Juror #3: Lee J. COBB	He believes he's guilty, witnesses, and how they saw the murder.
Juror #4: E. G. MARSHALL	If he wasn't guilty, he thinks he'd remember the name and actors of the film clearly if he went to the film the night of the murder as the boy said. And he thinks he'd guilty because he can't remember.
Juror #5: Jack KLUGMAN	He doesn't want to give an opinion.
Juror #6: Edward BINNS	He believes the boy had argued with his father and witnesses witnessed it.
Juror #7: Jack WARDEN	He stands out in the boy's trouble. He considers his previous crimes and, based on it, thinks he's guilty of this case.
Juror #8: Henry FONDA	He thinks nothing can be so positive and the lawyer doesn't defend him. That's why he's not saying he's guilty.
Juror #9: Joseph SWEENEY	He's not expressing any ideas.
Juror #10: Ed BEGLEY	Jack supports WARDEN.
Juror #11: George VOSKOVEC	He's not expressing any ideas.
Juror #12: Robert WEBBER	He's not expressing any ideas.

During the discussion, all jury members express their opinions and comment on the current case of the child, considering it in the decision-making process. It is the first jury member 7th Jury WARDEN, takes into account the crimes and criminal record that the child has committed in the past. WARDEN also draws attention to the murder evidence by opening the issue of the knife, which is a murder weapon.

² Twelve Angry Men by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft - February 14, 1996
*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

Henry then requests the knife to be brought into the hall. After the knife arrives, he retrieves another identical knife from his jacket and places it beside the knife on the table. With this action, Henry challenges the notion that the murder weapon belongs to the child, creating uncertainty in the minds of other jury members. This behavior aligns with the Yale approach. Throughout the film, Henry refrains from interrupting any jury member, attentively listening to each perspective. This approach strengthens communication with every jury, allowing him to observe and convey the correct message to all members. Even though the initial opinions were expressed during the first vote, the focal point remained the knife—the murder weapon. Henry's behavior captured the attention of attentive jury members, leaving a lingering question mark in their minds. In the realm of social psychology, the Yale attitude change approach, often referred to as the Yale attitude change model, delves into the exploration of conditions conducive to inducing shifts in people's attitudes through persuasive messages. The research conducted within this framework can be broadly categorized into two primary focal points: the speaker and the message content. Within this framework, it is postulated that individuals, under specific circumstances, display an increased inclination to scrutinize the facts presented in a message. Consequently, they become more amenable to being persuaded if the content of the message is logically credible. This implies that people occasionally engage in elaborative thinking, investing careful consideration in the information communicated to them. This process involves a deliberate assessment of the communication's content and a thorough cognitive processing of the information.

Psychologists Petty and Cacioppo have termed this scenario the "direct route" of persuasion. This direct mode of persuasion occurs when an individual thoughtfully contemplates the persuasive communication, attentively listens to the message, and assesses its content (Cengiz, 2013). This typically transpires when the individual possesses both the authority to carefully engage with the communication and a motivation to do so. In essence, the direct route of persuasion is activated when the listener exhibits a genuine interest in evaluating and comprehending the communicated message.

4.2. Discussions From The Second Voting To The Last Voting

According to Moscovici (1976), a group can quickly reject an individual, but when there is another person alongside the individual, the group will not exhibit rejection behavior. The second no guilty vote ensures this situation (Akyuz, 2019). In the film, Henry proposes a second vote and each jury to use a closed vote. He states that he will not vote in this vote and that if eleven jurors vote guilty, he will fit the majority. As a result of the voting, a jury member changes his mind and votes for "not guilty". This behavior of the jury member causes a discussion in the group. As a result of the 3rd jury member's doubt towards the 5th jury member, a discussion ensues between them. The 3rd jury member requests the 5th jury member to change his vote. After the discussion, it is understood that the person who changed the vote is actually a 9th jury member.

4.2.1. The Second Voting

Table 2

The Result of The Second Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
1-2-3-4-5-6-7-10-11-12	9	8

Example: Asking to know who changed the decision after the vote

<u>7th Juror:</u>	Let's remain focused on the topic. (addressing the 5th Juror) Could you please explain the reason behind your change in vote?
<u>9th Juror:</u>	He didn't alter his vote. I, on the other hand, modified mine. Would you be interested in hearing the reasons behind my decision?
<u>7th Juror:</u>	No, I'm not interested in hearing your rationale.
<u>9th Juror:</u>	Nevertheless, I'd appreciate clarifying it, if that's acceptable to you.
<u>10th Juror:</u>	Must we endure this discussion?
<u>6th Juror:</u>	Hey look! The man wishes to express his thoughts.

In the second voting, it was not explicitly stated why the old man, who was the 9th Jury, changed his mind because other jury members did not care about the old man's opinion and they changed the subject

when he wanted to tell. The word that attracts attention in speaking is “wanting to speak”. The old man has long been defeated by life, and now he is just waiting to die. He expresses that he feels a lack of value throughout his life and draws attention to his sense of loneliness while recounting the testimony of one of the witnesses.

Example: 9th Jury member's ideas about the witness..³

9 th Juror: I happened to observe him for an extended period. I couldn't help but notice a seam in his jacket that was torn right under his arm. Did anyone else notice this detail? It struck me that he came into the courtroom in such a state. He appeared quite aged, and his jacket's torn seam was emblematic of his wear and tear. Walking with a pronounced limp, he seemed almost embarrassed, trying to conceal his condition. I believe I possess a deeper understanding of him than anyone else present. He's a timid, unassuming elder who has been overlooked throughout his life. His existence was insignificany, never gaining recognition or having his name appear in newspapers. He's remained unnoticed, his words unquoted, his advice unheeded for a full seventy-five years. The weight of this insignificany is profoundly saddening. A man of his nature yearns to be acknowledged, to be heard, and to have his wisdom quoted, if only once. It's of utmost importance, and the opportunity to be recognized becomes all the more meaningful when considering how difficult it would be for him to fade into the background after a lifetime of being...

