The and tversky 193). over the years the

The nature of perception and your own feelings was famously questioned by psychologist Daniel Kahneman.

His experiments resulted in many findings with including the approach of the " prospect theory" of the problem solving people do before they make a choice. The results then showed the way a human brain works on the problem solving pattern even when the subjects did not know what the next move was. There was the further discovery that the brain, after a loss or a win the complex pattern the brain creates makes you a gambling addict. " These features of gambling games promote an ' illusion of control': the belief that the gambler can exert skill over an outcome that is actually defined by chance"(Clark 1). The person mainly in the situation of either winning or losing would most likely rely on their form of complex processing of a win or lost.

This is the mind relying on the probability of the next move, it could be either after one or multiple wins and losses the person will create a pattern in their head. As Kahneman and his associate states, " After observing a long run of red on the roulette wheel, most people erroneously believe the black is now due"(Kahneman & Tversky 193). Over the years the findings of Daniel Kahneman extended to the complexity of a gambling addiction. The main reason into getting a gambling addiction is the confidence you have in your personality. Also, the curiosity of getting the outcome or prize for the gamble. " You might rather have $100 for sure than a 50 percent chance of getting $200.

You discount the value of the probabilistic option"(Duggan 1). The thought of being at risk of either winning or losing the subject will most likely see the " probabilistic option" and hope for the win to give the brain more information, resulting in more pressure if you wanted the bigger outcome. Further findings gave a clearer understanding of the complexity the human brain has. Yet, in the experiment Kahneman gathered the thoughts people have from what they experienced before. " Consequently, judgements can frequently be wrong, because they are based on information that comes easily, rather than that has actual probability"(Kahneman 193). When the time comes to some form of gambling you as the subject can be as confident or as hesitant as possible. Either way there is a big chance of losing no matter on how skilled you are in anyway of gambling or betting.

These psychologists' work influenced my experiment of gambling and if people believe probability over their feelings. It is mostly common for people to choose. I decided to choose Oreos because, like money, people can't get enough of them. My testers will be freshman and sophmores because these students will be oblivious to the experiment. Also, Freshmen and Sophomores are known to be less mature than Juniors and Seniors so it will work perfectly.

For example, I used a sophomore student that is normally confident named Cesar. He made my results more interesting because his character is strong and very easy to pick up. Then, I seen a freshman who seemed very quiet along with the other freshman in the classroom. I am not familiar with their names however they gave the actions opposite to Cesar. Altogether, there

were in total of eight students that I tested on who had the opposite personality to Cesar.

I will do the experiment in a room that has a smartboard to show the computer screen. What I'll pull up on the screen is a random number generator that will show either the same or different number. This generator is the most important piece of the experiment. Before, I proceeded doing the experiment I tested the generator and it showed numbers twice. However, it will test if the numbers show twice if they want to change their number. Even if I tested the generator and it repeated numbers, I will not know what number will show up so it will be fair to the students. I'll gather them in the room and sit them down. I've already setted up the room looking at the smartboard and myself in the front giving them instructions of what is going on.

I told them that I am going to distribute the Oreos and give them 3 Oreos. Now, I tell the students have to at least bet one Oreo and say their number. The numbers the people have to choose from are between one and nine. Then, I'll see if they are confident or just thinking by taking a long moment to respond. After observing I'll press the number generator and get a random number.

I'll repeat this another time and ask the students a question: do you want to change your number? They could either change their number or keep it the same whichever is fine but if they do change their response it will be interesting. Now I'll do it one more time and that will be the end of the experiment. Once the experiment is finished, I'll ask the students a question

that if the number they chose the second time was a choice because of the numbers showing or because they were not winning. My hypothesis going into the experiment was that 60% of the students will change their number after 2 times.

In the beginning I first observed their body language which to me it said everything. The choice of Oreos made all the students interested but once I said that they have to give one Oreo the students did not acquiesce and take my instructions. Which I expected mainly from one of the freshman named Paola. I know her before the experiment and she kept on saying " can I eat the Oreos" or " why do we have to do this". I told her simply that, " you see all of the Oreos I distributed they all could be yours if you bet". Something that I made sure I said clearly to her but I said it in a way to persuade all the other students. To make things easier for me Mr. Tarantino was in the room and volunteered to write down the names with their numbers right next to it.

I went from left to right and asked each one of them to choose a number between 1 and 9. I also predicted that they would first stay in their own mindset and choose a different number and it became true. Then, I walk to the computer and show them that I'll be clicking the icon to show the random number on the website random. org.

After the first one, a freshman won the Oreos and was very surprised since this student gave the expression of not caring about the experiment. I did not know anything about the student since this is the first time I've seen this student. Compared to the other students, Cesar gave the same attitude even before the first time I generated number.

All the students now have to give away the Oreos they betted and were not happy and nobody bet more than one Oreo. That showed the students did not want to take a risk of losing their Oreos because all of them when they saw that I had Oreos for the experiment, I thought the students that knew me were going to ask me for a Oreo because it is a natural reaction. The second time I told all them that they had to bet one Oreo. Now, every single one of the students that did not win, now said this isn't fair because the person who won has the most Oreos and he has to bet two or three.

I said no and did not explain why I said no. In my head, in the moment I wanted to make it even more interesting of the nature of having envy. All of these students weren't actually mad at the instructions, they were frustrated at the student who had the most. This correlates to the real world of gambling because if the one person wins the bet it will make the gamblers more competitive and get the complicated probability of winning or losing. This now is now the point that I use the random number generator again to get the anonymous number. The number that shows up is 5 and another student gets one Oreo from all the students. This is now the part that gets me the interesting correlation of social pressure. I tell the students that, " I'm going to do it one more time do you guys want to change the number you picked?".

One thing I never thought of was either if the students should look at each other to talk or not look at each other and talk at all. Two students one of them is Paola she whispered to her classmate and her classmate nodded and changed her number to one of the winning people in the gamble. Another

was a freshman seeing Cesar's confidence and looked forward. Yet, 85% of the students chose to change their number and my hypothesis was proven to be wrong. Now, 2 out of the 8 students chosen not to change their number compared to the rest that changed their number due to the " domino effect" of Paola and her classmate decision. Now, since 6 of the students changed their number and 2 did not I ran the generator one more time. It said 5 again and this made students ask the question of " if the generator is rigged" and that I knew about the numbers that were going to pop up.

This time I explained to them since this was the ending of the experiment that it is not rigged, but the generator somehow throws people off. They questioned that as well, of throwing them off and giving the same numbers. I said " the number generator somehow repeats itself when it is not a wide range of numbers, since it was a small range of numbers to choose from there was a high chance of repeating itself". They now understood and now I asked them a question of how did the gamble go and did you choose from probability or from what you believe in? One of the freshman students said, " I just chose my lucky number 5, but I did think about it for a moment". Then, I asked Cesar and he said, " I just chose a number I didn't really think about it". That brought up a point because Cesar did not change his number at all throughout the experiment, as well as the student with the lucky number.

Cesar, and the other student did not win however they had the confidence and did not choose from probability.