

PSYD59: Psychology of Gambling

0.5 credits

University of Toronto, Scarborough

Winter Term, 2023

LEC01 (Weds 3-5PM in SW316)



Instructor: Prof. Michael Souza (he/him) (*note: my surname is pronounced "SUES-uh"*)

Email: michael.souza@utoronto.ca (*please note: I do not read or respond to Quercus messages*)

Office Hours: *Please see Quercus announcements for virtual office hours information*

I. Your instructor



Dr. Souza is an Associate Professor (Teaching Stream) of Psychology and Neuroscience at UTSC. He received his Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of California, Berkeley in 2010. His teaching interests include cognitive neuroimaging, higher-order cognitive functions, and cognitive impairments and neurorehabilitation.

II. Course description, pre-requisites and learning goals

Gambling in its many forms (e.g., casino gambling) is actually quite a complex phenomenon. Gambling may involve a complex interplay between many elements, including goals (e.g., financial, entertainment), perceived and actual value assessments, probability, your ability to control yourself, cultural and/or social influences (i.e., the presence of other people), your degree of intoxication (e.g., alcohol, cannabis), and much more. As such, understanding the motivations for individuals to start and continue gambling requires a careful examination and can have important implication for understanding how such behaviors can evolve into something more problematic (i.e., gambling disorder). This seminar is designed to give you a taste of some of these factors, primarily from cognitive and clinical perspectives. From a process standpoint, considerable attention will be given to help you fortify your ability to effectively consume primary research, collaborate with your colleagues, respond thoughtfully to critical feedback, and develop your public speaking ability.

Prerequisites:

PSYB70H3 and [PSYB07H3 or STAB22H3 or STAB23H3] and [PSYB32H3 or PSYB45H3] and [PSYB55H3 or PSYB57H3]

After successful completion of this course, you will have:

1. developed an understanding of what gambling is, as well as a number of cognitive and social influences that may affect the likelihood of various gambling behaviors;
2. explored how clinical science conceptualizes the causes, symptoms and consequences of gambling disorder;
3. synthesized contributions from the abovementioned domains in an effort to develop a more nuanced understanding of gambling and gambling disorder;
4. strengthened your schema for understanding, critiquing and extending original research in psychological science;
5. developed and implemented a variety of verbal strategies to effectively present information to others;
6. improved your ability to successfully collaborate with likeminded colleagues;
7. strengthened your schema for planning and executing an effective group-based research project;
8. reflected on your progress in the course with the larger goal of promoting lifelong learning.

III. Course readings

This course will **not** use a textbook. This course will prioritize strengthening your ability to becoming competent in consuming and evaluating primary literature and as such, will wholly rely on such articles.

IV. Course webpage

Please visit Quercus (<https://q.utoronto.ca/>) and sign in with your UTORid credentials to access our course webpage. This webpage will house all course-related materials, including announcements, discussion boards, lecture and related learning materials, assessments, and marks. You should expect to visit this webpage a few times per week to ensure you are up-to-date on any new happenings in the course throughout the term.

V. Course requirements and grading

Leading a discussion on an assigned journal article (25% of the course grade)

(Learning outcomes #1,2,3,4,5,6,8)

Together with one partner of your choosing¹, you will select one paper from the course schedule to lead a 12-minute article summary and immediately after, a 30-minute class discussion. In an effort to be fair with respect to topic selection, all pairs will be assigned a number and we will use a random number generator to determine the order of selection. Only one group may cover a given paper. As your order falls in luck's hands, it would be wise to rank order the papers so that you can choose the paper you are most interested in whenever you pick.

The article summary should last 12 minutes (+/- 20 seconds), and should review the core features of the article (i.e., rationale, hypotheses, key methods and results, and interpretations/conclusions). **You must take care to review all tables/figures during your presentation to facilitate audience understanding.**

You must use Microsoft PowerPoint or a comparable program and you should use very limited text on your slides (not including tables that might be presented). Images should be useful (i.e., not cutesy); they should help orient your audience to the ideas that you need to explain as you move along (i.e., how the experiment was run, value of figures/tables).

The second part of your presentation will last 30 minutes and will involve both you and your partner leading a critical discussion of the study you just reviewed. In addition to your own thoughts and insights into the paper, you will also benefit from receiving discussion questions submitted by your peers (see the Participation section). You need not address all of these questions; rather, they are meant to serve as inspiration for how you might guide the discussion. Your challenge here is to facilitate an inclusive and thoughtful class discussion where your fellow students are empowered to engage the material along with you.