7th Juror: Hold on a moment. Are you suggesting that he would fabricate a lie just to gain a semblance of importance?

9th Juror: No, it's not exactly lie. More like convincing himself that he heard those words and could identify the boy's face.

10th Juror: Well, that's the most incredible tale I've ever come across. How could you conjure such an idea? What knowledge do you possess about it?

The 9th Juror bowed his head in a state of embarrassment.

The words used in this speech are carefully selected. The first word that draws attention in the speech is "recognize" and the second word is "being nothing" pattern. 9th jury member's preference for the word “recognize” can be explained by the subject of identification in social psychology. Identification can be explained as the act of looking at the people one cares about and making them feel valued. In addition, the concept of "being nothing" can be elucidated within the context of social exclusion. Psychological exclusion, also referred to as ostracism, entails the deliberate neglect, disregard, or isolation of an individual or a group by another individual or group (Williams, 2007; Williams & Zadro, 2005).

The pivotal factor influencing the transformation of the 9th juror's decision is his personal identification with the experience of social exclusion throughout his life. This sense of exclusion resonates deeply with him, and he perceives a parallel situation within the testimony. This resonant connection leads him to reassess his stance and ultimately alters his decision.

³ Twelve Angry Men by Reginald Rose “Please Copy and Return”, First Draft – February 14, 1996

*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

Table 3

Votes That Changed During the Second Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
1-2-3-4-6-7-10-11-12	5-8-9	

In the next dialogue, Henry draws attention to the boy's discourse of "I will kill you" to expand the topic of discussion and highlight another topic in the incident. At the end of this topic, another jury member changes his decision, too (5th).

Example: 5th member who changed his decision..⁴

<u>8th Juror:</u>	There's another point I'd like to discuss briefly. While we may have demonstrated that the elderly man couldn't have heard the boy say, "I'm going to kill you," let's consider...
<u>10th Juror:</u>	You haven't proven anything at all. What are you getting at?
<u>8 th Juror:</u>	But let's suppose he did genuinely hear it. How often have we all used that phrase? Probably countless times. "I could kill you for that, sweetheart." "One more time and I'm going to kill you, Junior." "Come on, Rocky, finish him off." We utter variations of it in our everyday conversations. It doesn't necessarily imply a literal intent to kill.
<u>3th Juror:</u>	Hold on! What exactly are you trying to imply here? The phrase was, "I'm going to kill you," and the boy screamed it out loudly. Don't tell me he didn't mean it. Anyone who says something like that the way he did, they mean it.
<u>2nd Juror:</u>	Well, gosh, I'm not sure. I recall a recent argument with my coworker at the bank; he called me a fool, so I shouted back...
<u>3rd Juror:</u>	Now, listen, this guy's filling your heads with ideas that aren't accurate. The kid made a threat and he followed through on it.
<u>8th Juror:</u>	Allow me to pose a question: do you honestly believe the boy would loudly announce such a statement for the entire neighborhood to hear? I highly doubt it. He's far too intelligent for such a move.
<u>10th Juror:</u>	Intelligent? He's an ignorant commoner. He can't even speak proper English.
<u>5th Juror:</u>	I'd like to change my vote to "not guilty".

The words that attract our attention in this dialogue are "to prove" and "to convince". Henry consciously prefers these words. In manipulation theory, four rules are applied to affect a person. You should present the information in its most complete form and confirm this information. You should also make sure that it is relevant to the issue and that you present it in a way that the other person can understand. Since the beginning of the voting process, Henry has been listening carefully to the opinions of all the jury members and he speaks one to one with all the jury members by choosing his words as consciously as possible. During the negotiation, each subject is allowed to be discussed in different time periods, ensuring that one topic is not progressed to the next without clarification. In fact, the 5th jury member gave as abstentions the "guilty" voting in the first vote. The 5th jury member is the one who is influenced by the majority of the group and he is easy to persuade. The fact that Henry was one of the first to be affected by his manipulations shows that he does not have a strong and determined role in the group.

⁴ *Twelve Angry Men* by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft – February 14, 1996
*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

4.2.2. The Third Voting

Table 4

The Result of The Third Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
1-2-3-4-6-7-10-12	5-8-9-11	

Henry demanded another vote. After the vote, there were 9 guilty and 3 not guilty votes when the 11th juror became convinced that he had changed his mind. Therefore, he wanted to use the vote for the not guilty. When the 3rd jury member asked the 11th jury member to explain why he changed the vote, the 11th jury member explained that they had reasonable doubts.

Even during the first vote, the 11th juror abstained from the group consensus when casting his vote. 11th juror possesses shyness as a defining trait, displaying a natural inclination towards obedience to those in his vicinity. However, beneath this demeanor lies a determination to genuinely pursue justice, fueled by his own personal history of enduring a multitude of injustices. In times of confusion and uncertainty, individuals often turn to others to help describe the situation at hand. The informative social impact is particularly strong when the situation is uncertain, in the case of a crisis, and when others with the same situation have expertise. "If you don't have a better option, look at what others are doing and imitate them."

