Mark schemes

Q1.

[AO2 = 2 AO3 = 2]

Level	Marks	Description
2	3-4	Application of learning theory to gambling is clear and accurate. Explanation of the likely outcome is clear, coherent and appropriate.
1	1-2	Application is limited or muddled. Explanation is limited or inappropriate.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- the likely outcome is that more of the participants who won 5 practice games (partial reinforcement/variable interval condition) will be categorised in the high stakes category than the low stakes category and more of the participants who won no practice games (no reinforcement condition) will be categorised in the low stakes category than the high stakes category
- learning theory would explain this outcome through operant conditioning – formation of an association between response and consequence leading to repetition of behaviour and wins as positive reinforcement for betting behaviour which is strengthened through repeated association.

Credit other relevant material.

[4]

Q2.

[AO1 = 3 AO3 = 5]

Level	Mark	Description
4	7-8	Knowledge of cognitive bias as an explanation for gambling addiction is accurate with some detail. Discussion is thorough and effective. Minor detail and/or expansion of argument is sometimes lacking. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively.
3	5-6	Knowledge of cognitive bias as an explanation for gambling addiction is evident but there are occasional inaccuracies/omissions. Discussion is mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised but occasionally lacks focus. Specialist terminology is used appropriately.
2	3-4	Limited knowledge of cognitive bias as an explanation for gambling addiction is present. Any discussion is of limited effectiveness. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used

		inappropriately on occasions.
1	1-2	Knowledge of cognitive bias as an explanation for gambling addiction is very limited. Discussion is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology is either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Possible content:

- cognitive biases/distortions lead to distorted understanding of chance outcomes
- types of bias:
  - control bias – belief that outcomes can be predicted or controlled – illusion of control
  - ritual bias – belief that outcome can be controlled by using 'lucky' rituals, eg blowing on dice
  - perceptual bias/gambler's fallacy – the faulty belief that a run of losses must be followed by a win
  - selective recall/availability bias – recalling wins and forgetting losses
  - skill bias – belief in possession of special skill or knowledge, eg choosing lottery numbers or choosing a winning horse
  - near-win bias – gambler perceives a near-miss loss as a near win.

Possible discussion points:

- use of evidence to support/contradict the role of cognitive bias in gambling
- role of mediating factors – individual differences, eg self-efficacy, impulsivity, desire for control
- some types of bias are better at explaining some gambling addictions than others, eg gambler's fallacy is more likely to operate where gambling involves slot-machine or roulette throws
- comparison with alternative explanations for gambling addiction, eg learning theory, reinforcement and cue sensitivity
- cognitive bias is better at explaining maintenance than initiation
- implications for treatment – if cognitive bias makes people susceptible to gambling then cognitive therapy to alter perception of control might help gamblers.

Credit other relevant material.

[8]