



STUDYDADDY

**Get Homework Help
From Expert Tutor**

Get Help

would behave in given situations [Mischel 1968]. Moreover, it was difficult to demonstrate that persons who had undergone psychodynamically oriented treatment benefited more than nontreated cases [Bandura 1969a, Bergin 1966]. Acquiring insight into the underlying impulses through which behavioral changes were supposedly achieved turned out to represent more of a social conversion than a self-discovery process. As Marmor [1962], among others, pointed out, each psychodynamic approach had its own favored set of inner causes and its own preferred brand of insight. The presence of these determinants could be easily confirmed through suggestive probing and selective reinforcement of clients' verbal reports in self-validating interviews. For these reasons, advocates of differing theoretical orientations repeatedly discovered their favorite psychodynamic agents but rarely found evidence for the hypothesized causes emphasized by proponents of competing views. The content of a particular client's insights and emergent "unconscious" could therefore be better predicted from knowledge of the therapist's belief system than from the client's actual social learning history.

It eventually became apparent that if progress in understanding human behavior was to be accelerated, more stringent requirements would have to be applied in evaluating the adequacy of explanatory systems. Theories must demonstrate predictive power, and they must accurately identify causal factors, as shown by the fact that varying the postulated determinants produces related changes in behavior.

The attribution of behavior to inner forces can perhaps be likened to early explanatory schemes in other branches of science. At one time diverse chemical reactions were supposedly caused by movements of a material substance called phlogiston, physical objects were internally propelled by intangible essences, and physiological functioning was ascribed to the action of humors. Developments in learning theory shifted the focus of causal analysis from hypothesized inner determinants to detailed examination of external influences on responsiveness. Human behavior was extensively analyzed in terms of the stimulus events that evoke it and the reinforcing consequences that alter it. Researchers repeatedly demonstrated that response patterns, generally attributed to underlying forces, could be induced, eliminated, and reinstated simply by varying external sources of influence. These impressive findings led many psychologists, especially proponents of radical forms of behaviorism, to the view that the causes of behavior are found not in the organism but in environmental forces.

The idea that man's actions are under external

control, though amply documented, was not enthusiastically received for a variety of reasons. To most people it unfortunately implied a one-way influence process that reduced man to a helpless reactor to the vagaries of external rewards and punishments. The view that behavior is environmentally determined also appeared to contradict firm, but ill-founded, beliefs that people possess generalized personality traits leading them to behave in a consistent manner, however variable the social influences.

A more valid criticism of the extreme behavioristic position is that, in a vigorous effort to eschew spurious inner causes, it neglected determinants of man's behavior arising from his cognitive functioning. Man is a thinking organism possessing capabilities that provide him with some power of self-direction. To the extent that traditional behavioral theories could be faulted, it was for providing an incomplete rather than an inaccurate account of human behavior.

In the social learning view, man is neither driven by inner forces nor buffeted helplessly by environmental influences. Rather, psychological functioning is best understood in terms of a continuous reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling conditions. The social learning theory outlined in this paper places special emphasis on the important roles played by vicarious, symbolic, and self-regulatory processes, which receive relatively little attention even in most contemporary theories of learning. These differences in governing processes carry certain implications for the way one views the causes of human behavior.

Traditional theories of learning generally depict behavior as the product of directly experienced response consequences. In actuality, virtually all learning phenomena resulting from direct experiences can occur on a vicarious basis through observation of other people's behavior and its consequences for them. Man's capacity to learn by observation enables him to acquire large, integrated units of behavior by example without having to build up the patterns gradually by tedious trial and error. Similarly, emotional responses can be developed observationally by witnessing the affective reactions of others undergoing painful or pleasurable experiences. Fearful and defensive behavior can be extinguished vicariously by observing others engage in the feared activities without any adverse consequences. And behavioral inhibitions can be induced by seeing others punished for their actions.

Man's superior cognitive capacity is another factor that determines, not only how he will be affected by his experiences, but the future direction his actions may take. People can represent external influences symbolically and later use such representations to



STUDYDADDY

**Get Homework Help
From Expert Tutor**

Get Help