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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

**SAMPLE**

- CROATIA (n=2,702)
- BOSNIA&HERZEGOVINA (n=1,036)

National capitals

Pairing samples
1. Zagreb
2. Split
3. Rijeka
4. Osijek
5. Slavonski Brod
6. Vinkovci

1. Sarajevo
2. Tuzla

Geographical proximity
Similar size

M=454 (47,5%)
M=515 (49,7%)

7. Koprivnica
CROATIA

N=956
F=502 (52.5%)

Mage=16.63 (SD=1.2)

TYPE OF SCHOOL

3y vocational 217 (22.7%)
4y vocational 377 (39.4%)

BOSNIA & HERZEGOVINA

N=1,036
F=521 (50.3%)

Mage=16.60 (SD=1.023)

Equal in number, gender & age

TYPE OF SCHOOL

3y vocational 21 (2.0%)
4y vocational 651 (62.9%)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General education</th>
<th>high-school</th>
<th>362 (37.9%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General education</th>
<th>high-school</th>
<th>363 (35.1%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>General socio-demographic variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Gambling activities questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Canadian Adolescent Gambling Inventory (CAGI) (Tremblay et al., 2010.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Motivation for gambling check-list</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Risk and delinquent behavior scale (Atlanta et al., 2005.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Cognitive distortions related to gambling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A.</td>
<td>International personality item pool – 50 (IPIP-50) (Mlačić &amp; Goldberg, 2007.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B.</td>
<td>Zimbardo time-perspective inventory (ZTPI) (Zimbardo &amp; Boyd, 1999.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Gambling experience and gambling behavior questions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports betting</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Never**: Indicates never engaging in the activity.
- **Occasionally**: Indicates engaging in the activity once a year or less.
- **Regularly**: Indicates engaging in the activity every day.
## 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>Sports betting</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch cards</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLTs</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roulette</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betting on virtual races</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game of chance</td>
<td>Effect size (r)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports betting</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>0,06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLTs</td>
<td>0,28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roulette</td>
<td>0,16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual races</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Country differences regarding gambling intensity

Game of chance
Scratch cards

Small to medium effect sizes
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)
THE WHOLE SAMPLE

RED LIGHT  YELLOW LIGHT  GREEN LIGHT
Chi-Square = 15,816
74.00%
THE SUBSAMPLE OF HIGH-SCHOOL BOYS
RED LIGHT  YELLOW LIGHT  GREEN LIGHT

Chi-Square = 27,660

23.19%

THE SUBSAMPLE OF HIGH-SCHOOL GIRLS
Chi-Square = 2.101
p = 0.362
91.10%
III. PARENTS’ AWARENESS OF GAMBLING
(STUDENTS’ PERCEPTION)

Do your parents know that you sometimes gamble?
(yes / no / I don’t gamble)

„Yes, they do.”
Chi-Square = 12,046  
*p = 0.002

Chi-Square = 18,205  
*p = 0.000

Chi-Square = 1,726  
*p = 0.126

Chi-Square = 68,197  
*p = 0.000

Chi-Square = 6,546  
*p = 0.012

35.3%  

29.5%
IV. GAMBLING WITH PARENTS

- Expansion of empirical research and knowledge
- Parents’ perception
- Student gambling

- Youth gambling prevention program „Who really wins?”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>CRO</th>
<th>B&amp;H</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sports betting</td>
<td>20,30%</td>
<td>13,10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VLTs</td>
<td>2,20%</td>
<td>1,40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>24,10%</td>
<td>10,00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scratch cards</td>
<td>20,80%</td>
<td>16,20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSION

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