The influence of symbolic generalisation on simulated slot machine choice

Alice E. Hoon¹ and Simon Dymond^{1,2}

Swansea University¹ Reykjavik University²



Traditional behavioural accounts of gambling

- Schedules of reinforcement are fundamental to gambling behaviour: Matching law
- Skinner (1971). Variable Ratio schedule is at the heart of gambling.
- Haw (2008); Weatherly et al (2009): Ps do not always prefer the slot with highest payout.
- Rule governed behaviour: schedules of reinforcement overridden by externally delivered rules
- Can schedules of reinforcement account for all aspects of gambling behaviour?
- How might verbal behaviour influence gambling?

Contemporary behaviour analytic account of gambling

- Relational Frame Theory (RFT) contemporary behaviour analytic account of language and cognition
- Explains how humans can learn in the absence of direct reinforcement, through the way we relate stimuli
- Relate things in non-arbitrary and arbitrary ways.

Derived stimulus relations

 Relate stimuli to one another – any stimuli can become related (derived relational responding)



Derived stimulus relations

 Relate stimuli to one another – any stimuli can become related (derived relational responding). Emergent relations have not been explicitly trained.



Transformation of function

"When a given stimulus in a relational network has certain psychological functions, the functions of other events in that network may be modified in accordance with the underlying derived relation" (Hayes et al., 2001, p 31).





Present experiment

- Could derived verbal rules be involved in slot machine choice?
- Could we experimentally manipulate to participants derive an 'arbitrary rule' with regard to structural characteristics of a slot machine, and influence slot machine choice?

Overview

Phases 1 & 2: A < B < C < D < E

Phase 3:

Slot machine C

0.2 payout probability

Slot machine X

0.8 payout probability

Phase 4: Presented concurrent choice of all combinations of slot machine

Participants

- Participants: N = 88, aged 18 to 30 years (M = 21.33, SD = 2.79).
- Ps randomly assigned to one of four conditions:
- Condition 1: E > D >C > B > A
- Condition 2: A > B > C > D > E
- Condition 3: A < B < C < D < E
- Condition 4: E < D < C < B < A

Non-arbitrary relational training



Non-arbitrary relational training



Arbitrary relational training



Arbitrary relational training



Arbitrary relational training



- A < B < C < D < E
- VEK < JOM < BIH < CUG < PAF

Phase 2: Arbitrary training and testing A < B < C < D < E

Trained Relations	A < B	B < C	C < D	D < E		
Mutually Entailed	B > A	C > B	D > C	E > D		
Combinatorially Entailed	A < C	B < D	C < E	C > A	D > B	E > C
	A < D	B < E	D > A	E > B		

Phase 3: Training discriminative slot machine functions



Slot machine C

0.2 payout



Slot machine X

0.8 payout

Phase 4: Preference testing (Test for transformation of functions)



Concurrently presented with choice between two slot machines labelled with the nonsense words. All possible combinations presented four times.

Phase 4: Test for transformation of functions A>B>C>D>E



Results

Mean trials to criterion and the mean number of exposures (with standard deviations in brackets) during non-arbitrary and arbitrary relational training and testing phases for all conditions.

Condition	Phase 1:	Phase 1:	Phase 2: CR	Phase 2: CR	Phase 3:	Phase 3: No.	Phase 3:	Phase 4:
	Non-	Non-	Non-	Non-	Arbitrary	exposures	Arbitrary	Arbitrary
	arbitrary	arbitrary	arbitrary	arbitrary	training	to Arbitrary	test (ME)	test (CE)
	training	test	training	test		training		
1 (E>A)	13.51 (7.36)	7.97 (0.19)	10.64 (2.02)	7.96 (0.19)	9.53 (2.43)	2.41 (0.19)	30.07 (3.34)	50.24
								(10.26)
2 (A>E)	12.70 (4.20)	7.96 (0.19)	10.5 (1.90)	8 (0)	9.94 (2.31)	2.40 (1.52)	31.52 (1.39)	53.21 (5.97)
3 (A <e)< th=""><th>12.96 (6.39)</th><th>7.93 (0.26)</th><th>11.4 (4.24)</th><th>8.16 (0.55)</th><th>10.86 (7.21)</th><th>2.60 (1.80)</th><th>30.79 (1.36)</th><th>53.19 (5.89)</th></e)<>	12.96 (6.39)	7.93 (0.26)	11.4 (4.24)	8.16 (0.55)	10.86 (7.21)	2.60 (1.80)	30.79 (1.36)	53.19 (5.89)
4 (E <a)< th=""><th>10.65 (1.84)</th><th>7.82 (0.39)</th><th>10.83 (2.36)</th><th>8 (0)</th><th>9.92 (2.52)</th><th>2.03 (1.03)</th><th>30.60 (2.14)</th><th>54.80 (1.38)</th></a)<>	10.65 (1.84)	7.82 (0.39)	10.83 (2.36)	8 (0)	9.92 (2.52)	2.03 (1.03)	30.60 (2.14)	54.80 (1.38)

Note: CR refers to constructed response training; ME refers to mutual entailment test trials; CE refers to combinatorial entailment test trials.

Results

A<B<C<D<E



Results

D









E<D<C<B<A



Conclusions

- Participants showed preferences for slotmachine despite no history of a win on that machine
- Derived verbal self-rules may influence slot machine choice such that Slot machine choice may be influenced by labels or names given to slot-machines

Limitations & implications

Limitations

- Real world gambling?
- Challenge: balancing controlled experimental design vs translational implications

Implications

Talking therapies such as ACT – identifying maladaptive verbal rule following

Alice E. Hoon, Craig Bickford, Lotte Samuels & Simon Dymond (2019) 'This slot is hotter than that one': symbolic generalization of slot machine preference in simulated gambling, International Gambling Studies, DOI: <u>10.1080/14459795.2019.1602159</u>

Thanks for listening!

a.e.hoon@swansea.ac.uk