We will spend a portion of class time reviewing these expectations, as well as discussing various ways to promote successful presentations and discussions. Prof. Souza will use a detailed rubric to evaluate your performance on both components of the presentation detailed above.

Participation (23% of the course grade)

(Learning outcomes #1,2,3,4,5,8)

Small seminar courses provide an important opportunity to engage in group discussions and to develop your thinking alongside your peers. Seminars don't work well without the collective buy-in and participation from ALL of the members, and that is exactly the sort of environment that we will be working to cultivate. The following policies and procedures were developed to help support this priority.

¹ Final course enrolment may not be divisible by 2, hence there may be one singleton in the class. That person will be permitted to choose which article they'd like to do first as a concession, but will be held to the same standard as their other peers.

Participation will be recognized in the following three ways:

Pre-course and post-course reflection (0.5% each, totaling 1%)


In the spirit of promoting lifelong learning, you will be asked to complete a reflection survey at the beginning of class and at the end of the class. The goal of the pre-course reflection is to help you critically consider your degree of skill and comfort with various elements of this course, and how you plan to have a successful experience in this course. The post-course reflection will be your assessment of how things actually went and how you can continue to get better at these core skills beyond this course. This will be marked on a complete/submitted and non complete/not submitted basis.

Discussion prompts (1% per paper presentation, totaling 11%)

For every paper presentation **other than your own**, you will be required to submit **one thoughtful discussion question** directly to the appropriate assignment on Quercus. As most all weeks should have two readings (depending on final course enrolment), this means that you will be submitting a total of two (2) discussion questions per week (note: on the week that you present, you will only submit one question). Your name and student ID number should be at the top of the document, and your questions should appear below. **These questions must be submitted by 11:59PM three days before class occurs** (i.e., since our class is on Wednesday, discussion questions are due the Sunday evening just before by 11:59PM). On Monday, Professor Souza will share the questions on the Quercus discussion board for presenters and the audience alike to consider.

You should be aware of a couple of things here. First, critically reading journal articles and generating thought-provoking discussion questions is a challenging and time-consuming process. Ideally, you should expect to be thinking about these articles over a couple of days at minimum. Second, you should expect a learning curve for developing these skills. Regular feedback is essential for continued improvement and as such, I will post your scores on a weekly basis so that you know exactly where you are so that you can seek out assistance and resources as appropriate.

The anatomy of an effective discussion question:



1. Compelling idea/critique. After a careful review of the paper, you should generate a compelling critique of the article, or an idea that would extend the knowledge of the article. It should be thoughtful, useful, and demonstrate clear knowledge of the article’s process and/or implications.
2. Principled justification. Your idea/critique should be grounded in scientific rationale, not just “I think it would be interesting...” You can analyze information presented in the article to make this argument, and/or you can even reference other articles as appropriate.
3. Innovative thinking. Criticism of scientific literature can be cheap; if we just stopped at that, we wouldn’t move science forward the way we need to be productive. This portion requires you to generate and articulate testable ideas that allow you to examine the validity of your critique/idea.

The following grading scheme will be used for each question:

Score	Description
0	No discussion question submitted, or they were late.
1.00 - 1.25	Idea/critique and justification provided but is relatively weak/superficial.
1.38 - 1.50	A solid idea/critique and justification were provided but innovative thinking is weak/superficial.
1.63 - 1.88	A solid idea/critique and justification were provided and there are clear signs of innovative thinking, albeit noticeable room for improvement remains for the latter.
2.00	The question is strong and effective in its structure and thinking.

Your ability to regularly generate thoughtful written discourse is an integral learning component of this course. Failure to earn at least 50% for this portion of the grade will result in your receiving an overall course mark no higher than 55%.

Discussion generated during classes with paper presentations (1% per paper presentation, totaling 11%)

For each paper presentation **other than your own**, you will be required to contribute to the class discussion. The goal here is to acclimate you to regularly contributing to class discussions and to help you feel more comfortable thinking critically on your feet.

The following grading scheme will be used for each participation opportunity:

0	Student is late, did not participate, or has an unexcused absence from class.
1.00	Student contributed once; the contribution was relatively weak/superficial.
1.25 - 1.50	Student contributed 2+ times and demonstrated partial evidence of higher-level thinking.
1.75 - 2.00	Student contributed 2+ times and demonstrated clear evidence of higher-level thinking.