So why did the 11th jury member change his vote now?

Example: Two important speeches of the 11th jury member are demonstrated shown before changing his mind..⁵

11th Juror: I have a question I'd like to pose. We're operating under the assumption that the young man indeed committed murder. He allegedly stabbed his father in the chest and fled the scene, which happened around ten minutes past twelve. However, what perplexes me is the subsequent events. He returned home around three o'clock, where two detectives apprehended him in the hallway of the house. This prompts me to wonder, if he were truly guilty of his father's murder, why would he return three hours later? Wouldn't he be apprehensive about getting caught?

...

11th Juror: I apologize for any confusion. Now, let me address your main point. The woman residing across the street provided testimony that right after witnessing the incident, precisely when the train passed by, she let out a scream and then promptly proceeded to call the police. It's logical to assume that the boy, being in such close proximity, would have heard that scream and realized that someone had observed the event. Given this, I find it difficult to believe that he would have chosen to return to the scene if he were, indeed, the perpetrator of the crime. Such a decision seems counterintuitive, as it doesn't align with the behavior one would expect from a murderer.

Minority influence is a distinctive facet of social influence, manifested when a member of a minority group wields the power to sway the majority's perspective to embrace the beliefs or conduct advocated by the minority (McLeod, 2023). This phenomenon materializes when a small group or an individual steps forward as a catalyst for societal transformation, challenging established conventions and presenting fresh, alternative ideas that counter prevailing social norms. Broadly speaking, there exist two categories of social influence: majority influence and minority influence. Majority influence engenders conformity and public compliance, whereby the majority endeavors to compel the minority to conform. In contrast, minority influence leads to conversion, encompassing the process of influencing the majority to assimilate the viewpoints upheld by the minority faction. In essence, majority influence seeks to mould the minority's perspective, while minority influence strives to persuade the majority to adopt the perspectives espoused by the minority group.

⁵ Twelve Angry Men by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft – February 14, 1996
*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

While some jury members have remained in the background around the table, consistently voting 'guilty' from the first stage of voting until now, Henry (8th Juror) questions the situation. He has actively proposed alternative ideas and demonstrated determination within the group. They support the idea. The 11th jury member is a refugee from Europe. Not only at the jury's table, but also before he had to keep himself in the background in this country. Migration creates a new situation both for those who migrated and local residents. The old, familiar order has deteriorated, a new situation has emerged. Throughout his life in this country, the 11th jury had to act under the influence of the majority in almost all areas and found it difficult to express his ideas freely. However, after Henry's attitude (minority effect), the "Why" and "How" question patterns used by the 11th Jury member, which also draws attention in the example above. This approach supports the fact that alternative thoughts are not ignored.

Once a segment of members within a group transitions their viewpoints to align with the minority stance, that previously marginalized minority transforms into the prevailing majority. This phenomenon is commonly referred to as the "snowball effect". Over time, as the minority garners more adherents, its ideas gradually permeate and integrate into the broader societal culture. Consequently, the original source of the minority influence, which catalyzed this transformative shift, may fade from collective memory. This phenomenon is termed "social cryptoamnesia." In the context of successful minority influence, a key aspect involves the ability of individuals to differentiate between the socio-cognitive resistance prompted by the originating source and other forms of resistance stemming from the message's content. This process of differentiation is facilitated by the concept of social cryptoamnesia. Over time, what was once perceived as distinct or unorthodox gradually morphs into an alternative viewpoint, leading to a progressive shift in societal perspectives.

4.2.3. The Fourth Voting

Table 5

The Result of The Fourth Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
1-3-4-7-10	2-5-6-8-9-11	12

The elaboration likelihood model (ELM) of persuasion is a dual-process theory that delineates the dynamics of attitude transformation. Conceived by Richard E. Petty and John Cacioppo in 1980, the model seeks to elucidate diverse methods of processing stimuli, elucidating the rationale behind their employment, and forecasting their effects on the alteration of attitudes. Central to the ELM is the concept of "elaboration," denoting the extent of cognitive exertion undertaken by an audience member when processing, assessing, recollecting, and subsequently accepting or rejecting a conveyed message. Consequently, individuals engage in either high or low levels of elaboration, contingent upon which they opt for central or peripheral route processing. In the central route processing, recipients meticulously scrutinize and critically engage with the message's content, resulting in deep and comprehensive cognitive analysis. Conversely, peripheral route processing involves a more cursory assessment, focusing on superficial cues rather than the substantive content of the message. The choice between these routes hinges on the level of elaboration evoked by the message and plays a pivotal role in influencing attitude change.

The 4th voting was made as open and everyone saw who voted what. Members who changed their decisions created problems for other members and were uncomfortable with this. The issue that attracted attention in the 4th voting was actually the conversations of the 4th member with Henry. 4th member is a stockbroker. An accomplished speaker who consistently portrays an impressive image. He carries an air of subtle superiority over his fellow jurors. His primary focus centers on the factual details of the case. He expresses a deep sense of shock and disapproval towards the conduct exhibited by the other jurors. What matters to the 4th member is the facts and he is concerned with details. The crucial matter for him is that the child cannot recall the name of the motion picture and the lead actor he claimed to have seen on the night of the murder. To convince the 4th jury, Henry then prompts the 4th member to recount his activities from the previous night. Each time the 4th member responds swiftly, Henry continues to inquire about the events of the night before.

Example: Henry's dialogue with the 4th jury member..⁶

8th Juror: What was the second feature?

