



Norwegian Playscan-users' view of their risk assessment

David Forsström, Alexander Rozental, Emma Danielsson & Per Carlbring

Background



- Behavior tracking has been investigated in several studies (Adami et al., 2013; Braverman & Shaffer, 2012; Dragicevic, Percy, Kudic, & Parke, 2013; Dragicevic, Tsogas, & Kudic, 2011; Percy, França, Dragičević, & d'Avila Garcez, 2016; Philander, 2013)
- Differences over time, several gamblers using one account, and gamblers using different sites calls for different research methods (Chagas & Gomes, 2017)
- Discrepancy perceived and actual spending (Auer & Griffiths, 2018). This result suggest that feed back on gambling behavior might be a delicate matter

Aim of the study

- Gamblers' views needs to be included in the general discourse concerning behavior tracking
- **Overarching aim:** To explore Norwegian gamblers' view of their risk assessment in the responsible gambling tool Playscan
- **Specific questions:**
 - How does the result of the risk assessment correlate with the general view of Playscan and the accuracy of the assessment?
 - How does the gamblers comment on their risk assessment?

Methods

- Both quantitative and qualitative data
- Included risk assessment, assessment by gambler of how accurate the risk assessment was and the general view of Playscan
- Risk assessment reduced to three levels (low, medium and high risk of developing gambling problems)
- The other assessments were estimated on a scale from 1-9
- Qualitative comments on a general level

Methods

- Data was collected between 2015-03-19 to 2015-05-06.
- In total 757 comments were collected
- 79 % men and 21% women
- Mean age was 49 (SD =13) years
- Similar to previous studies

Results

Correlations between the risk assessment, general view of Playscan, and the accuracy of the risk assessment

	Risk assessment	Accuracy of the risk assessment	General view of Playscan	Age
Risk assessment				
Accuracy of the risk assessment	-0,541**			
General view of Playscan	-0,346**	0,728*		
Age	0.156**	-0,127**	-0.093*	

Results

- 40% of the comments were positive, 36% negative, and 24% were neutral and was related to other aspects of the tool
- Several themes emerged, e.g. positive aspects of the tool, lack of understanding what Playscan is and explaining ones risk assessment
- One theme was comprised of different ways of expressing a positive experience. A second theme was an appreciation from the gamblers that Norsk Tipping provided the tool
- Some felt helped by the tool and some thought the tool was helpful, but it was not for them

Results

- Some gamblers just gave a negative review, another theme was that the gambler was not at risk, the assessment did not take into account if there were several gamblers using one account, and that it did not take winnings or income into account
- Some of the gamblers just criticized Playscan in general way saying that it can not help gamblers
- Some gamblers report that they do not understand the concept of Playscan
- Also, some of the gamblers provide explanations for their high risk rating

Discussion

- How to handle cognitive dissonance when the risk assessment and the view of its accuracy does not match. The gamblers express negative emotions (anger)
- The equilibrium between an overall level and individual variation is difficult question to handle which the negative comments show
- The discrepancy actual spending and is perceived spending substantiated further. Based on the negative correlation between accuracy and risk assessment. More complex way of analysing this discrepancy
- A pedagogic stance is needed to communicate the feed back

Discussion

- Adopting a proactive stance has shown positive results (Jonsson et al, 2018)
- Gamblers do not mind if gambling companies contact them (Ivanova et al, 2019)
- Much can be done in terms of feed back to gamblers
- What is purpose of feed back to gamblers and how can it be used in the best possible way?

Limitations



- The included participants choose to comment on their results.
Might only reflect the extreme answers
- Short survey. Limited information. A more extensive questionnaire might give a better perspective
- No information about gambling on other sites. The accuracy of risk assessment can be questioned

Future research

- More studies investigating gamblers' view of RG tools
- How different types messages are received
- On a general level, different types of responsible gambling measures needs to be investigated from gamblers' point of view
- A longer survey about gamblers' view of their risk assessment needs to be carried out
- Merge the results from aggregated data with the gamblers perspective

Thank you!

E-mail: david.fosstrom@su.se