Your ability to regularly generate thoughtful oral discourse is an integral learning component of this course. Failure to earn at least 50% for this portion of the grade will result in your receiving an overall course mark no higher than 55%.

Research project PowerPoint presentation (multiple parts, totaling of 52% of course grade)

(Learning outcomes #1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8)

Together with two partners of your choosing², you will be asked to conduct a research project to further explore a topic associated with gambling. Your group will research a minimum of nine (9) references (averaging 3/group member) and detail what you've learned into a PowerPoint presentation that your group will co-present near the end of the course. A detailed handout will be posted to give more detail than is presented below.

Forming your group of three (PASS/PENALTY scoring)

You are responsible for forming groups prior to the stated deadline. Please use the discussion board in Quercus to connect with your fellow classmates so that you may share pertinent information for forming a successful group. You will submit documentation clarifying that you understand what is expected of you in this project, and that you will work in good faith as a team to accomplish this portion of the course.

² Final course enrolment may not be divisible by 3, hence there may be 1-2 groups with two members. Such groups will be held to the same standard as their other peers.

Topic Pitch (02% of course grade)

Prior to fleshing out your topic proposal, you will need to submit a one paragraph pitch to Quercus to clarify what your proposed research will examine, and why it is crucial for others to know about the topic. You will be evaluated on the extent to which your pitch is feasible in the context of this assignment, clearly articulated, and engaging for the reader and proposed audience.

Topic proposal (08% of course grade)

After receiving an approved topic pitch, you will then co-develop a **one (1) page document**, single-spaced and in 11pt Times New Roman font, that offers: (1) your project's working title, taking care to represent the breadth of your focus in a concise, engaging way; (2) a paragraph introducing your topic, taking care to contextualize and substantiate your research focus/goal; (3) a paragraph articulating your proposed division of labor to ensure all group members are contributing fairly and equally; and (4) learning outcomes to specify what your audience should expect to learn from your work. The proposal must include at least three (3) peer-reviewed, empirical articles as references, and the reference information for those articles must be included on a second page. You will be evaluated on the quality and clarity of the items listed above.

Revised proposal + annotated bibliography (12% of course grade)

After your group has received and carefully reviewed detailed feedback on your topic proposal, you will then carefully revise and refine your proposal. This will involve: (1) a systematic review of the feedback you received and a thoughtful, productive response to each element in a peer-review like format; (2) the revision of your topic proposal informed by this feedback, still honoring the one-page limit; and (3) producing an annotated bibliography, which should first include a full list of properly cited references (APA format), and starting on the following page, a brief paragraph summarizing each article and how you plan to use it in your research. You will be evaluated on the quality and clarity of the items listed above.

Instructor evaluation of your PowerPoint presentation (28% of course grade)

Your group will equitably co-present a 13-15 minute PowerPoint presentation to the class. Half of the groups (class) will present in-person on the last day of class, while the other half will present live virtually via Zoom at a mutually-agreeable time. Your presentation will be evaluated using a detailed rubric by Prof. Souza that will be provide to you well before the presentation.

Peer-review (02% of course grade)

Receiving positive and constructive feedback is a crucial component to continued self-improvement. As such, you will be expected to provide positive and constructive feedback for all presentations other than your own. You will be evaluated on the quality and clarity of feedback you provide to your peers.

VI. Course policies

A respectful learning space

A sizeable amount of this course is designed to create opportunities for building skills that are critical for moving into the "real world" successfully: critical analysis of information, working with others effectively, and developing confidence in your voice. As these are common areas of concern for many individuals (not just students!), our classroom will be vulnerable space. I welcome that vulnerability because it offers the opportunity for growth and improvement, and I hope that you do as well.

As such, I expect you to be respectful to your colleagues at all times. This includes submitting thoughtful discussion questions that the presenters can use to support their presentation, showing up to class on time every day, always using respectful language, and genuinely trying your best every day.

E-mail policy

In most cases, e-mails will be answered within 48 hours of receipt (not including weekends). The email subject should include our course name and nature of the inquiry (i.e., "PSYD59: Question about Illusion of Control"). The start of your email should include your full name and student ID number so that I know who you are. Emails that you send should contain no more than one question and you should try to explain your current understanding of the concept in the email (which will be affirmed or corrected).

