

Cognitive Styles of Gamblers and Smokers:A Comparative Study

Dr Neeta Gupta
Department of Psychology
Associate Professor
DAV (PG) College
Dehradun.

Abstract

The present study has tried to explore Cognitive Styles of Gamblers and Smokers. For this, the data was collected on 100 people. 50 Gamblers and 50 Smokers who were further classified into two groups i.e. Males (N=50) and Females (N=25) in each group of Smokers and Gamblers. The design which is used to conceptualize the data is 2X2 factorial design. Cognitive styles of the respondents were measured by using Cognitive Style Scale of Parveen (2011) which measures five types of cognitive styles. The obtained data was analyzed using Mean, S.D. and ANOVAs. The results had revealed that 1. Smokers were significantly found to use more Systematic Style while Gamblers were significantly found to use more undifferentiated Cognitive Style. 2. Boys were significantly found to use more Systematic style than girls while girls were found to use more Intuitive and Split Style. 3. No interaction was found to be significant on any of the dimensions of Cognitive Styles.

Keywords: Cognitive Styles, Smokers and Gamblers.

INTRODUCTION

The term Cognitive Styles was introduced by American Psychologist Gordon Allport (1967) in his famous theory of personality and from studies of Carl Jung. Cognitive Styles are general psychological dimensions by which people differ. Cognitive styles refer to the individual differences in ways of perceiving, remembering and thinking. A cognitive style is based on the way to process information and to use own, such as perception, thought, memory and that are related to the individual personality cognitive resources, (Santrock, 2011). People

also differ in their more or less intelligence to accept and tolerate incongruent or unusual perceptions or experiences regarding what the individual knows.

Cognitive styles describe a person's typical mode of thinking, remembering or problem-solving. Furthermore, styles are usually considered to be bipolar dimensions whereas abilities are unipolar. It is usually a personality dimension which influences attitudes, values and social interaction.

According to Manjula Devi(2016) Cognitive styles describe how the individuals acquire knowledge (cognition) and processes information (conceptualization). Cognitive styles are related to mental behaviour which individual apply habitually when they are solving problems. Since, all the people have their subjective ways of interpreting and understanding the situations it would be very interesting to know how the people suffering from addictive behaviour interpret and understand the things. So the present study has tried to explore Cognitive styles of Pathological Gamblers and Smokers.

Gambling starts from a fun, harmless diversion to an unhealthy obsession with serious consequences. Gambling becomes problem when it disrupts the life of a person. A compulsive or pathological gambler is someone who is unable to resist his or her impulses to gamble. This leads to severe personal and social consequences.

Smoking is a practice in which a substance is burned and the resulting smoke breathed into be tasted and absorbed into the bloodstream. Most commonly used is the dried leaves of the tobacco plant. (Wikipedia, 2017). Smoking is a hard habit to break because Tobacco contains nicotine, which is highly addictive and the mind quickly becomes so used to the nicotine that a person needs to have it just to feel normal. (KidsHealth, 2016). A smoker is a person who smokes tobacco regularly. People smoke for various reasons. Some people with mental-health problems smoke in depression or anxiety. They smoke to relieve their tension. They feel like smoking keeps their emotions under control, helping them to cope.

As it is clear that smokers and gamblers both have their different reasons for smoking and gambling. So it would be interesting and enlightening to explore the cognitive styles of these people.

RESEARCH-METHODOLOGY

Objectives:

1. To explore Cognitive-Styles of the Gamblers and Smokers.

2. To identify gender differences on Cognitive-Styles of the Adolescents.

Hypotheses:

1. There would be significant differences on Cognitive –Styles of the Gamblers and Smokers.
2. There would be significant gender differences on Cognitive-Styles of the Adolescents.
3. There would be significant interaction of Addictive disorders and Gender on different dimensions of Cognitive-Styles.

Design: The present study has utilized a 2x2 factorial design to conceptualize the study and analyze the data. One variable being Gender of the respondents being divided into two parts i.e. Males and Females and the other variable being Addictive disorders divided into two parts i.e. Gamblers and Smokers.

Tools-

Cognitive Style Inventory by Praveen (2011) was used to measure Cognitive Styles of the respondents. This scale measures Cognitive Styles through 40 questions. Each question has 5 points rating scale ranging from Strongly-Agree to Strongly-Disagree. The scale measures 5 types of Cognitive Styles. They are; Systematic Style, Intuitive Style, Integrated Style, Undifferentiated Style and Split Style.

Population and Sample: The data for the present study was collected on 100 adolescents of Lucknow city (U.P.). The data was collected on 50 Gamblers and 50 Smokers equally divided into Males and Females i.e. 50 Gamblers (M=25, F=25) and 50 Smokers (M=25, F=25). Precautions were taken while collecting the data. For example, only those gamblers were selected who were not smokers also and only those smokers were selected who were not involved in any type of gambling to avoid the overlapping because in the present study the effect of Gambling and Smoking is studied independently. The average age of the Males was 20.9 years and it was 19.9 for the females in both the groups of Gamblers and Smokers.

