

Abstract

Self-exclusion is a process by which individuals can request to be banned from participating in gambling activities. This can include being banned from entering physical casinos or participating in online gambling. The purpose of self-exclusion is to help individuals who have a problem with gambling to limit their access to potential triggers and to prevent them from further problem gambling behavior by limiting or preventing access to gambling opportunities.

1. Overview of gambling
 - a. Gambling is defined as XXXX
 - b. Gambling is a global phenomenon, with the majority of countries having some form of legalized gambling.
 - c. Other prevalence stats about gambling types, prevalence (Global use is 73% of adults gambled at least once in their life; Griffiths cite)
2. Problem gambling
 - a. Global gambling phenomenon comes with a cost, problematic use.
 - b. Example of problem gambling—definition,
 - c. Prevalence rates of problem gambling globally
 - d. Something else here about problem gambling—on the rise with legalization of sports gambling, online gambling, etc.
3. Considering “harm” and how to minimize harm
 - a. Best strategies is to reduce harm
 - b. Self exclusion is WHAT—Define this and operationalize it
 - c. Examples of self-exclusion across globe
4. Issue: US does not have a single approach to self-exclusion (**you have language for this, use that here~)
 - a. No useful way to track what folks do or if it is effective
 - b. Need to determine how effective it is, but we cannot do that without knowing all the various ways states are offering SE programs.
 - c. Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to establish a functional database for self exclusion programs in the united states.

Self-Exclusion in the United States

Gambling is a global phenomenon, spanning across 144 countries to date (CITE). Gambling is considered any time a person wagers something of value (i.e., money) on a probabilistic event with an uncertain outcome (CITE). Gambling can take many forms, including casino games, sports betting, lottery, bingo, and online gambling (Welte et al., 2009). While more common forms of gambling are often viewed as brick and mortar casinos, recent legalization in the US for sports betting and opportunities for online or Internet gambling has increased not only the availability of gambling venues but also the corresponding increases in gambling related harms and problem gambling (see also CCC, CCC, CC)

Gambling is the act of wagering money or something of value on an event with an uncertain outcome. The purpose of gambling is to win money or material goods, but many people also gamble for the thrill of the competition or the excitement of risking something of value. Gambling can take many forms, including casino games, sports betting, lottery, bingo, and online gambling (Welte et al., 2009). Many countries have laws regulating the gambling industry and some have banned it altogether (CITE). Gambling is illegal in some countries, while others have regulated and legal forms of gambling. Some countries have a complete ban on all forms of gambling, while others may only prohibit certain types of gambling.

In Asia, for example, gambling is illegal in countries such as Malaysia, Indonesia, and North Korea. In the Middle East, most countries also have a complete ban on gambling, such as Saudi Arabia, UAE, and Egypt. In Africa, gambling is illegal in countries such as Libya, Ethiopia, and Somalia. In Europe, some countries have a complete ban on gambling, such as Turkey, while others have regulated and legal forms of gambling, such as the United Kingdom and many countries of the European Union. It's important to note that laws and regulations regarding gambling are subject to change and may differ depending on the state or country you are in. In the United States, gambling laws vary by state, with some states having legalized certain forms of gambling while others have a complete ban on it. Some states such as Utah and Hawaii have banned all forms of gambling. While the principles of selection by consequences and the cultural level of selection can be observed in the gambling industry in the United States, it is important to note that the cultural and legal context of gambling can vary greatly between countries. In this context, it's worth exploring how these principles play out in other countries and how they may differ from the situation in the United States.