If you are not used to writing emails in an academic context, I encourage you to review this online resource so that you adopt proper email etiquette now and in the future: <<https://tinyurl.com/kysxwtx>>

Office hours

Office hours are a valuable resource for you to learn more about the class and/or important things related to (but outside of) the class. You should consider visiting Prof. Souza's office hours if you would like to (1) discuss course content, (2) if you have an issue with course performance or progress, or (3) you would like to discuss the field of psychology/neuroscience and how to get more involved.

Syllabus changes

There may be minor changes to the syllabus during the term due to changes in class size or the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic. You will be notified of these changes ASAP and no changes will be instituted that dramatically affect your ability to reasonably prepare for a class.

Lecture slides

Where appropriate, any lecture slides will usually be posted by 10PM the evening before a lecture. They will be posted in PDF format in two versions only (2 slides and 6 slides per page).

Instructional materials are only for the purpose of learning in this course and must not be distributed or used for any other reason whatsoever.

Issues with lateness

The way that tardiness is handled varies as a function of the course component and is as follows:

Paper presentations: as an audience member preparing for discussion

If you are not present at the start of a presentation, you will receive a zero for that portion of participation.

Paper presentations: as a presenter

Tardiness to your own presentation is beyond unacceptable. Starting your presentation late will have a powerfully negative impact on your ability to do well, and will be reflected in your mark. A failure to present on the day you are assigned to will result in a zero.

Project: Group Member form, Topic Pitch

Failure to complete and submit these requirements by the stated deadline will result in a 2% deduction off of the total course grade for each group member who fails to submit it on time.

Project: Topic Proposals and Revised Topic Proposals and Annotated Bibliography

All topic proposals will receive feedback regardless of how late they are. That said, the following penalty schedule will apply for failure to submit the work by the stated deadline.

15% deduction: 5 minutes – 24 hrs late

30% deduction: 24 hrs, 5 minutes – 48 hrs late

40% deduction: 48 hrs, 5 minutes – 72 hrs late

50% deduction: 72 hrs, 5 minutes late – 96 hrs late

100% deduction: 96 hrs, 5 minutes late or more

Project: as a presenter

Tardiness to your own presentation is beyond unacceptable. Starting your presentation late will have a powerfully negative impact on your ability to do well, and will be reflected in your mark. A failure to present on the day you are assigned to will result in a zero.

Project: Peer Evaluations

If you are not in class when a presentation starts, you will not be allowed to peer evaluate it and will receive a zero for peer evaluating that presentation.

Social loafing on group work

This course assumes that you will have the maturity and the good faith to engage group work with a positive attitude, a respect for your colleagues, and a willingness to pull your weight. A failure to adopt one or more of those features can result in a compromised group situation, which may have deleterious effects on all group members. Consider some of the tips below to reduce the likelihood of social loafing.

1. Everyone needs to have a say. When group members feel unheard or disrespected, they disengage and produce less than their potential. Ensure that everyone's voice is heard and is part of the process. This doesn't mean everyone gets their way, but rather that the process is fair and inclusive.
2. Discuss each other's interests and work to reasonably accommodate those interests (wherever possible). People tend to work harder and perform better when they are motivated to take something on, something incredibly useful and important to harness when relying on others to produce an elevated product.
3. Don't wait until the last minute to prepare. Quality, well-coordinated presentations take time and given that everyone has different demands on their time, you need to think ahead and plan accordingly.

However, despite very good intentions, there are cases where people refuse to reasonably pull their weight. **In the event that this is happening and you have already made clear and reasonable efforts to address it, you should contact Prof. Souza.** Be prepared to produce documentation showing your group's attempts to coordinate and work with the individual (i.e., multiple meetings scheduled but not attended, failure to produce promised work on a fair timeline). Such cases will be dealt with on a one-by-one basis and various outcomes are possible, including meeting with Prof. Souza, a mediation by Prof. Souza with the entire group, a complete reassessment of group work to more accurately reflect the effort given, a mark penalty commensurate to the infraction, and/or expulsion from the group and the assignment of a comparable assignment to make up that part of the grade.

Department of Psychology Missed Term Work Policy

For missed term work (assignments and term tests) due to illness, emergency, or other mitigating circumstances, please follow the procedures outlined below.