Theoretical Framework: Variables of the study contain dependent and independent variables. The independent variables are Addictive Disorders (Gamblers and Smokers) and Gender and dependent variable being Cognitive-Styles.

Procedure-The data was selected using quota sampling method. The respondents were contacted personally and the data was collected through Questionnaire method. The questionnaire required approximately 10-15 minutes to complete. The obtained data was analyzed using Mean, S.D. and ANOVAs.

Statistical-Tools:-The data was analyzed using Mean, S.D. and ANOVAs.

Results and Discussion-The results obtained are as under:

Table-1: Mean and SD on all dimensions of Cognitive Styles.

Cognitive Style	Gambler		Smoker		Total	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
1. Systematic Style						
Boys	59.18	11.09	85.28	11.19	72.23	11.14
Girls	50.79	12.92	63.32	10.09	57.05	11.50
Total	54.98	12.01	74.30	10.64		
2. Intuitive Style						
Boys	68.29	15.82	57.01	13.92	63.05	14.07
Girls	73.80	12.12	63.92	15.25	68.86	13.68
Total	71.04	14.01	60.86	14.58		
3. Integrated Style						
Boys	65.82	14.32	72.58	15.82	69.20	15.07
Girls	70.21	13.22	66.29	12.28	68.25	12.75
Total	68.01	13.77	69.43	14.05		
4. Undifferentiated Style						
Boys	75.01	14.02	65.23	13.92	70.12	13.47
Girls	71.84	11.95	70.48	11.45	71.17	11.70
Total	73.42	12.98	67.85	12.68		
5. Split Style						
Boys	75.34	13.82	69.82	15.81	78.03	14.81
Girls	81.29	15.27	75.64	17.52	72.46	16.39

Total	78.31	14.54	72.45	16.66
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Table-2 Summary ANOVAs

Cognitive Style	Group	Gender	Group X Gender
1.Systematic Style	6.09**	6.32**	1.59
2.Intuitive Style	1.64	7.09**	1.73
3.Integrated Style	1.79	2.15	0.89
4.Undifferentiated Style	10.25**	1.01	2.11
5.Split Style	2.01	9.35**	1.85

**= Significant at .01 level

1. Cognitive Styles among Gamblers and Smokers-As it is evident from the inspection of Table-2 that few dimensions of cognitive styles were found to be significant. The result partially support the first hypothesis stating that there would be significant differences on Cognitive –Styles of the Gamblers and Smokers.

As it is evident from the inspection of Table-1 that Gamblers were found to use Undifferentiated style significantly more than Smokers. While Systematic Style was found to be used more by Smokers as compared to Gamblers. No other significant differences were found on the use of other dimensions of Cognitive Styles.

The systematic style is associated with logical, rational behaviour that uses a well defined step by step approach to thinking, learning and overall plan. While Undifferentiated individuals tend to be withdrawn, passive and reflective and look to others for problem-solving strategies. The gamblers were found to report more undifferentiated styles because gamblers are significantly more likely to experience mood disorders. (Lister et al 2015). Lister et al (2015) also reported that a co-occurring mood disorder was associated with higher personality scores for alienation and stress reaction, lower scores for well being, social closeness, and control as well as higher impulsiveness score for urgency and lack of premeditation. These results support the findings of the present study. Gamblers

because of their mood-fluctuations and impulsivity tend to be found reflexive, passive and withdrawn.

While Smokers were found to use significantly more Systematic style as most of the smokers report that they smoke to reduce their tensions and anxieties. So they plan and go strategically in all the aspects of their life.

This result of the present study stands in contrast with the findings of Brown and Bond (2015) who reported that there was a strong tendency for smokers to report both low rational and high experiential thinking.

Since some smokers smoke cigarettes to help ease the signs and symptoms of stress. They perceive it as 'Self-Medication'. They smoke to eliminate their stress so that they won't feel anxious and depressed. So they smoke with logic and rationally. They have reason why they smoke and they perceive that smoking helps them in better thinking, learning and in overall planning.

2. Gender Differences in Cognitive Styles-As it is evident from the inspection of Table-2 that few dimensions of Cognitive Styles were found to be significant supporting the second hypothesis stating that there would be significant gender differences on Cognitive-Styles of the Adolescents.

As it is clear from the inspection of Table-1 that boys were significantly found to use more Systematic Style and more Split Style as compared to girls while girls were significantly found to use more Intuitive Style than girls.