Cultural level of selection and self-exclusion in gambling policies in the United States refer to the ways in which certain cultural attitudes towards gambling are promoted or discouraged in society, as well as the ways in which individuals are able to choose to opt out of gambling

activities. Cultural level of selection in gambling policies can take the form of laws and regulations that promote or discourage certain types of gambling. For example, some states in the US have legalized certain forms of gambling, such as casino gambling, while others have not (e.g., Hawaii and Utah) . This can lead to a cultural acceptance of certain forms of gambling in those states where it is legal, while other forms of gambling may be viewed as less acceptable. Self-exclusion in gambling policies refers to the ways in which individuals can choose to opt out of gambling activities. Many states in the US have implemented self-exclusion programs that allow individuals to voluntarily exclude themselves from gambling activities by placing themselves on a list that prohibits them from entering casinos and other gambling establishments. These policies are put in place to help individuals who have gambling problems to take control of their habits, and to prevent them from gambling. Self-exclusion policies can be applied to individuals who have a gambling addiction or to those who have a history of gambling-related problems. It's important to notice that these policies are not always effective and are not the only solution for gambling addiction. They are a tool that can be used in conjunction with other types of support and resources.

Having discussed the principle of selection by consequences and its role in shaping gambling behaviors, it's important to also consider the prevalence of gambling in different populations. By understanding the prevalence rate of gambling and how it varies among different groups, we can gain a better understanding of how cultural and societal factors influence the persistence of gambling behaviors and the potential consequences.

Previous research has shown between 73-84% of adults in western countries (i.e., xxx) report having gambled at least once in their lifetime (Calado & Griffiths, 2016). In the US, estimates range from XXX-XXX (CITE). For example, in a recent review by Wilson et al., xxxxxx.

Calado and Griffiths (2016) conducted a systematic review methodology to identify relevant studies on problem gambling published between 2010 and 2015. A total of 208 studies were included in the review, which covered a wide range of topics, including prevalence, risk factors, comorbidity, treatment, and policy. The main findings of the study found approximately 84% of individuals in the United States have gambled in their life. The prevalence of problem gambling varied widely across different countries, with the highest rates reported in Australia, Canada, and the United States, the most commonly reported risk factors for problem gambling were mental health problems, substance use disorders, and stressful life events, problem gambling was found to be highly comorbid with other mental health and substance use disorders, and the most commonly used treatments for problem gambling were cognitive-behavioral therapy and pharmacotherapy.

Overall, the study highlights the need for more research on problem gambling and the effectiveness of different policy measures to reduce it. The study also emphasizes the importance of considering the cultural context in which problem gambling occurs when studying it. The study by Calado and Griffiths (2016) provides valuable insights into the current state of research on problem gambling worldwide and the various factors associated with it. However, to fully understand the nature of gambling disorder, it is important to also consider the diagnostic criteria and classification of gambling disorder as outlined in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-V) and American Psychiatric Association. (APA). This will

provide a framework for understanding the diagnostic criteria and criteria for diagnosis of gambling disorder and how they compare with the findings of the study.

According to the DSM-5, gambling disorder is classified as an impulse control disorder. In order to be diagnosed with gambling disorder, an individual must have persistent and recurrent problematic gambling behavior that leads to clinically significant impairment or distress. The DSM-5 specifies that the diagnosis of gambling disorder should be based on the presence of at least four out of the following criteria in a 12-month period: preoccupation with gambling (e.g., frequent thoughts about past gambling experiences, planning future gambling activities), persistent and recurrent gambling behavior that leads to clinically significant impairment or distress, tolerance, as evidenced by the need to gamble with increasing amounts of money to achieve the desired level of excitement, withdrawal symptoms when gambling is reduced or stopped (e.g., anxiety, irritability, restlessness), the individual has made repeated unsuccessful attempts to control, cut back or stop gambling, gambling continues despite knowledge of having a persistent or recurrent social, financial, psychological or physical problem that is caused or exacerbated by gambling, giving up or reducing important activities in order to gamble, and/or gambling to escape from problems or to improve one's mood.