Note:

- The following reasons are not considered sufficient for missed term work: travel for leisure, weddings, personal commitments, work commitments, human error.
- [Missed Final Exams](#) are handled by the Registrar's Office and should be declared on eService.
- Instructors cannot accept term work any later than five business days after the last day of class. Beyond this date, accommodations are only possible via the Registrar's Office [petition process](#).

The email address to submit missed term work accommodation requests in PSYD59 is:

michael.souza@utoronto.ca

ILLNESS OR EMERGENCY accommodations:

For missed work due to ILLNESS OR EMERGENCY, complete the following process:

1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
2. Declare your absence on [ACORN](#) (Profile & Settings > Absence Declaration)

3. Email **both** of the following items to the course email **WITHIN 2 BUSINESS DAYS** of the missed work:
 - a. the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#)
AND
 - b. a screenshot of your Self-Declared Absence on ACORN

Note:

- If you are unable to submit your request within 2 business days, you must still email your instructor within the 2 business day window to explain the nature of the delay. Exceptions to the 2 business day deadline will only be made under exceptional circumstances.
- If your absence is declared on ACORN, we do not require any additional supporting documentation (e.g. medical notes) to support your missed term work accommodation request.

ACADEMIC CONFLICT accommodations:

For missed term work due to an ACADEMIC CONFLICT (e.g. two midterms at the same time):

1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
2. Take screenshots of your course Quercus pages that demonstrate the conflict.
3. Email the form and screenshots to the course email **at least two weeks (10 business days) before the date of the activity**, or as soon as possible if it was not possible to identify the conflict earlier. Requests sent after the activity deadline may not be accommodated.

Note:

- Multiple assignments due on the same day are not considered conflicts. Students are expected to manage their time effectively to meet assignment deadlines.
- Back-to-back tests/quizzes are not considered conflicts. Only overlapping activities are conflicts.
- Students are responsible for keeping their course timetables conflict-free. Students who register in two courses with overlapping lecture/tutorial/lab schedules will not be accommodated.

RELIGIOUS CONFLICT accommodations:

For missed term work due to a RELIGIOUS CONFLICT:

1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
2. Email the form to the course email **at least two weeks (10 business days) before the date of the activity**, or as soon as possible if it was not possible to identify the conflict earlier. Requests sent after the activity deadline may not be accommodated.

ACCESSABILITY SERVICES accommodations:

For missed **TERM TESTS** due to ACCESSABILITY REASONS:

- **Contact your AccessAbility consultant** and have them email the course email detailing accommodations required.

For missed **ASSIGNMENTS** due to ACCESSABILITY REASONS:

- If your desired accommodation is **within the scope** of your Accommodation Letter (e.g. your letter includes “extensions of up to 7 days” and you need 3 days):
 1. Complete the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#).
 2. Email the form ***AND*** your **Accommodation Letter** to the course email specifying how many days extension you are requesting.
- If your desired accommodation is **outside the scope** of your Accommodation Letter (e.g. your letter includes “extensions of up to 7 days” but you need more time than that):
 1. **Contact your AccessAbility consultant** and have them email the course email detailing the accommodations required.

Accommodation Procedure:

After submitting your documentation, you will receive a response from your instructor or TA. This form does not guarantee that you will be accommodated. The course instructor reserves the right to decide what

accommodations (if any) will be made. Failure to adhere to any aspect of this policy may result in a denial of your request. **You are responsible for checking your official U of T email and Quercus course announcements daily**, as accommodations may be time-critical.

For missed assignments, **do not wait for the instructor's response to resume work on your assignment.** Extensions may be as short as one business day, depending on the nature of the illness/emergency. Complete your assignment as soon as you're able, and email it to your instructor.

For an **anticipated absence** (e.g. a scheduled surgery or an illness with a prolonged recovery period), if you would like to request accommodations in advance, submit a [Verification of Illness Form](#) completed by your doctor AND the [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#) to the course email. Absences can be declared up to 14 days into the future on ACORN.

Missed Accommodations

If an accommodation is granted but a continued illness/emergency prevents you from meeting its requirements, you must repeat the missed term work procedure to request additional accommodations. **Please make it clear in your subject line that you are requesting a second accommodation.** E.g. If you are given an extension but are still sick and need more time, or if you miss a make-up term test, you must submit *another* [Request for Missed Term Work Accommodations Form](#) and declare your extended absence on ACORN. *Note: In the case of a missed make-up test, an opportunity to write a second make-up test may not necessarily be provided.