4th Juror: (struggling) The... I'll recall it shortly. The... Remarkable Mrs. Something. Mrs... um... Mainbridge. No, not quite right. It was The Remarkable Mrs. Bainbridge.

2nd Juror: Pardon me, I saw it. It's titled The Amazing Mrs. Bainbridge.

4th Juror: The.. Amazing Mrs. Bainbridge. Yes, I believe that's correct.

8th Juror: Who played in The Amazing Mrs. Bainbridge?

4th Juror: I believe it was Barbara... Long, I believe. She's a brunette, quite attractive. Barbara... Lang... Land... something along those lines.

8th Juror: Anyone else?

The 4th juror reaches a handkerchief and wipes his suddenly sweating forehead.

4th Juror: To be honest, I hadn't heard of the others before. It was a rather budget-friendly second feature, with relatively unknown..

8th Juror: And you weren't experiencing any emotional strain, correct?

Henry understands that the 4th jury member feels under emotional pressure by the words "I think" and "I will explain in a minute". Additionally, the reactions of the 4th juror, more than Henry's words, reinforce Henry's assumption. Although the 4th jury member meeting room was warm and the air conditioner was not working, he was not affected and sweaty like other members. He underlined that he was a man who did not sweat in normally. But in this dialogue with Henry, he felt sweaty for being under pressure. Henry was aware of this situation. Henry's statement that the child is under emotional pressure also emphasizes the natural difficulty in remembering certain details and asserts that this situation should not render the child guilty.

Another notable issue during this voting process was the way the child's knife (the murder weapon) stabbed into his father's chest, despite being taller than his father. The 2nd jury member wanted to re-examine the knife, talk about the blade wound and its angle. He said: "You can't stab the knife from top to bottom on someone's chest about twenty inches longer than you." The 3rd jury wanted to revive this incident. The 3rd and 12th jury members agreed that the angle of the knife could be as suggested. However, it was pointed out that the 5th jury member's claim about its use may not be accurate.

Table 6

Votes That Changed During the Fouth Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
3-4-10	2-5-6-8-9-11	1-7-12

Central route processing indeed involves a heightened degree of elaboration. In this scenario, the audience or user dedicates a substantial level of scrutiny to the message's content, driven by a strong motivation. This heightened motivation is a result of the audience's clear understanding of what holds significance to them. Consequently, when confronted with a message presented in a credible design, users invest the effort required to thoroughly examine it. When persuasion occurs through central route processing, users concentrate their attention on the message's merits. The decision to align with the message is a product of their cognitive "work" or thoughtful consideration. Given their substantial engagement with the message's content, users are more likely to focus their attention and disregard distractions, such as pop-ups, in their pursuit of their objectives. The commitment to deep thought and analysis leads to a more informed and thoughtful decision-making process.

⁶ *Twelve Angry Men* by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft – February 14, 1996
*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

4.2.4. The Fifth Voting

Table7

The Result of The Fifth Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
3-4-10	1-2-5-6-7-8-9-11-12	

As a result of the new voting, with the increasing number of "non-guilty" voters, the jury members who cast "guilty" votes were disturbed and expressed his ideas the 10th jury member with the racist speeches he made.

Example: Racist behavior of the 10th jury member⁷

10th Juror: Let's focus on the facts here. These individuals are predisposed to deceive. It's ingrained in them, and no intelligent person will convince me otherwise. They lack an understanding of the truth. Just look at them. They're distinct. Their thinking, their behavior, it's all different. And you know what? They don't need substantial reasons to commit murder.

The 5th Juror walks into the washroom, forcefully shutting the door.

10th Juror: What's with the door slam? That's just who they are, naturally. Violent! They don't value human life like we do.

The 11th Juror stands and heads toward the washroom door, following the 5th Juror.

10th Juror: Where are you headed?

The 11th Juror remains silent and entering the washroom.

10th Juror: While you're in there, maybe clean out your ears. Might do you some good to hear something.

The 4th Juror rises and approaches the window.

10th Juror: Listen up, all of you. These people, they're out there boozing and fighting constantly. And if someone ends up dead, well, it's just another casualty. They're indifferent. Family doesn't carry the same weight for them. They multiply like animals. Fathers, mothers, none of it holds significance. Sure, there might be a few redeeming qualities among them. I've encountered a handful who were decent, but that's the exception.

Prejudice refers to an unjustifiable negative attitude toward a group and its individual members. When we look at the issue of prejudice over the social group dynamics, it is seen that the most important contribution was made by the researches conducted within the framework of the social identity theory. According to this theory, people identify with their group (in-group) they find it more valuable and they are prone to find other groups (outer-group) more worthless. In this dynamic, two main constituent factors stand out: Classification and eigenvalues. In the above dialogue, the words "born to lie", "different", "violent", and "animal" chosen by the 10th jury are noteworthy. The words chosen by the 10th jury to describe an ethnic group were uttered with a highly racist attitude. Subsequent sentences he used further demonstrated his biased approach. This attitude of the jury leads to the negative use of its decision in the case.

Cognitive classification, or categorization, is an essential cognitive process that enables individuals to comprehend and situate the world, its surroundings, and their own identity. However, a significant cognitive bias arises: humans tend to overemphasize distinctions between different categories and downplay variances within a single category. Consequently, this tendency leads to homogenization within the in-group and within the out-group. To bolster our self-esteem and maintain a positive self-concept, we naturally exhibit a preference for our in-group over out-groups. This inclination stems from the belief that our in-group holds greater worth, superiority, or value in comparison to out-groups. By

⁷ Twelve Angry Men by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft – February 14, 1996

*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

affiliating with our in-group, we enhance our own sense of well-being, superiority, and worthiness. In this process, positive prejudices and favoritism may develop towards our in-group, while concurrently fostering negative prejudices and discrimination towards out-groups. This propensity for favoring one's in-group can give rise to discriminatory behaviors and negative perceptions of out-groups. Remarkably, the degree of identification with the in-group directly correlates with the intensity of prejudices and discriminatory attitudes directed at out-groups. As identification with the in-group intensifies, so does the potency of biases and discriminatory tendencies aimed at out-groups.