The DSM-5 does not classify gambling disorder into different levels or stages. Instead, it provides a set of criteria that must be met in order to diagnose an individual with gambling disorder. According to the DSM-V, an individual must have at least 4 out of the listed criteria over a 12-month period in order to be diagnosed with gambling disorder. Similar to the DSM-V, the American Psychiatric Association (2013) states that an individual must have at least 5 out of the listed criteria over a 12-month period in order to be diagnosed with gambling disorder. While the DSM-V and APA do not classify gambling disorder into different levels, it's important to note that there's a range of severity in gambling disorder, and the consequences can vary from person to person. Some people may experience mild gambling disorder, while others may have severe gambling disorder that causes significant problems in multiple areas of their life such as financial, social, and personal. Factors such as the duration and frequency of the problematic gambling behavior, the level of impairment or distress caused by the behavior, and the presence of comorbid mental health conditions can all influence the severity of gambling disorder. The level of severity is usually determined by the clinician based on the criteria met and the impact of the disorder on the individual's life. It's important to also consider how these criteria are reflected in gambling laws and restrictions in the United States. These laws and restrictions play a crucial role in shaping the cultural context in which gambling occurs and can have a significant impact on the prevalence and severity of gambling disorder in the United States.

Gambling is legal under United States federal law, but the legality of gambling varies from state to state. Under the federal law, the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA) of 1988, Indian tribes are allowed to conduct certain types of gambling on their reservations. The Professional and Amateur Sports Protection Act (PASPA) of 1992, banned sports betting in most states. However, this act was repealed in 2018, which allows states to legalize and regulate sports betting. Each state has the authority to determine its own laws and regulations regarding gambling within its borders. Some states have legalized various forms of gambling, such as casino gambling,

poker, horse racing, and lotteries, while others have placed strict restrictions or outright bans on gambling activities. For example, some states have legalized casino gambling, while others have only legalized certain forms of gambling, such as lottery or horse racing. The laws and regulations for gambling can vary widely between states and can change over time. While it's clear that the laws and regulations for gambling can vary widely between states and can change over time, there is a growing emphasis on responsible gaming across the country. In fact, 21 out of 50 states in the United States currently require land-based and online gaming operators to submit a plan for responsible gaming (e.g., employee training, public awareness efforts, problem gambling brochures). This highlights the growing awareness of the potential negative consequences of gambling and the importance of addressing problem gambling. It's clear that states are taking steps to address problem gambling and promote responsible gaming. While 21 states require land-based and online gaming operators to submit a plan for responsible gaming, the American Gaming Association (2022) (AGA) reports that 34 out of 50 states in the United States currently require sports betting and gaming operators to offer a self-exclusion program for patrons who wish to withdraw their rights of any wins, losses, and entrance if they are found gambling in a physical venue or online venue (e.g., BetMGM) (American Gaming Association, 2022). These self-exclusion programs often require patrons to voluntarily enroll for a specific period of time and to comply with certain rules. For example, patrons may be prohibited from entering casinos or other gambling venues, or from accessing online gambling platforms during the self-exclusion period. Some self-exclusion programs also include measures such as cooling-off periods, which can help patrons to evaluate their gambling behaviors and make informed decisions about their future gambling activities. This highlights the growing importance placed on providing patrons with tools to manage their gambling behaviors and to make informed decisions about their gambling activities and behaviors. By enrolling in these programs, patrons can restrict their access to gambling venues and online platforms and reduce their gambling behaviors. However, it's important to note that self-exclusion programs are not a substitute for professional help and treatment for problem gambling, but they can be a useful tool for individuals who wish to reduce their gambling behaviors. Although self-exclusion programs are voluntary, once a person enrolls, they are legally bound to the agreement (American Gaming Association, 2022).

If someone violates their self-exclusion agreement, the consequences can vary depending on the specific rules and regulations of the self-exclusion program they have enrolled in. In general, if a person who is self-excluded is found gambling in a physical venue, they may be asked to leave the premises and may be barred from returning for the duration of their self-exclusion period. If the violation occurs online, the person may have their account suspended or terminated, and may be prohibited from opening a new account for the duration of the self-exclusion period. In some cases, a violation of a self-exclusion agreement may result in criminal charges or fines. For example, if a person is found to have intentionally circumvented the self-exclusion program, they may be charged with trespassing or other crimes. Since there are potential legal consequences of violating a self-exclusion agreement, it's important to consider the process of self-excluding through various methods such as online application, brick and mortar (i.e., casino), or phone. This will help individuals understand the steps they need to

take to enroll in a self-exclusion program and the resources available to them in order to make an informed decision.

