Gambling Addiction - Mark Scheme

Q1.

AO1 = 4

AO1 credit is awarded for an outline of the learning explanation of the maintenance of gambling. Maintenance of gambling can be explained by operant conditioning (positive reinforcement of winning or excitement of betting) or classical conditioning (association of gambling related stimuli such as lottery tickets / betting shop with excitement). SLT can gain credit provided it is shaped to reinforcement of gambling. Partial reinforcement schedules can also obtain credit.

AO1 Mark bands
4 marks Sound Knowledge and understanding are accurate and well detailed. Organisation and structure of the answer are coherent.
3 marks Reasonable Knowledge and understanding are generally accurate and reasonably detailed. Organisation and structure of the answer are reasonably coherent.
2 marks Basic Knowledge and understanding are basic / relatively superficial. Organisation and structure of the answer are basic.
1 mark Rudimentary Knowledge and understanding are rudimentary and may be very brief, muddled and / or inaccurate. Lacks organisation and structure.
0 marks No creditworthy material.

Q2.

AO2 / AO3 = 10

AO2 / AO3 credit is awarded for an application of knowledge of addictive behaviour to the scenario. The scenario provides a number of 'clues' as to the source of Sam's addiction. These include vulnerability factors (e.g. age personality and peer influence) and approaches (e.g. learning theories). Material from both sub–sections of the specification can gain credit. The marks awarded will depend on how effectively knowledge is applied.

• Boredom of work and excitement of the betting shop atmosphere may be linked to personality factors such as sensation seeking.

• Peer influence – is important in many addictions notably smoking (Bricker et al) and drug use. Credit if linked to gambling.

• Observational learning from peers.

• Positive reinforcement from winning money.

Candidates who select relevant explanations, but do not apply these to the scenario, should be awarded a maximum of 4 marks.

AO2 / AO3 Mark bands   Application
9 – 10 marks Effective Explanation / application demonstrate sound analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is well focused and effective. Ideas are well structured and expressed clearly and fluently.
6 – 8 marks Reasonable Explanation / application demonstrate reasonable analysis and understanding. Application of knowledge is generally focused. Most ideas are appropriately structured and expressed clearly.
3 – 5 marks Basic Explanation / application demonstrate basic analysis and superficial understanding. Application is sometimes focused. Expression of ideas lacks clarity.
1 – 2 marks Rudimentary

Explanation / application are rudimentary demonstrating very limited understanding.
The answer is weak, muddled and may be mainly largely irrelevant.
Deficiency in expression of ideas results in confusion and ambiguity.

0 marks
No creditworthy material is presented.

Q3.

Marks for this question: AO1 = 6, AO3 = 10

Level	Marks	Description
4	13 – 16	Knowledge is accurate and generally well detailed. Discussion / evaluation / application is thorough and effective. The answer is clear, coherent and focused. Specialist terminology is used effectively. Minor detail and / or expansion of argument sometimes lacking.
3	9 – 12	Knowledge is evident. There are occasional inaccuracies. Discussion / evaluation / application is apparent and mostly effective. The answer is mostly clear and organised. Specialist terminology is mostly used effectively. Lacks focus in places.
2	5 – 8	Some knowledge is present. Focus is mainly on description. Any discussion / evaluation / application is only partly effective. The answer lacks clarity, accuracy and organisation in places. Specialist terminology is used inappropriately on occasions.
1	1 – 4	Knowledge is limited. Discussion / evaluation / application is limited, poorly focused or absent. The answer as a whole lacks clarity, has many inaccuracies and is poorly organised. Specialist terminology either absent or inappropriately used.
	0	No relevant content.

Please note that although the content for this mark scheme remains the same, on most mark schemes for the new AQA Specification (Sept 2015 onwards) content appears as a bulleted list.

AO1

Credit is awarded for the outline of the cognitive explanation of problem gambling. Candidates can refer to any or all of the stages of addiction. The cognitive model in general emphasises the importance of cognitive bias, coping, expectancy and self-efficacy in addiction.

Likely material includes:

- Cognitive bias - Expectancy plays an important role in the initiation of gambling. The benefits of winning money are seen as very high in gamblers who tend overestimate the likelihood of winning.

- Gamblers often place a higher priority on present excitement than on future consequences (cognitive myopia).

- Gamblers who find themselves in financial difficulties may gamble more often in an attempt to increase their negative mood creating a vicious cycle (Beck).

- Gambling may help people to cope by reducing negative mood states (such as boredom) and increasing positive moods (excitement).

AO3

Credit is awarded for an evaluation of the cognitive explanation of problem gambling. Candidates may use research studies which support the claims made by the cognitive explanation. For example:

- There is strong evidence that gambling is used to improve moods.

- Studies have shown that gamblers engage in irrational self-talk and cognitive bias when gambling (Sharpe 1995), Griffiths (1994).

- Delfabbro and Winefield 1999 found that 75% of thoughts / self-talk during gambling are irrational – effectively gamblers tell themselves they are going to win!

Candidates may also discuss the difficulties with gathering cognitive evidence and establishing cause and effect in studies of gambling. It is particularly difficult to separate the effects of learning / association from cognitive factors. Candidates who present alternative explanations (eg biological model) can receive credit provided the material is used effectively to comment on the limitations of cognitive explanations.