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Missouri Model

- First comprehensive, state-sponsored self-banning program (in the U.S.)
- 1996
- Formal names:
  - “Voluntary Exclusion Program” or
  - “List of Disassociated Persons”
What is Self-Exclusion?

- A harm minimization strategy
- A barrier to gambling
- A safeguard against impulsivity
- A gateway to treatment and related services
Principles of Self-Exclusion

- A proportion of individuals have problems controlling their gambling.
- Industry should assist in limiting negative impact of gambling.
- Individuals should accept responsibility for excessive gambling and take action to limit it.
- Self-exclusion is a barrier to access, not a form of treatment.
Missouri’s SE Program

Initial Program
Goals of the Missouri Program

- Create a platform for the problem gambler to acknowledge problem and accept personal responsibility for it.
- Block from direct marketing by casinos.
- Establish pipeline to treatment.
- Provide effective deterrent to gambling.
- Formalize and document procedures to limit liability and establish an audit trail to monitor performance.
What It Is…

- A forum for the problem gambler to accept personal responsibility for their problem.
- A method to provide the gambler with some isolation from the temptations of gambling.
- A deterrent to destructive behavior.
  - A “wake up call” during a lapse in recovery.
  - A reminder of the importance of treatment.
What It Is Not...

- A panacea
- A substitute for treatment
- A promise to keep the gambler out of the casino
- A program for someone who occasionally gambles irresponsibly but is not:
  - *a chronic problem gambler*; or
  - *a pathological gambler*. 
Application Process

- Right to private interview
- Instructions, rule & promotion of free counseling & GA
- Interview & Questionnaire
  - Sobriety, coherence, coercion
- Application and demographics
- Waiver/Release
- Power of attorney
- Application verification
  - Interpreter (if necessary)
- Photograph
- Provide treatment information and resource packet
Follow-up Issues

- Letter assigning PIN
  - Handling third party interests
- Providing resources
  - Treatment
  - Support groups
  - Hotline & web sites.
- Trespass
  - Jackpots
  - Check cashing
  - Players club
- Database administration
Disassociated Persons List

- Includes penalties for breaches (trespass, forfeiture of winnings)
- Waiver of liability (notification provision)
- Current enrollment >10,500
Database Enhancements

Now available in real-time format

Approved applications are available for verification and download immediately;

- Class A Licensees can view only Approved and Deceased (approved) applications
- Cashiers and other relevant personnel can execute a query against the database at any time to verify whether an individual is a DAP (i.e. cashing checks, issuing a players card)
Enforcement
Although the terms “self-exclusion” and “enforcement” seem contradictory, certain mechanisms should be in place.

- Jurisdictions must analyze/seek statutory authority to allow forfeiture of jackpots
- Regulators should require gaming operators to check against SE list anytime it is practical, and when patrons required to provide positive ID
- Self-excluders should report violations of their exclusion
Enforcement

- Removal from all mailing lists and players clubs
- Committee supports arrest as an effective deterrent for many gamblers
  ~ Jurisdictions should develop methods to direct repeat offenders into mandatory counseling
- Should be clear to the self-excluder that it is NOT the responsibility of the casino or the regulatory agency to prevent them from entering a gambling venue.
Recent Self Exclusion Research

Missouri Data
Disordered Gambling in Missouri: Regional Differences in the Need for Treatment

- Phase I Report prepared for the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation
- Released August 26, 2004
- Authors:
  - Howard J. Shaffer, Principal Investigator
  - Richard A. LaBrie
  - Gabriel Caro
  - Debi A. LaPlante
  - Sarah E. Nelson
  - The Division on Addictions, Harvard Medical School

- Objective: determine the relative prevalence of gambling disorders in Missouri’s counties and the greater Kansas City area through analysis of the Commission’s DAP database
Disordered Gambling in Missouri

- Sample: participants in Missouri’s DAP program between 1997 and 2003
- Missouri Disassociated Persons (DAPs) are younger than the state’s adult population
  - 83% of the DAPs are between 24 and 54 years of age,
  - 57% of Missouri’s adult population is in that age range.
- Males and females are equally represented among Missouri DAPs.
- Missouri’s statewide rate of problem gambling mirrors the national estimates of approximately one-percent (1%) of the adult population demonstrates that the rate of self-excluders is a valid indicator of the prevalence of people experiencing gambling-related problems.
Disordered Gambling in Missouri

- 92% of all Missouri DAPs were from the Western Planning Region (Kansas City area) or the Eastern Planning Region (St. Louis area).
- Phenomenon of Adaptation and Exposure During Phase II, information is being obtained directly from a representative sample of the self-excluders about their experiences in the program.
Characteristics and Gender Differences Among Self Excluded Problem Gamblers: Missouri Data

- Pending publication
- Authors:
  - Lia Nower, J.D., Ph.D.
    - Assistant Professor of Social Work
    - University of Missouri-St. Louis, Missouri, USA
  - Professor Alex Blaszczynski, Ph.D.
    - Head, Department of Medical Psychology
    - University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
- N=2670
  - participants in Missouri’s DAP Program between 2001 and 2003
  - Female = 48.4 %
  - Male = 51.1 %
  - Age Range: 21 to 84 years
Self-exclusion

- Majority of participants exhibit criteria for pathological gambling
- Internationally, requirements, procedures, processes, and penalties are inconsistent across jurisdictions
- There have been few published empirical studies systematically evaluating the effectiveness of SE
  - Ladouceur, Jacques, Giroux, Ferland & Leblond (2000) study
Methods

- Data collected by MGC on DAP application
- De-identified set from 2,670 program participants from Jan. 2001 – March 2003
- No measure of gambling severity (self-identified)
Data Categories

- Demographic characteristics
  - Age at application
  - Household/personal income
  - Race
  - Employment status
  - Educational status
  - Marital status
Data Categories

- Gambling behavior
  - Years spent gambling
  - Age of gambling onset
  - Strategic (black jack, craps, sports betting) versus non-strategic (slots, lottery, video poker) and mixed forms
Data Categories

- Reasons for self-exclusion
- Referral source
- Self-help, counseling, bankruptcy services
Personal Income level

- Females (29% vs 13%) were over represented in the lowest two income brackets (<$20,000/yr).
- Males (33% vs 16%) were over represented in the two highest income brackets (>$50,000/yr).
- No significant differences in household income.
Personal Income Level by Gender
(N= 1212)
## Reasons for Self-Exclusion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gain control</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need help</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save marriage</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hit rock bottom</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advice of others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save job</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevent suicide</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Referral by counselor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implications

- Telescoping effect for females
  - Move quickly through stages
  - Need early aggressive interventions

- Higher prevalence among African American females
  - Need for more research, individualized treatments
Re-envisioning SE in Missouri
Where Are We Going?

- Importance of research.
- Do we need property level exclusion lists?
- Need to examine liability issues.
- Can there be an exclusion program without free or subsidized treatment?
Pending Initiatives

- Proposed revisions to Voluntary Exclusion Program – “Menu of options”
- Potential initiatives
  - Forfeit of DAP jackpots to Compulsive Gamblers Fund
  - Transfer long-term unclaimed jackpots to Compulsive Gamblers Fund
- Internal modifications to enhance DAP procedures
- “Balance In Life” Education Program
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