Disability-Related Accommodations (Accessibility)

Students with diverse learning styles and needs are welcome in this course. In particular, if you have a disability/health consideration that may require accommodations, please feel free to approach me and/or the AccessAbility Services Office (<http://www.uts.utoronto.ca/ability/>) as soon as possible.

AccessAbility Services staff (located in Rm AA142, Arts and Administration Building) are available by appointment to assess specific needs, provide referrals and arrange appropriate accommodations. Please contact 416-287-7560 (tel/TTY) or email ability.uts@utoronto.ca for more information.

The sooner you let us know your needs the quicker we can assist you in achieving your learning goals in this course.

Academic Integrity

Academic integrity is essential to the pursuit of learning and scholarship in a university, and to ensuring that a degree from the University of Toronto is a strong signal of each student's individual academic achievement. As a result, the University treats cases of cheating and plagiarism very seriously. The University of Toronto's Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters

(<http://www.governingcouncil.utoronto.ca/Assets/Governing+Council+Digital+Assets/Policies/PDF/ppiun011995.pdf>) outlines the behaviours that constitute academic dishonesty and the processes for addressing academic offences. Potential offences include, but are not limited to:

In papers and assignments:

- Using someone else's ideas or words without appropriate acknowledgement;
- Submitting your own work in more than one course without the permission of the instructor;
- Making up sources or facts;
- Obtaining or providing unauthorized assistance on any assignment.

On tests and exams:

- Receiving aid of any form from another person in the context of an examination
- Using or possessing unauthorized aids;
- Looking at someone else's answers during an exam or test;

- Misrepresenting your identity; and
- When you knew or ought to have known you were doing it.

In academic work:

- Falsifying institutional documents or grades;
- Falsifying or altering any documentation required by the University, including (but not limited to) doctor's notes; and
- When you knew or ought to have known you were doing so.

All suspected cases of academic dishonesty will be investigated following procedures outlined in the Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters. If students have questions or concerns about what constitutes appropriate academic behaviour or appropriate research and citation methods, they are expected to seek out additional information on academic integrity from their instructors or from other institutional resources.

Note that you may see advertisements for services offering grammar help, essay editing and proof-reading. Be very careful. If these services take a draft of your work and significantly change the content and/or language, you may be committing an academic offence (unauthorized assistance) under the *Code of Behaviour on Academic Matters*.

It is much better and safer to take your draft to the Writing Centre as early as you can. They will give you guidance you can trust. Students for whom English is not their first language should go to the English Language Development Centre.

If you decide to use these services in spite of this caution, you must keep a draft of your work and any notes you made before you got help and be prepared to give it to your instructor on request.

University's Plagiarism Detection Tool

Normally, students will be required to submit their course essays to the University's plagiarism detection tool for a review of textual similarity and detection of possible plagiarism. In doing so, students will allow their essays to be included as source documents in the tool's reference database, where they will be used solely for the purpose of detecting plagiarism. The terms that apply to the University's use of this tool are described on the Centre for Teaching Support & Innovation website (<https://uoft.me/pdt-faq>).

VII. Resources you will likely find helpful..

(a) **UTSC administrative information, academic support, and well-being**

[Quercus \(learning platform for this course\)](#)

[Important Dates and Deadlines](#)

[Academic Advising and Career Centre](#)

[Writing Services](#)

[AccessAbility](#)

[Health and Wellness](#)

(b) **Relevant academic programs and opportunities at UTSC**

[Psychology, Mental Health Studies Calendar](#) (course listings, program requirements, etc.)

[Chapter of Psi Chi, the International Honours Society in Psychology](#)

[Psychology and Neuroscience Departmental Association \(PNDA\)](#)

[Department of Psychology](#)