The process for self-excluding can vary depending on the specific rules and regulations of the self-exclusion program and the type of gambling venue or platform. However, in general, someone who wishes to self-exclude would first research and identify the self-exclusion program that they wish to enroll in. This can be done through the website of the casino, state gaming commission, or other relevant authority. Then, they will gather the required documentation. This may include identification documents such as a driver's license or passport, and proof of address. The required documents vary by state and venue. Following collecting the required documents, they will contact the self-exclusion program and provide the required documentation. Some programs have online application forms that can be filled out and submitted digitally, while others may require the person to visit a casino or other gambling venue in person to enroll. After that, they will sign the self-exclusion agreement. This will typically include the individual's personal information, the duration of the self-exclusion period, and the specific gambling venues or platforms that the individual is prohibited from accessing. Once enrolled, the individual must comply with the rules of the self-exclusion program, such as staying away from prohibited gambling venues or platforms during the self-exclusion period. If an individual self-excludes in Nevada for commercial casinos (e.g., Caesars) they will be prohibited from entering all Caesars properties (caesarsrewards.custhelp.com). The length of exclusion time may also depend on state (e.g., six months, one year, five years, 10 years, lifetime) (Ladoucer et al., 2017).

In comparison to the many public policies that support or require the availability of self-exclusion programs, research on these programs is limited (Wilson book). Through the minimal research to date, research found that self-exclusion programs are available in the United States and other countries (e.g., Finland, Italy, Sweden,). Ludwig et al. (2022), found that Finland offers self-exclusion for land-based casinos. To implement their self-exclusion, a self-ban entry must be agreed with the casino staff. If the gambler attempts to enter the premises, the staff will block their entry. Patrons may set their self-ban electronically or have a customer service employee set it for them. Self-exclusion from online casinos (i.e., Veikkaus) requires the ban to be agreed upon by the staff. Veikkaus has monitoring tools for entry-bans. They have a customer registry where the self-excluded gamblers are recorded. Compared to Finland, Italy also offers self-exclusion for land-based casinos and online gambling. When a gambler self-excludes from one gambling website, they are excluded from all websites. However, for land-based casinos, a self-excluder must exclude from single casinos (i.e., they are excluded from one casino they request, but may request multiple casinos). Sweden offers exclusion for more forms of gambling compared to Finland and Italy. Not only does Sweden offer self-exclusion for online gambling and land-based casinos, they also offer it for in-store and on the track (i.e., horse betting) gambling. Using their national self-exclusion register (i.e., Spelpuas), they exclude all forms of gambling provided by licensed companies in Sweden (Håkansson & Widinghoff, 2020; Ludwig et al., 2022). In contrast to Sweden offering a national self-exclusion register, the United States offers self-exclusion for certain types of gambling under each jurisdiction. For example, Massachusetts only has three land-based casinos in which you can self-exclude from.

Self-exclusion from the three land-based casinos, does not prohibit you from other gambling forms (e.g., lottery) (Massachusetts Gaming Commission).

As previously discussed, gambling is legal under United States federal law, but each state has its own distinct approach to self-exclusion programs. To start, California's current policies for self-exclusion prohibit patrons from all licensed gambling establishments in California but is not limited to tribal casinos. Patrons that self-exclude are prohibited from collecting, redeeming, and/or recovering wins or losses during their dose (i.e., term) of one year or lifetime. However, it is unclear if the State of California offers self-exclusion for other forms of gambling. It is possible that tribal casinos may offer individual self-exclusion programs or self-bans (e.g., Morongo Casino). For all other forms of gambling, the State of California does not indicate any self-exclusion programs available. North Carolina does not offer state-wide self-exclusion but offers individual self-exclusion programs. For example, Two Kings Casino offers self-exclusion for 1 year or lifetime. Harrah's Cherokee Casino Resort offers self-exclusion from all Caesars properties nationwide (caesarsrewards.custhelp.com). It is unclear whether there are more options for self-exclusion for other forms of gambling.