In the dialogue, the 10th jury member states that in the inner-group and the outer-group, other people (outer-group) are less valuable than themselves (inner-group): "*Human life don't mean as much to them as it does to us. Family don't mean anything to them. They breed like animals. Fathers, mothers, that don't mean anything.*"(Rose, 1996).

Example: Reaction of other jury members to the 10th jury member..⁸

10th Juror: Now, you so-called geniuses had better pay attention to what I'm saying. They're a violent, vicious bunch, completely uneducated, and their intention is clear. They want to silence us. That's their plan – to shut us up. (addressing the 7th Juror) I'm giving you a warning. This boy, the one on trial here, we've got him. That's one down, at least. I'm proposing we take action before his kind turns the tables on us. To hell with the law, why should I care? They certainly don't. I'm telling you this right now.

2nd Juror: I've had my fill of this. Put a stop to all this nonsense.

10th Juror: (looking angrily at the 2nd Juror) How'd you like me to knock some sense into that little head of yours, you smug little bastard? Where do you even get the nerve?

The 4th Juror steps in between the 10th Juror and the others, firmly halting his movement.

4th Juror: We've endured enough of this. Sit down. And do us all a favor by keeping your offensive mouth shut.

The 4th and 10 Jurors lock eyes for a moment. Eventually, the 10th Juror turns away, walks over to a chair, and positions himself with his back to the rest. Gradually, the other jurors return to their seats.

Symbolic racism, also known as modern-symbolic racism, modern racism, symbolic prejudice, or racial resentment, encompass a coherent set of beliefs that reveals an underlying, unidimensional bias against specific ethnicities (Roos et.al., 2019). Unlike overt racism, symbolic racism is not directly tied to race but instead operates through indirect associations with social and political issues. Some individuals may not perceive symbolic racism as prejudice due to its indirect nature. They distance it from overt racial discrimination. This form of prejudice, symbolic racism, develops as a result of socialization and tends to manifest unconsciously, often evading an individual's awareness. This can lead to a paradox where an individual may genuinely denounce racism, believing they are not racist, while simultaneously harboring symbolic racist beliefs.

Symbolic racism has become one of the most widespread racial attitudes in contemporary society. Despite the 10th jury member's demonstration of racist and biased attitudes through their statements, such perspectives can sadly be considered commonplace and consistent with the patterns of symbolic racism. The point that attracts attention here is the reaction of the other members of the group to the 10th jury member. Each of them moved away from the table and stopped communicating with him. The harsh attitude of the 4th jury made the 10th jury member realize that the group was uncomfortable with his attitude. The change in the vote during the next round does not necessarily indicate a genuine belief in the boy's innocence but rather an inclination to align with the majority. "It is always good to do what the crowd does in such situations." "What if there are two separate communities?" "Then you will join the most crowded." (Dicknes, 1837).

⁸ Twelve Angry Men by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft – February 14, 1996
*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

4.2.5. The Last Voting

Table 8

At The Beginning of The Last Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
3-4-10-12	1-2-5-6-7-8-9-11	

Informational social influence is the change in opinions or behavior that occurs when we conform to people whom we believe to have accurate information (Jhangiani & Tarry, 2022). When you make decisions about how to behave, there are many sources of information available to help you make these decisions. One other way is to use informational social influence; you look to the behaviors of others who are also in the same or similar situation to see how they behave (Drew, 2023). Then, you can follow their lead. The 12th jury member, vote of changing his vote to 'guilty,' draws attention at the beginning of the last voting. The influence exerted by the 3rd jury member on the 12th jury member through persuasion led to a change in the decision. The 12th jury member is characterized by indecisiveness during each voting, as he is someone who struggles to truly understand people. Consequently, he is easily swayed by persuasive speeches and readily changes his decision under the influence of the 3rd jury member's pressure. The 12th Jury member grapples with an internal dilemma. Initially conforming to the group by casting a 'guilty' vote in the first round, he later comes to believe that those who have remained steadfast in their decisions from the beginning are advocating the correct idea. Consequently, at the onset of the final vote, he changes his decision from 'not guilty' to 'guilty'.

During the 6th voting, the jury member who led the 4th and 12th jury members to change their decision is the 9th jury member (old man). Thanks to the attention of the 9th jury member, woman who is one of the eyewitnesses was made clear by a simple glasses trail in which did not see the murder or did not see that the murder was committed by the boy.

As the vote approaches its conclusion, the reason behind the insistence of the 3rd jury member on the 'guilty' decision was examined in the following dialogue.

Example: The reason for the decision of the 3rd jury..⁹

8th Juror: (addressing the 3rd Juror) You're standing alone.

3rd Juror: I couldn't care less whether I'm standing alone or not. It's my prerogative.

..... (Continues discussing the old evidence that has been addressed in this section.)

3rd Juror: And that entire matter about hearing the boy shout? The words were "I'm going to kill you." That's exactly what he said. To his own father. It doesn't matter what kind of man the father was, he was still the father. That damned, wretched kid. I'm familiar with his type. Their behavior, their impact on you. How they tear you apart every single day. My God, don't you comprehend? Why am I the only one who sees this? It's as if I can physically feel that knife being driven into me.