Assigned readings

- Cowley, E., Briley, D.A., Farrell, C. (2015). How do gamblers maintain an illusion of control. *Journal of Business Research*, 68, 2181-8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2015.03.018>
- Dixon, M.J., Graydon, C., Harrigan, K.A., Wjtowicz, L., Siu, V., Fugelsang, J.A. (2004). The allure of multi-line games in modern slot machines. *Addiction*, 109, 1920-8. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.12675>
- Farhat, L. C., Foster, D. W., Wampler, J., Krishnan-Sarin, S., Hoff, R. A., & Potenza, M. N. (2022). Casino gambling in adolescents: Gambling-related attitudes and behaviors and health and functioning relationships. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 38(3), 719-735. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-021-10083-6>
- Hunt, C. J., & Blaszczynski, A. (2019). Gambling disorder as a clinical phenomenon. In *Gambling Disorder* (pp. 15-27). Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-03060-5_2
- Meng, M. D., & Leary, R. B. (2021). Mitigating the detrimental effect of skeuomorphism on gambling behavior. *Journal of Consumer Affairs*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joca.12427>
- Molde, H., Holmøy, B., Merkesdal, A. G., Torsheim, T., Mentzoni, R. A., Hanns, D., ... & Pallesen, S. (2019). Are video games a gateway to gambling? A longitudinal study based on a representative Norwegian sample. *Journal of gambling studies*, 35(2), 545-557. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-018-9781-z>
- Nower, L., Blaszczynski, A., & Anthony, W. L. (2021). Clarifying gambling subtypes: the revised pathways model of problem gambling. *Addiction*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15745>
- Peter, S.C., Li, Q., Pfund, R.A. et al. Public Stigma Across Addictive Behaviors: Casino Gambling, eSports Gambling, and Internet Gaming. *J Gambl Stud* 35, 247–259 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-018-9775-x>
- Syvertsen, A., Erevik, E. K., Hanss, D., Mentzoni, R. A., & Pallesen, S. (2022). Relationships between exposure to different gambling advertising types, advertising impact and problem gambling. *Journal of gambling studies*, 38(2), 465-482. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-021-10038-x>
- Williams, R. J., Leonard, C. A., Belanger, Y. D., Christensen, D. R., El-Guebaly, N., Hodgins, D. C., ... & Stevens, R. M. (2021). Predictors of gambling and problem gambling in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 112(3), 521-529. <https://doi.org/10.17269/s41997-020-00443-x>
- Wohl, M.J.A., Enzle, M.E. (2002). The effects of near wins and near losses on self-perceived personal luck and subsequent gambling behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39, 184-91. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031\(02\)00525-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00525-5)
- Zendle, D., Cairns, P., Barnett, H., & McCall, C. (2020). Paying for loot boxes is linked to problem gambling, regardless of specific features like cash-out and pay-to-win. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 102, 181-191. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206767>

PSYD59: Course meeting schedule

May be subject to minor revisions with advance notice from the instructor

<u>Week</u>	<u>Date</u>	<u>Agenda for the day</u>	<u>Tasks/deadlines</u>
1	11-Jan	Course primer and expectations <i>Getting to know your colleagues</i>	<i>Quickly review assigned papers</i>
2	18-Jan	<i>Skills: Effective communication skills</i> <i>Skills: Crafting effective discussion prompts</i>	<i>Paper Presentation groups formed today</i>
3	25-Jan	<i>Skills: Effective summaries and discussions</i>	<i>Paper Presentation lottery today</i> Pre-reflection DUE this week
4	1-Feb	Illusion of Control; skeuomorphic design #1 (Cowley 2015) #2 (Meng & Leary 2021)	<i>Project groups formed this week</i> Disc Q DUE 29-Jan by 11:59PM
5	8-Feb	"Near misses" and multi-line slots #3 (Wohl 2003) #04 (Dixon 2014)	Disc Q DUE 05-Feb by 11:59PM
6	15-Feb	Video games and gambling #05 (Molde 2019) #06 (Zendle 2020)	Disc Q DUE 19-Feb by 11:59PM Topic proposals DUE this week
7	22-Feb	NO CLASS - Reading week	
8	1-Mar	Adolescent gambling; advertising #07 (Farhat 2022) #08 Syvertsen (2022)	Disc Q DUE 26-Feb by 11:59PM
9	8-Mar	Gambling Disorder; gambling in Canada #09 (Hunt 2019) #10 (Williams 2021)	Disc Q DUE 05-Mar by 11:59PM Revised proposals DUE this week
10	15-Mar	Gambling 'pathways;' stigma #11 (Nower 2021) #12 (Peter 2019)	Disc Q DUE 12-Mar by 11:59PM
11	22-Mar	Knowledge synthesis and reflection	-
12	29-Mar	<i>Skills: Telling a compelling research story</i> <i>Skills: Positive and constructive feedback</i>	-
13	5-Apr	Research presentation week!	Post-reflection DUE this week

Please note:

Depending on our final class size, adjustments may be made (i.e., eliminating a paper if we have 22 students), which may trigger a modest change in how the participation is calculated. Such changes will be discussed with the class as we move forward.