Further research needs to be done to identify other ways people can self-exclude. Since there is minimal research on self-exclusion, it is difficult finding all self-exclusion information for each form of gambling for each state. Some states don't have self-exclusion and some do have self-exclusion, but not for all forms of gambling. There is a lack of research in self-exclusion. There are limitations for self-exclusion in the United States that every state is different. There is not a system to house all the information pertaining to self-exclusion, therefore it is unclear how users, patrons, and gamblers would know what the rules are for self-exclusion and how to self-exclude. Also, it is unclear how clinicians know what the state's rule of self-exclusion is and the process for self-exclusion. Therefore, the purpose of the current study is to establish a functional database on United States self-exclusion policies.

Methods

Materials

The materials needed for this study include: a computer with internet access, Google Sheets, and Google Forms.

Selection Criteria

To be considered eligible for this study, the state must have at least one legal form of gambling. Since United States territories do not have state rights and are under federal law, they were not considered eligible to be selected for this study.

Creation of Legal Gambling Spreadsheet

Researchers created a Google Sheet spreadsheet with all 50 states including the District of Columbia's legal forms of gambling (see Appendix A). Variables in the spreadsheet included: commercial casinos, bingo halls, slot machines/video gaming terminals (i.e., outside of casinos), sports/bookmaking, fantasy sports, lottery, online/mobile casino, online/mobile sports, online

cards/poker, racing, card/poker rooms, and number of casinos. Legal forms of gambling were found under (INSERT WHERE YOU CAN FIND INFO).

Establish Database

Create Form. A database will be established by creating a Qualtrics XM® including all states including the District of Columbia.

Training. The researcher will train other professionals to fill out the form using a step-by-step task analysis. The steps consisted of: 1) Open Google Drive, 2) Go to “Shared with me” tab on left side, 3) Look for “Self-Exclusion” folder shared by Alyssa Wilson, 4) Click on “Self-exclusion folder, 5) Click on ‘Self-Exclusion Forms (Summer)”, 6) Click on State you are inputting results for, 7) Click on the eye icon on the top right panel, 8) When you are redirected to the preview page, type in your name in the required section, 9) Then, select if there is self-exclusion offered for each type of gambling, 10) If there is self-exclusion offered, select “Yes” and click on “Next”, 11) If there is not self-exclusion offered, select “No” and click on “Next”, 12) If there is self-exclusion offered for the gambling type, you will be redirect to an “If yes...” section of the Google Form, 13) Select/type what they call self-exclusion, 14) Select/type how they self-exclude (i.e., the process- brick and mortar or online), 15) Select applicable terms (i.e, how long they self-exclude) multiple answers may be selected... If a term is not displayed, type it in the “other” section, 16) If applicable per state, for “other animal if yes” section, repeat steps 13-15 and include what other animals (e.g., dog), 17) At the end, you will be redirected to a references page. Copy and paste all references used for your answers, 18) Once finished, click submit, 19) Repeat all steps per state.

Analyze Data. The researcher will analyze data by transforming data from qualitative to quantitative data. For example, “Do they have...” Yes=1 and No= 0, What do they call it?: Self-exclusion= 1, Disassociated Persons=2, Problem Gambling List=3, Lifetime Exclusion=4, Other=5, “How do they self-exclude? (process)”: Brick and mortar=1, Online= 2, Term/Dose: 6 months= .5, 1 year= 1, 10 years= 10, Lifetime= 100. Following this, the researcher will compare data to other states.

Inter-rater reliability

To evaluate the quality of the data reported, an inter-rater reliability agreement will be collected across all states at 100%. To collect inter-rater reliability, multiple raters will evaluate the same data independently and their scores are compared to assess the level of agreement among raters.

Response Definitions

The dependent variables in this study will be: Self-exclusion offered for legal gambling type (i.e., Yes/No), What do they call it (e.g., Self-exclusion, disassociated persons list, etc.), Dose/Term (e.g., 1 year, lifetime), and what animal (i.e., if applicable for “other animal racing” sub-variable). Sub-variables will include: card/poker rooms, commercial casinos, tribal casinos, bingo halls, slot machines/video gaming terminals (outside of casinos), sports/bookmaking, fantasy sports, lottery, online/mobile casinos, online/mobile sports, online cards/poker, and racing (horse, greyhound or other animals)/off-track betting for applicable states (i.e., where it is legal in).

