

**Annotation:**

---

3 marks

1 AO2 for application of SLT to the findings in terms of role models

1 AO2 for application of operant conditioning in terms of positive punishment to the findings

1 AO2 for application of operant conditioning in terms of positive reinforcement to the findings

No AO2 credit for SLT at the end as 3 AO2 max. has already been reached

No AO3 content presented, so no further marks can be awarded.

(b) Using research evidence, explain how far learning theories could account for the findings of the anti-littering study.

AO1 - 3 : SLT - vicarious reinforcement  
AO2 - 3 : vicarious intimidation (6)  
in NYC

social learning theory <sup>by Albert Bandura</sup> suggests that ~~people~~ people learn behaviours through the observation and imitation of role models, who we are likely to identify with. NYC is a large city with a large population which means that people are more likely to find others who they identify with compared to the people in Bern in Switzerland. This can explain why more people in NYC showed no reaction <sup>to littering</sup> (28.1%) than people in Bern (6.1%) because ~~there~~ there are more and ~~stronger~~ <sup>effective</sup> role models in NYC who ~~demonstrate~~ <sup>model the</sup> behaviour of ~~being~~ <sup>showing</sup> no reaction than in Bern.

Operant Conditioning suggests that we learn through consequences (~~the~~ ~~positive~~ positive reinforcement, negative reinforcement, positive punishment, and negative punishment). ~~These~~ <sup>These</sup> consequences ~~can~~ either strengthen/encourage the repetition of a behaviour (through reinforcement) or discourage a behaviour from happening again (through punishment). ~~These consequences can happen directly or~~ <sup>This can happen directly or</sup> vicariously - through observation of consequences experienced by others. This can explain more people in Bern (12.1%) giving a direct sanction to the confederate compared to NYC (2.1%) because ~~most people don't react~~ <sup>most people don't react</sup> (82.1%) to ~~the~~ <sup>the</sup> ~~large~~ <sup>large</sup> population of NYC.



Littering in NYC  
~~can be given~~ and therefore anyone who  
 does give as a direct ~~of~~ sanction to littering  
 may face a negative e.g. aggressive reaction.  
 This discourages the large population of NYC  
 to give direct sanctions as it can be intimidating.  
 This may be the opposite for Bern population; the people  
 who give direct sanctions may usually receive a  
 positive response <sup>(or positive reinforcement)</sup> from people who litter, which enforces  
 other people to give direct sanctions to those that litter  
 (imitate the behaviour).  
 Because they have seen positive modelling.  
 Lastly, most people are taught <sup>poor</sup> social <sup>and fictional</sup> behaviours  
 from their parents as they can easily identify with  
 them as role models due to their family status. <sup>This</sup> explains  
 participants <sup>both being more likely to</sup> giving a sanction to littering and  
 picking the litter up themselves in clean areas than  
 littered areas because they have observed their parents  
 keeping the ~~houses~~ <sup>houses</sup> clean and therefore ~~are~~ <sup>are</sup> replicating  
 the same behaviour in the real world as they have the motivation.

Total for Question 3 = 8 marks

HA057603050



P 7 1 9 2 1 R A 0 2 1 3 6

21

Turn over ►