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N=2,702 – representative sample of adolescents (\(M_{age}=16.51; SD_{age}=1.17\))
- ✓ 72.9% gambled at least once in a lifetime
- ✓ Most frequent = sports betting
- ✓ Around 35% male adolescent regularly bet

CAGI-GPSS subscale results
- 12.9% high severity of adverse gambling related psychosocial consequences
- 17.3% low to moderate
- 69.8% no problems

Differences regarding the type of high-school
- ✓ Girls – no differences
- ✓ Boys – vocational school students have developed more adverse gambling consequences (23-28%) compared to those in grammar schools (18%)
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GENERAL AIMS OF THE PROGRAM

Prevention of youth gambling (minors)
Development of the „right” attitudes towards games of chance
Development of personally responsible gambling in the future
Prevention science standards (+structured psychosocial treatment interventions)

- socio-culturally sensitive
- right setting (school)
- based on theory and research
- developmentally matched (age)
- different teaching methods
- adequate length
- wide range of topics
- comprehensive (knowledge & skills)
- scientifically evaluated
- positive relationships

Ferland, Ladouceur, Vitaro, 2005
Derevensky et. al. 2006
Williams, West, Simson, 2006
St-Pierre, Derevensky, 2016

Williams, 2002
Davis, 2003
Nation et. al., 2003
Najavits, Grymala, George, 2003
Youth gambling prevention program „WHO REALLY WINS?“

PILOT IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION STUDY

T1 – T2: INTERVENTION GROUP

✓ Better knowledge about gambling
✓ Less cognitive distortions
✓ Same for all types of schools

▪ No effects on measured problem-solving skills
▪ No effects on measured refusal skills
▪ No effects on general self-efficacy

T1 – T2: CONTROL GROUP

▪ No differences on any variable
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Lenght:
• 3 days = 21 hour training

School – training pair/team:
• High-school counselors + teachers (training team)

Methods:
• Lectures, workshops, interactive discussion, role-playing

Educational package:
• Manual for trainers
• Workbooks for students
• Evaluation questionnaires

Dissemination of the Program on a national level (2016-today)
PRELIMINARY RESULTS FROM THE FIRST NATIONAL IMPLEMENTATION STUDY

First evaluation of the Program implemented by trained professionals
**T1**
Pre-test
Before the Program

**T2**
Post-test
After the Program

---

**Intervention group (N=631) short-term outcome evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>SCHOOL PROGRAM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>M=66.3%</strong></td>
<td><strong>F=33.7%</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL PROGRAM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAMMAR=16.8%</strong></td>
<td><strong>4y. VOCATIONAL=70.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>3y. VOCATIONAL=12.7%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>M=39.4%; F=60.6%</strong></td>
<td><strong>M=70.1%; F=29.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>M=82.4%; F=17.6%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mage=15.57; SDage=.785</strong></td>
<td><strong>Mage=15.53; SDage=.714</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRADE</strong></td>
<td>1st=34.3%; 2nd=65.7%</td>
<td>1st=44.7%; 2nd=55.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>17 Croatian cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Croatian schools</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Instrument / variables

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>T1 α</td>
<td>T2 α</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Gambling Related Knowledge Scale (<em>Huić et al.</em>, 2017)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.</strong> Gambling Related Cognitive Distortions Scale (<em>Ricijas et al.</em>, 2016)</td>
<td><em>Illusion of control</em></td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Probabilistic r. and superstitious t.</em></td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Problem Solving Skills Scale (<em>for this research</em>)</td>
<td><em>Problem solving</em></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.</strong> Resistance to Peer Pressure Skills Scale (<em>for this research</em>)</td>
<td><em>Peer pressure resistance</em></td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.</strong> Generalized Self-Efficacy Scale (<em>Schwarzer &amp; Jerusalem</em>, 1995)</td>
<td><em>Self-efficacy</em></td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.</strong> Gambling Activities (<em>Ricijaš &amp; Dodig</em>, 2013)</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.</strong> GPSS Subscale of CAGI (<em>Tremblay et al.</em>, 2010)</td>
<td><em>Problem gambling</em></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Cognition

KNOWLEDGE (0-20)

ILLUSION OF CONTROL (1-5)

PROBABILISTIC R. & SUPERSTITIOUS T. (1-5)

**p<.01
***p<.001
Results

Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEM SOLVING (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER PRESSURE RESISTANCE (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-EFFICACY (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GRAMMAR</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEM SOLVING (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER PRESSURE RESISTANCE (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-EFFICACY (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4Y VOCATIONAL</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEM SOLVING (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER PRESSURE RESISTANCE (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-EFFICACY (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3Y VOCATIONAL</th>
<th>T1</th>
<th>T2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PROBLEM SOLVING (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEER PRESSURE RESISTANCE (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-EFFICACY (1-5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results

Gambling activities (in the past 2 months)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GRAMMAR</th>
<th>4Y VOCATIONAL</th>
<th>3Y VOCATIONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPORTS BETTING</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIRTUAL BETTING</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLOTS</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOTTO</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCRATCH</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROULETTE</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
<td>![Bar Chart]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* *p<.05
** **p<.01
*** ***p<.001
Results

Symptoms

CAGI-GPSS SUBSCALE (0-27)

GRAMMAR

4Y VOCATIONAL

3Y VOCATIONAL

T1  T2

p>.05

No iatrogenic effects!
"Who really wins?" youth gambling prevention program proved its effectiveness in gambling related knowledge and cognitive distortions with no differences regarding the type of high-school.

Less gambling after the Program
- LOTTO – all types of high-schools
- SPORTS BETTING – 4y vocational schools

No iatrogenic effects on behavior change

CHALLENGES
- Convenient sample (intervention group)
- Different proportion of sample between schools
- No control group
- No long-term outcome evaluation results
- No process evaluation
- Problems with the reliability of two instruments:
  - Problem Solving Skills Scale
  - Resistance to Peer Pressure Skills Scale

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH
- Updated questionnaire
- Control and intervention groups
- Differences regarding the type of high school attended, separately for boys and girls
- Long-term outcome evaluation
- Process evaluation

New 4-year project proposal
Thank you for your attention!

E-mail: sabina.mandic@gmail.com