

Ongoing Evaluation of a Self-Exclusion Program

Marvin A. Steinberg, Ph.D.

Connecticut Council on Problem Gambling

William Velardo

Mohegan Sun

12th International Conference on Gambling & Risk-Taking

Vancouver, British Columbia

May 26- May 30, 2003

Introduction

- Currently, there is considerable debate about the value of self-exclusion programs. Do they benefit the patron and/or the casino...or neither?
- Discussions of the value of self-exclusion programs have been primarily based on assumptions and anecdotes. This study adds to the limited research data that are available.

Method

- The data reported in this study are based upon the collection of survey information from patrons of a large casino.
- Patrons were asked at the time of self-exclusion to fill out a survey containing 51 questions.
- The study encompasses the period of January 1, 2000 through May 21, 2003
- During this period of time 479 patrons self-excluded and 235 (49%) voluntarily filled out the survey.

Demographics of Baseline Survey

<u>Total Number</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
235	63%	38%
Mean Age:	39	42

Race/Ethnicity

	<u>%</u>
African American	14
Caucasian	68
Latino/Hispanic	2
Asian/Pacific Islander	8
Native American	2
Other	6

Marital Status

	<u>%</u>
Married	41
Separated	8
Divorced	23
Single	27
Other	2

Household Income

	<u>%</u>
\$0- 24,999	16
\$25,000-\$34,999	16
\$35,000-\$59,999	31
\$60,000 +	37

Source of Primary Income

	<u>%</u>
Full-Time Work	79
Part-Time Work	11
Other	10

How did the patrons find out about self-exclusion:

	<u>%</u>
Friend or Family:	37
GA:	13
Psychotherapist:	11
Employee at Mohegan Sun:	8
Other Mohegan Sun customer:	6
Literature at Mohegan Sun:	6
Other:	16

Months Gambled at Mohegan Sun

	<u>Mean Months</u>
Overall:	39 Months
Male:	40 Months
Female:	37 Months

Who was important in the decision to self-exclude?

	<u>%</u>
Only Myself:	57
Spouse/Partner:	27
Other family members:	8
Mohegan Sun employee:	<1
Psychotherapist:	4
Other:	9

Mean Estimated Losses

	<u>Overall</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Last 12 months:	\$24,773	\$30,196	\$16,483
Over lifetime:	\$131,377	\$173,011	\$53,572
Currently owe:	\$19,779	\$23,803	\$14,077

SOGS Results

<u>Score</u>	<u>Self-Excluders</u>
> 5	95.3%
3 and 4	1.7%
< 2	3%

Breakdown of scores >5

5-9	34.4%
10-14	41.5%
15-19	24.1%

SOGS Results Cont.

Mean SOGS Score by Gender:

Male: 10.6

Female: 11.3

Mean SOGS Score by Race:

Caucasian: 11.4

All Others: 9.7

Areas of Problem Gambling

Casino: 95%

Non-Casino: 35%

Specific Areas:

Casino Only: 64%

Non-Casino Only: <1% (.4)

Both: 36%

Top 8 Problem Gambling Areas

	<u>Overall</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
Slots (c)	60%	49% (1)	86% (1)
Black Jack (c)	40%	48% (2)	26% (2)
Video Poker (c)	17%	15% (7)	18% (3)
Cards (nc)	15%	16% (6)	15% (4)
Lott-Scratch (nc)	14%	18% (4)	10% (5)
Roulette (c)	14%	20% (3)	7% (6)
Craps/Dice (c)	13%	17% (5)	10% (5)
Poker (c)	12%	10% (8)	7% (6)

Whose responsibility is it not to gamble at Mohegan Sun?

Mine	54%
Both	46%
Mohegan Sun Only	0%

N = 24

Follow-Up Study

Methodology

- Self-excluders were asked if they agreed to a follow-up in approximately three months.
- Of the 235 self-excluders, 93 (40%) agreed to be contacted for follow-up.
- Of the 93 that agreed to the follow-up, only 30 (32%) could be reached to complete the second survey.

Changes in Gambling After S.E.