8th Juror: But it's not your son. He's a different person altogether.

The remarkable sentences in the dialogue are "I know him", "What they do to you". The 3rd juror's character is depicted as somber, lacking a sense of humor, and displaying a complete unwillingness to consider viewpoints divergent from his own. He is accustomed to imposing his desires and perspectives onto others, exhibiting an intolerance for dissenting opinions. As a father experiencing challenges with his son, the 3rd juror's stern demeanor reflects the difficulty of reaching a compromise with him, as he strongly relies on his own ideas, experiences, and values. As in the case of the murder, he thinks that based on his past experiences (to problems with his son), each incident developed and ended in a similar way. So he concentrates on the idea that the child can kill his father and he firmly advocates his opinion from the first vote to the final vote. We can associate this behavior of the 3rd jury member with the Cognitive Conflict Theory.

⁹ *Twelve Angry Men* by Reginald Rose "Please Copy and Return", First Draft – February 14, 1996

*Sorumlu yazar: zeynepkaptan12@gmail.com

The cognitive dissonance theory, also known as cognitive conflict theory, asserts that individuals shape their behaviors and beliefs in alignment with their past experiences and core values (Villines, 2023). As people navigate through life, they may come across situations that challenge or contradict these established thoughts and values. When such situations arise, a state of cognitive dissonance emerges - a condition where there is a conflict between an individual's existing beliefs and the opposing circumstances they encounter. In response to this cognitive conflict, individuals have a tendency to take actions that help them avoid accepting or acknowledging the inconsistencies between their beliefs and the contradicting situations. They may deliberately ignore subsequent contradictions or oppositions in order to safeguard their beliefs and values. Essentially, this process involves evading direct confrontation with facts that challenge their convictions. This can lead to individuals dismissing or neglecting opposing viewpoints, effectively behaving as though those differing perspectives never existed. By doing so, they evade the discomfort of reconciling their established beliefs with new, conflicting information, even if it goes against the objective truth.

The sentence from Henry is effective in changing the decision of the 3rd jury member "It's not your son. He's a different person altogether."

Conclusion

Focus group studies are qualitative studies conducted in closed meetings with small groups. The Focus group studies involve qualitative research conducted in small, closed meetings to gather participants' opinions on a specific subject. The primary aim of focus group studies is to delve into how individuals deeply perceive events and how their decisions are reflected on the social stage. These discussions are employed to thoroughly analyze the opinions, inclinations, attitudes, and behaviors of a target audience or social stakeholders regarding a given topic. An analogous example of focus group discussions in the context of the US legal system is the jury system. In the US, there are two types of juries: the "grand jury" and the "petit jury" (also known as the small jury). The nomenclature is determined by the number of jurors involved. The grand jury, convened during the investigation phase, operates in secrecy and typically comprises 12 or more members. This jury decides whether there is substantial evidence and justification to pursue a criminal case, thus serving as a safeguard for the accused (Dikmeci, et al., 2017).

The primary role of the grand jury is to prevent individuals from being arrested and tried without a formal indictment, which is the decision of a single person, usually the prosecutor. Instead, a group of unbiased citizens reviews the prosecution's evidence to determine if it merits a trial.

Following the process, the jury delivers its decision, known as the "verdict," which is a concise declaration of "guilty" or "not guilty." The number of votes required can vary based on the specifics of the case and the jurisdiction. While majority votes suffice for certain crimes, more serious offences might necessitate a supermajority or even unanimity. It's important to note that the jury does not determine the applicable laws, the case's final outcome, or the nature of the punishment. These responsibilities lie with the judge. If the jury cannot reach a consensus or sufficient votes, it's referred to as a "hung jury." In such instances, the judge might dismiss the case or opt to convene a new jury for further deliberation. In approximately 90% of jury trials, the initial verdict endorsed by the majority becomes the final decision of the jury. This implies that minorities do wield a certain level of influence over the outcome. However, in cases where a jury reaches an impasse, it is usually due to the resistance or dissent of one or two jurors who stand apart from the majority. When jurors in the minority are unwavering in their perspectives, they often succeed in persuading another member of the jury to align with their viewpoint. Over time, this influence may extend, leading to more jurors shifting their votes to support the original minority stance. The key factor in this process is the consistency and confidence exhibited by the initial minority jurors.

For their influence to be effective, the minority jurors must maintain steadfastness in their opinions. If they appear uncertain or wavering, their ability to sway the majority diminishes. In essence, the more resolute and assured the minority jurors are in presenting their viewpoint, the greater their chances of convincing others to adopt their stance, and potentially altering the overall decision of the jury. Within the 12 Angry Men films examined in this study, the effect of the main character in the minority group (8th jury member Henry Fonda) against the other 11 jury members in the majority group; in fact, it has been analyzed that it is vital for a single person to be consistent and stable while defending their ideas, and to convey the message to the recipient correctly and understandably. In the film, in order for the jury to declare the boy guilty or not guilty, 12 jurors must agree with one answer. In other words, the vote should be 12 to 0.