Design

The study will be conducted using a naturalistic observation. (Find Catania article).

Data Transformation & Analysis

The researcher will analyze data by transforming data from qualitative to quantitative data. For example, "Do they have self-exclusion..." Yes=1 and No/Not found= 0 "What do they call it?": Self-exclusion= 0/1, Disassociated Persons=0/1, Problem Gambling List=0/1, Lifetime Exclusion=0/1, Other=0/1, "How do they self-exclude? (process)": Brick and mortar=0/1, Online= 0/1, Term/Dose: 6 months= .5, 1 year= 1, 10 years= 10, Lifetime= 100. Following this, the researcher will compare data to other states according to how they correspond with each other (e.g., California has 10 forms of gambling, but only one self-exclusion program; i.e., nine forms of gambling do not have self-exclusion programs available).

To transform the categorical data for what self-exclusion is called, the researcher will transform the following to the corresponding number: Self-exclusion= 0/1, Disassociated Persons=0/1, Problem Gambling List=0/1, Lifetime Exclusion=0/1, and Other=0/1.

The term/dose to self-exclude will be transformed to years (i.e., if days and months apply). For example, 6 months will be .5, 1 year will be 1, 10 years will be 10, and lifetime will be 100, respectively.

Lastly, the process of self-excluding will be: Brick and mortar=0/1, Online=0/1, and Other=0/1. If the results for a variable are "Yes" it will equal 1. If the results for the variable are No/Not found, it will equal 0.

Hypothetical Results and potential limitations

The results will display a comparison of what California and North Carolina's self-exclusion programs would look like. In the future, the study will include a table with a larger scale (i.e., all states instead of two). The following graphs will display California's self-exclusion for Card/Poker Rooms and North Carolina's self-exclusion for Tribal Casinos.

POTENTIAL LIMITATIONS AND HOW YOU PLAN TO CONTROL FOR THIS.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
- American Gaming Association (2022). Responsible gaming regulations and statutes guide. <https://www.americangaming.org/resources/responsible-gaming-regulations-and-statutes-guide/>

Håkansson, A., & Widinghoff, C. (2020). Gambling despite nationwide self-exclusion—a survey in online gamblers in Sweden. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, 11, 599967. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2020.599967>

Kessler, R. C., Hwang, I., LaBrie, R., Petukhova, M., Sampson, N. A., Winters, K. C., & Shaffer, H. J. (2008). DSM-IV pathological gambling in the national comorbidity survey replication. *Psychological Medicine*, 38(9), pp. 1351-60. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0033291708002900>

Kraus, L., Loy, J. K., Bickl, A. M., Schwarzkopf, L., Volberg, R. A., Rolando, S., Kankainen, V. E., Hellman, M., Rossow, I., Room, R., Norman, T., & Cisneros Örnberg, J. (2022). Self-exclusion from gambling: A toothless tiger?. *Frontiers in psychiatry*, 13, 992309. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsy.2022.992309>

National Council on Problem Gambling. (2021) National survey on gambling attitudes and gambling experiences. http://www.ncpgsurvey.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/NCPG_NGAGE-Natl_Detailed_Report-Public.pdf

Self-exclusion registration. Bureau of Gambling Control - Self Exclusion - California Dept. of Justice - Office of the Attorney General. <https://ems.doj.ca.gov/selfExclusionHome.action>

Volberg, R. A., McNamara, L. M., & Carris, K. L. (2018). Risk factors for problem gambling in California: Demographics, comorbidities and gambling participation. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 34(2), 361–377. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-017-9703-5>

Massachusetts Gaming Commission. (2022). Voluntary self-exclusion. <https://massgaming.com/about/voluntary-self-exclusion/>

Welte, J.W., Barnes, G.M., Tidwell, M.C.O. et al. Gambling and problem gambling in the United States: Changes between 1999 and 2013. *J Gambl Stud* 31, 695–715 (2015). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-014-9471-4>