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ABOUT THE RESEARCH

NATIONAL RESEARCH
„Gambling of high-school students in Croatia”

- N=2,702
- 7 cities/towns included

NATIONAL RESEARCH
„Gambling of high-school students in Bosnia and Herzegovina”

- Parallel study within Croatian project
- N=1,036
- 2 cities/towns included
### University of Zagreb

- **Faculty of Education and Rehabilitation Sciences**
  - Project holder
  - Leader:
    - Neven Ricijas, asst.prof.
  - Associates:
    - Dora Dodig Hundric, PhD.
    - Valentina Kranzelic, assoc.prof.

- **Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences**
  - Associate:
    - Aleksandra Huic, PhD.

### University of Tuzla
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WHY THE COMPARISON?

DIFFERENCES
- Croatia
  - EU Member State
  - Predominantly Chatolics (87%)
- Bosnia & Herzegovina
  - Predominantly Muslim by religion (51%)

SIMILARITIES
- Both were part of Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
- Geographic proximity
- Almost identical language
- Political, geopolitical & socio-economic similarities and connections
Uncontrolled expansion in gambling venues – especially sports betting (in residential areas, close to schools etc.)

No adequate regulation (especially accessibility and availability)

No adequate legal rules and/or guidelines for advertising

Loose understanding of legal rules (<18 etc.)

Lack of specific prevention and/or treatment interventions for young people
Pairing samples

- **CROATIA** (n=2,702)
  1. Zagreb
  2. Split
  3. Rijeka
  4. Osijek
  5. Slavonski Brod
  6. Vinkovci
  7. Koprivnica

- **BOSNIA&HERZEGOVINA** (n=1,036)
  1. Sarajevo
  2. Tuzla

**National capitals**

**Geographical proximity**

**Similar size**
## CROATIA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3y vocational</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4y vocational</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- N=956
- M=454 (47.5%)
- F=502 (52.5%)
- Mage=16.63 (SD=1.202)

## BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF SCHOOL</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3y vocational</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4y vocational</td>
<td>651</td>
<td>62.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General education</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high-school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- N=1,036
- M=515 (49.7%)
- F=521 (50.3%)
- Mage=16.60 (SD=1.023)

*Equal in number, gender & age*
# MEASURES

1. GENERAL SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

2. GAMBLING ACTIVITIES QUESTIONNAIRE

3. CANADIAN ADOLESCENT GAMBLING INVENTORY (CAGI)  
   (TREMBLAY ET AL., 2010.)

4. MOTIVATION FOR GAMBLING CHECK-LIST

5. RISK AND DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR SCALE  
   (ATLANTA ET AL., 2005.)

6. COGNITIVE DISTORTIONS RELATED TO GAMBLING

7A. INTERNATIONAL PERSONALITY ITEM POOL – 50 (IPIP-50)  
   (MLAČIĆ & GOLDBERG, 2007.)

7B. ZIMBARDO TIME-PERSPECTIVE INVENTORY (ZTPI)  
   (ZIMBARDO & BOYD, 1999.)

8. GAMBLING EXPERIENCE AND GAMBLING BEHAVIOR QUESTIONS
## I. GAMBLING ACTIVITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of game</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>Once a year or less</th>
<th>Once a month</th>
<th>Once a week</th>
<th>Several times a week</th>
<th>Every day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VLTs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports betting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- VLTs: Occasionally
- Sports betting: Regularly
- Lottery: Never
### Frequency of REGULAR gambling

**>= 1x per week**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CRO (N=956)</th>
<th>B&amp;H (N=1,036)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sports betting</strong></td>
<td>21,0%</td>
<td>13,7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lottery</strong></td>
<td>2,7%</td>
<td>4,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scratch cards</strong></td>
<td>2,6%</td>
<td>4,4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VLTs</strong></td>
<td>7,5%</td>
<td>1,5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roulette</strong></td>
<td>3,8%</td>
<td>1,2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Betting on virtual races</strong></td>
<td>7,3%</td>
<td>3,3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Country differences regarding gambling intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Game of chance</th>
<th>Effect size (r)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports betting</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLTs</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roulette</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual races</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Small to medium effect sizes

Game of chance:

- Scratch cards
II. GAMBLING RELATED PROBLEMS

Canadian Adolescent Gambling Inventory (CAGI)
Gambling Problem Severity Subscale (GPSS)

“RED LIGHT”
High severity
(6+ points)

“YELLOW LIGHT”
Low-to-moderate severity
(2-5 points)

“GREEN LIGHT”
No problem
(0-1 points)
Chi-Square = 15,816
p = .000

THE WHOLE SAMPLE

CRO (n=956)
- Red Light: 15.10%
- Yellow Light: 17.40%
- Green Light: 67.60%

B&H (n=936)
- Red Light: 9.30%
- Yellow Light: 16.70%
- Green Light: 74.00%
THE SUBSAMPLE OF HIGH-SCHOOL BOYS

Chi-Square = 27,660
p = .000

CRO (n=454)
- Red Light: 29.10%
- Yellow Light: 26.20%
- Green Light: 44.70%

B&H (n=496)
- Red Light: 15.90%
- Yellow Light: 25.20%
- Green Light: 58.90%
THE SUBSAMPLE OF HIGH-SCHOOL GIRLS

Chi-Square = 2,101
p = .362

RED LIGHT  |  YELLOW LIGHT  |  GREEN LIGHT
---|---|---
CRO (n=502) | 2.40% | 9.40% | 88.20%
B&H (n=440) | 1.80% | 7.00% | 91.10%
Do your parents know that you sometimes gamble?
(Yes / No / I don’t gamble)

„Yes, they do.“

Chi-Square = 12.046
p = 0.002
IV. GAMBLING WITH PARENTS

Chi-Square = 18,205
p = .000

Chi-Square = 1,726
p = .126

Chi-Square = 68,197
p = .000

Chi-Square = 6,546
p = .012

20,30% 13,10%
Sports betting

2,20% 1,40%
VLTs

24,10% 10,00%
Lottery

20,80% 16,20%
Scratch cards

CRO B&H
CONCLUSION

- Expansion of empirical research and knowledge
  - Parents’ perception
  - Student gambling
- Youth gambling prevention program „Who really wins?”

- Significant presence of gambling & gambling related problems
- The necessity of implementing Croatian good practice examples
Thank you for your attention! 😊
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