Table 9

The Last State of Voting

Those who say quality	Those who say not quality	Abstentions and fits the group
	1-2-3-4-5-6-7-8-9-10-11-12	

Henry (8th jury member) is a person who focuses on the facts and adopts the principle of justice for all, from the first vote to the last vote. Henry's aim is to search and find the right thing from the very beginning. While doing so, he did not underestimate the opinion of any jury member, but he listened carefully to the opinions of each member. In the film, he symbolized justice by wearing white, which gave the impression that the man was educated and kind to other members. We can explain the situation of Henry in the group with minority effect because when he made the first vote, he used only that "not guilty" vote and did not fit the majority. Afterwards, he acted consistently in his decision and caused the group's thoughts and votes to change.

Minority influence encompasses a type of social influence that arises from exposure to a consistent viewpoint held by a minority within a group. This influence exerts a significant impact on fostering the acceptance of the minority's perspectives. Notably, the dynamics of the minority effect differ from those of normative social impact, where the majority typically doesn't concern themselves with the opinions of the minority. Instead, the influence of the minority predominantly hinges on informative social impact. Informative social impact revolves around the provision of novel ideas and fresh information by the minority, compelling the majority to reassess and reconsider their existing viewpoints. In this way, the minority's consistent and distinctive stance triggers a reevaluation of prevailing notions within the majority, leading to a potential shift in their beliefs and perspectives.

There are four main factors for a minority to influence the majority. These are behavioral science, thinking style, flexible and compromise, and definition. Consistency is consistency in the view of a minority. As Henry has done in the film, it is the resistance to the pressure of other group members, at the same time, to look neutral and not to give up at any stage of the vote, relying on the accuracy of the ideas and opinions he offers. If the minority can get the majority to discuss and debate the arguments that the minority are putting forward, influence is likely to be stronger (Nemeth, 1995). Henry establishes a platform for discussion to influence the eleven jury members, ensuring that every subject can be comprehended and accepted by all. Henry is actually acting as a minority in leadership behavior. At each stage of the debate, by addressing various issues, Henry generates differences of opinion among the majority, leading to the division of the group. In this way, he sees the thinking style of each member and continues his words by considering their personality characteristics. Flexibility and compromise: If the consistent minority appears to be flexible, rigid, uncompromising, and dogmatic, the majority are unlikely to change their views. However, if they seem flexible and accommodating, they are likely to be seen as less extreme, more moderate, collaborative and reasonable. As a result, the chances of changing the majority views will be greater (Mugny & Papastamou, 1980). Finally, in the definition part, it is started that the majority is identified with the minority, it is seen that the minority is more likely to take their views seriously and change their own views according to the minority's views. Henry took a decisive and consistent stance at every stage of the vote, and changed the views of other members. Thus, the number of members of the minority side of the group increased with each vote.

The main effect of talking about any subject is to strengthen one's ideas; in fact, people never know exactly what they believe until they are convinced by the heat of attack and defense (Warner, 1873).

The subject of this study is a very interesting and important social dynamic. However, like any study, this study has certain limitations. One of the limitations of the study is that the analysis only focused on the movie "12 Angry Men." A wider range of text can make the results more generalizable. Critical discourse analysis is an important research method, but subjective interpretations and analyst biases can affect results. This may affect the reliability of the study. The context of the work is limited only to the characters and events in the movie. Generalizations about how these findings might apply in real-world interactions or different groups may be limited. A study comparing group dynamics and minority influence between different films or texts in future research may offer a broader perspective. Research examining how similar group dynamics apply to real-world situations and how the influence of the minority is seen in real life can help us understand how theoretical findings can be translated into practice. By performing similar analyzes on groups with different demographics, it can help us understand how the influence of minorities may differ in different groups.

The original value of this study is to draw attention to the relationship between leadership and minority influence by explaining how minority members can lead and influence group dynamics. The analysis of the symbolic representations and social aspects of the film offers readers a deep reflection, offering a broad cultural and social understanding. The analysis of communication strategies used for minority influence provides examples and ideas for practice in the field of communication. This study offers an important perspective for researchers who want to understand group dynamics, leadership, and minority influence, presenting ideas and strategies on how minority influence can be created and managed, both theoretically and practically.