	<u>Decrease/Stop</u>	<u>Increase</u>	<u>Same</u>
Slots (c)	63%	13%	10%
Black Jack (c)	36%	6%	6%
Video Poker (c)	37%	0%	10%
Lott.-Scratch (nc)	30%	13%	30%
Cards (nc)	20%	6%	16%
Craps/Dice (c)	9%	0%	10%
Poker (c)	20%	3%	10%
Roulette (c)	33%	3%	6%

Have any of these been a problem for the self-excluder?

	<u>Only Before</u>	<u>Only After</u>	<u>Before/After</u>
Anxiety:	21%	0%	48%
Depression:	21%	0%	48%
Anger:	17%	0%	53%
Stress:	13%	10%	57%
Tobacco Use:	7%	0%	48%
Alcohol Use:	3%	0%	21%
Drug Use:	0%	0%	4%
Family Conflict	25%	0%	25%
Financial Prob.	0%	0%	50%

Help Sought After S.E.

	<u>None</u>	<u>Yes</u>
Gambling Therapist:	68%	18/14%
Gamblers Anonymous:	47%	27/27%
Other Counselor:	60%	28/12%
Other Help:	92%	4/4%
Clergy	92%	7/0%

Yes = current/terminated

How well was the S.E. Program advertised?

Too Little:	53%
Enough:	18%
Too Much:	0%
Don't Know:	29%

Did you tell any employees
you had a gambling
problem before S.E.?

Yes: 15%

No: 84%

Mean number of times told
an employee: 4

Did self-excluders believe
employees knew or should
have known about their PG?

Yes: 36%

No: 44%

Don't Know: 20%

Did the self-excluder return to gamble after self-excluding?

Yes:	18%
No:	82%

If yes, number of times:

1-2 times:	13%
------------	-----

5-6 times:	4%
------------	----

9 + times:	13%
------------	-----

Did not return:	71%
-----------------	-----

Why did self-excluders return?

To win money:	82%
To stay in action:	12%
Be in that environment:	25%
Couldn't control impulses:	28%
Other:	6%

* Self-Excluders may have chosen more than 1

Why did self-excluders not return?

Determined to stay abstinent:	84%
Fear of arrest:	79%
Fear of embarrassment:	41%
Promise to someone:	33%
Other:	29%

* Self-Excluders may have chosen more than 1

Probability of Returning to Mohegan Sun

Probable:	17%
Improbable:	65%
Unsure:	19%

Preferred Time Frame of S.E.

Permanent, no appeal:	50%
Permanent, with appeal:	17%
Time Limited:	33%

Mean Length of Time Preferred:
3 years

Satisfaction with S.E.

Satisfied:	53%
Unsatisfied:	10%
Mixed feelings:	37%

Recommend to Others?

Yes:	86%
No:	3%
Don't Know:	10%

Summary: Baseline Survey

- Self-excluders are a relatively diverse group and demographically similar to problem gamblers identified by the CCPG Helpline.
- SOGS scores indicate that self-excluders are probable pathological gamblers.
- At the time of S.E., at least one-third were also having problems with non-casino forms of gambling.

Summary: Follow-Up Survey

- After S.E., gambling decreased in most types of gambling. Decreases were greater than the increases in each gambling area.
- While anxiety, depression, anger and family conflict decreased after S.E., tobacco, alcohol use and stress level showed little change.

Summary Cont.

- Self exclusion appeared to be a gateway to professional counseling for one-third of the self-excluders and to Gamblers Anonymous for half the self-excluders.
- Only one 1 out of 5 self-excluders learned about S.E. through the casino.

Summary Cont.

- One-third of self-excluders believe that employees knew or should have known they had a gambling problem prior to S.E.
- 4 out of 5 self-excluders did not return to the casino. Of those who did, the range was 1 to 9 times.

Summary Cont.

- Of those who had not returned, 2 out of 3 thought it was improbable they would return.
- Of those who returned, money was the primary motivation. For those who did not return, the prime motivators were determination to stay abstinent and fear of arrest.

Summary Cont.

- 2 out of 3 self-excluders were in favor of S.E. being permanent.
- Only 10% of the self-excluders were unsatisfied with having self-excluded and only 3% would not recommend self-exclusion.

Summary Cont.

- Due to the limited number of completed follow-up surveys, conclusions from the follow-up data are only suggestive.