Systematic Style as we know is associated with logical and rational behaviour, which is significantly used more by boys in the present study. In other words, it can also be said that boys in the present study, are more logical and rational than girls. These results may be attributed to the fact that boys, from the beginning of their life, are encouraged and supposed to behave and think rationally. They are trained to see the cause and effect relationships of everything right from the very beginning of their socialization because they are considered as the breadwinners. They are necessarily have to engage in some gainful activities as they have to fulfill all the financial demands of their family in future. While employment is still optional for girls. So in their child-rearing they are not forced to be rational. The rationality and logic is not cultivated in their personality. If they are curious, they themselves become logical but they are not as trained as their male counterparts because they are supposed to primarily rear their children and run the family. So they develop the schemas and cognitions accordingly.

These results stand in contrast with the findings of Gupta(2016) who reported no significant gender differences on Systematic Cognitive style of

boys and girls. Boys were also found to use Split Style significantly more than girls. An individual rating in the middle range on both the systematic and the intuitive scale is considered to have a split style involving fairly equal (average) degrees of systematic and intuitive specialization. This result of the present study are not supported by the findings of Gupta(2016) who reported no significant Gender differences on split dimension of the cognitive style.

It is clear from the inspection of the Table-1 that girls used significantly more intuitive style than boys suggesting that as compared to boys, girls rate low in systematic scale and high on intuitive scale. The intuitive style supposes a reliance on fast, automatic answers. This result suggests that like boys, the girls don't plan their actions rather they respond immediately and fastly depending upon the demands of the situations. Again the child rearing practices are important for this. Since the girls are trained to be multi-tasker and the expectations of their family and society is not very high for them. So they don't work under pressure. They respond spontaneously and need not to plan each and every aspect before implementing them in action.

These result stand in contrast with the findings of Gupta (2016) who found that boys were found to use more intuitive style of cognition than girls. All these gender differences may be attributed to child-rearing practices and to the environment in which a child grows. All the informations gathered from the environment makes the schema of the individuals. A schema is cognitively organised network of associations that is readily available to help and guide individual's perception and thinking. The child learns the contents of the society, things that are related to their own and opposite sex, and incorporates it into their gender schemas. The child then learns to apply the appropriate attributes respectively to the right gender by selectively using this knowledge to conceptualize their own cognitions. Hence, categorizing how they should perform and interpret various situations by molding their capabilities to match the schematic labels (Bem, 1981). No significant gender differences were found on Integrative and Undifferentiated dimentions of the Cognitive Style.

No significant interaction of Gender and Groups were found on any of the dimensions of cognitive styles. These results reject the third hypothesis stating that there would be significant interaction of Addictive disorders and Gender on different dimensions of Cognitive-Styles.

Conclusion-The present study has tried to explore cognitive styles of the Gamblers and Smokers. The reults have revealed few significant differences on cognitive styles used by Gamblers and Smokers. For example Gamblers were

significantly found to use more Undifferentiated Style while Smokers were found to use more Systematic Style of the cognition. The results show light on how Gamblers and Smokers perceive and interpret the situations and how males and females differ in their ways of perceiving, thinking and interpreting things. The patterns by which gambling and smoking related Cognitions mediate the relationship between thinking style and Gamblers and Smokers severity suggest that thereapeutical interventions way benefit from considerations of a gambler's and smoker's thinking. The study also reveals as how and why Gamblers and Smokers interpret and perceive the things. So when coming to the implementation of social programmes aimed at children, the people can help those who want to stop gambling and smoking. Better cognitive styles should be cultivated in the personalities of the future generation to make them more rational and logical rather than accepting all the things and rituals blindly.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W. (1967): Personal Religions, orientation and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 5(4), 432.
- Bem, S.L. (1981): Gender Schema Theory: A Cognitive account of Sex Typing. *Psychological Review*. 88(4), 354-364.
- Brown, L.J. and Bond, M.J. (2015): Thinking about Smoking: a novel Approach to describing Cognitive Styles. *Personality and Individual differences-Elsevier*.
- Devi, M. (2016): Cognitive Style and Academic Achievement of Standard IX students. *Paripex-Indian Journal of Research*, April, 5(4), 46-47.
- Gupta, N. (2016): Cognitive styles among Rural and Urban Adolescents: A comparative Study. *Golden Research Thought*. Vol-6, Issue-5, Nov
- Kidshealth (2016): <https://kidshealth.org> Renewed in June 2016.
- Lister, J.J. Milosevic, A. Ledgerwood, M. (2015): Psychological characteristics of Problem Gamblers with and without Mood Disorders. *Can J. Psychiatry*, Aug. 60 (8): 369-376.
- Praveen, J. (2011): Cognitive Style Scale. National Psychological Corporation. Kacheri Ghat, Agra.
- Santrock, J.W. (2011): Educational Psychology. McGraw Hill Education-Europe.
- Wikipedia (2017): <http://en.m.wikipedia.org>