References

- Akyuz, C. (2019). 12 kızgın adam filminin sosyal psikolojik incelenmesi. *Psikolojik Ağı*. Erişim adresi: <https://www.psikolojiagi.com/12-kizgin-adam-filminin-sosyal-psikolojik-incelenmesi/>
- Ankaraligil, N. (2008). Media capital and the representation of South Asian muslims in the British press: An ideological analysis. *Istanbul University Faculty of Communication Journal*, 34, p.37-52.
- Aronson, E., Wilson, T. D., & Akert, R. M. (2012). Sosyal psikoloji. *Kaknüs Yayınları*, ISBN: 9789752563520
- Bal, C. G. & Avcu, G. (2023). A reception analysis on the concept of group interaction in the movie 12 Angry Men. *Anadolu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi*, 24(2), p.459-475, doi: 10.53443/anadoluibfd.1176107
- Bolanos, R., Fontela, E., Nenclare, A., & Pastor, P. (2005). Using interpretive structural modelling in strategic decision-making groups. *Management Decision*, ISSN: 0025-1747.
- Bowling, A. (2002). Research Methods in Health: Investigating Health and Health Services. *Philadelphia, PA: McGraw-Hill House*.
- Cengiz, C.B. (2013). İknaya yönelik iletişim ve tutum değişikliği. *Gündem Türkiye*. Erişim adresi: <https://www.gundemturkiye.com/birey/sosyal-psikoloji/tutumlar/iknaya-yonelik-iletisim-ve-tutum-degisikligi.html>
- Cubillo, J.M., Sanches, J., & Cervino, J. (2006). International students' decision-making process. *International Journal of Educational Management*. ISSN: 0951-354X
- Demir, E. & Tore, E. (2021). Examination of bilgievi in the context of management processes: Sample of Kucukcekmece Municipality. *İZÜ Eğitim Dergisi*, 3(5), p.15-39, doi: 10.46423/izujed.760523
- Devran, Y. (2010). Haber, söylem, ideoloji. *Başlık Yayın Grubu*, ISBN: 978-605-4033-02-7
- Dickens, C. (1837). The pickwick papers. Serialised March 1836 – November 1837; book format 1837.
- Dikmeci, O., Tekin, Z., Samoylov, Y., Karakose, M.E., Işık, M., Sahin, M.C., Sen, U.M., & Celik, R. (2017). ABD mahkemelerinde jüri nedir? Kimlerden oluşur? Ne yaparlar?. *Sahipkiran Stratejik Araştırma Merkezi*.
- Drew, C. (2023). Informational social influence: 10 examples & definition. Erişim adresi: <https://helpfulprofessor.com/informational-social-influence/>
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). Studies in ethnomethodology. *Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall*.
- Geddes, J. (2016). Elaboration likelihood model theory: How to use ELM. *Interaction desing, Alistapart*.
- Geyer, C. (2017). The social unconscious in action: Linking theory to group work with young adults. *Sage Journal*, 50(2). Doi:10/1177/0533316417702265
- Gibbs, A. (1997). Focus groups. *Social Research Update*, 19. Erişim adresi: <http://sru.soc.surrey.ac.uk/SRU19.html>
- Gizer, A. (2011). Odak grup çalışması. Erişim adresi: <https://aligizer.wordpress.com/2011/06/25/odak-grup-calismasi/>
- Jhangiani, R. & Tarry H. (2022). Principles of social psychology – 1st international H5P edition. Erişim adresi: <https://opentextbc.ca/socialpsychology/>
- Kitzinger, J. (1994). The methodology of focus groups: the importance of interaction between research participants. 16 (1), 103–121.
- Kitzinger J. (1995). Qualitative research. Introducing focus groups. *Natinal Library of Medicine*, 29:311(7000):299-302. doi: 10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299
- Kokdemir, D. (2003). Decision making and problem solving under uncertainty. Ankara University, Department of Social Psychology, [doctoral dissertation]
- Krueger, R.A. (1994). Focus groups: A practical guide for applied research. *London: SAGE*.
- Lerner, J.S., Li, Y., Valdesolo, P., & Kassam K.S. (2014). Emotion and decision making. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1).

- Mcleod, S. (2023). Moscovici and minority influence in psychology. *Simply Psychology*, reviewed by [Olivia Guy Evans](#).
- Moscovici, S. & Lage, E. (1976). Studies in social influence III: Majority versus minority influence in a group. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 6, 149-114.
- Mugny, G., & Papastamou, S. (1980). When rigidity does not fail: Individualization and psychologization as resistances to the diffusion of minority innovations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(1), 43–61. Eriřim adresi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420100104>
- Nas, S. (2010). Scientific approaches to the decision making styes. *Dokuz Eylul University Maritime Faculty Jurnal*, 2(2), p.43-65.
- Nemeth, C. J. (1995). Dissent as driving cognition, attitudes, and judgments. *Social Cognition*, 13(3), 273–291. Eriřim adresi: <https://doi.org/10.1521/soco.1995.13.3.273>
- Oppermann, M. & Chon, K.S. (1997). Convention participation decision-making process. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(1), p.178-191. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383\(96\)00049-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0160-7383(96)00049-7)
- Petty, R.E. & Cacioppo, J.T. (1986). The elaboration likelihood model of persuasion. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 19(1), p.124-205.
- Pomerleau, M. (2021). Tension in translation: Spain's and Catalonia's discourse on independence. *Studies in Translation Theory and Practice*, 31(3), p.(450-469). Doi: 10.1080/0907676X.2022.2030374
- Roos, J.M., Hughes, M., & Reichelmann, A.V. (2019). A Puzzle of racial attitudes: A measurement analysis of racial attitudes and policy indicators. *Socius*. Doi:10.1177/2378023119842738
- Rose, R. (1996). Twelve angry men. "Plese Copy and Return", Fist Draft – February 14.
- Stewart, D.W. & Shamdasani, P.N. (1990). Focus groups: Theory and practice. *Newbury Park, CA: SAGE*.
- Van Dijk., T.A. (2001). Critical discourse analysis. In D. Tannen, D. Schiffrin, & H. Hamilton (Eds.), *Handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 352-371). *Oxford: Blackwell*.
- Van Dijk., T.A. (2015). Critical discourse analysis. H. E. Hamilton, D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen (Yay. Haz.), *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis* (2. Basım) içinde (ss. 466-485). *West Sussex: John Wiley & Sons*.
- Villines, Z. (2023). Cognitive dissonance: What to know. *Medical News Today*, reviewed by Yalda Safari.
- Warner, C.D. (1873). *Backlog Studies*. *CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform* , ISBN:1540386899
- Weisband, S.P. (1992). Group discussion and first advocacy effects in computer-mediated and face-to-face decision making groups. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 53(3), p. 352-380.
- Williams, C. (2007). Research Methods. *Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 5, p. 65-72.
- Williams, K. D., & Zadro, L. (2005). Ostracism: The indiscriminate early detection system. In K. D. Williams, J. P. Forgas, & W. von Hippel (Eds.), *The social outcast: Ostracism, social exclusion, rejection, and bullying* (p. 19–34). *Psychology Press*.