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Personalized Feedback

**Definition:** Providing written results to a client from an assessment that are tailored to the individual.

**Purpose:** To increase a client’s motivation to change and/or engage in treatment.
Elements of Personalized Feedback Report

Written Introduction:

All information presented here is based upon information you provided on {DATE}. This report is an opportunity to review what you've told us and make any changes or additions. As you and I work together in reviewing and discussing this report, we will discuss any changes you would like to make to your gambling behavior.
Elements of Personalized Feedback Report

Client Specific Gambling

– Gambling behavior (frequency, time, intent, amount risked, amount won/loss)
– Negative consequences
– GD criteria and diagnostic status

Gambling Behavior

Petry & Weinstock
What patterns do you see here? Do you have any idea why some days are higher than others?
Your gambling losses for the past 6 months totaled approximately $12,500, which translates into approximately 32% of your total reported income for this time period. What priorities does this graph reflect?
Elements of Personalized Feedback

Client Perception vs. Normative Information
- Prevalence of gambling behavior in society
- Prevalence of gambling disorder

How People Gamble

- Recreational Gamblers: 84%
- Heavy Gamblers: 5%
- Non-Gamblers: 10%
- Compulsive Gamblers: 1%
Elements of Personalized Feedback

High Risk Situations
– “Think about the machine I lost on”
– “Wanting the excitement”

I would be able to control my gambling

If there were fights at home

Petry & Weinstock
Elements of Personalized Feedback

Other possible feedback:
- Gambling Motives
- Gambling Cognitive Distortions
- Overall Wellbeing/Quality of Life
- Relationship Satisfaction (Dyadic Adjustment)
- Addiction Severity Index (ASI) Scores

If Stand Alone Intervention: Tips for Change
Benefits of Personalized Feedback

Can be a stand alone, self-help intervention.

www.Checkyourgambling.net

Therapist Benefits:
1. Aids conceptualization of client
2. Fosters a collaborative environment
3. Helps establish positive therapeutic alliance

Client Benefits:
1. Brings awareness to or increases understanding of the problem
2. Increases client autonomy and self-efficacy.
3. Rate that it is helpful.
Review of the Literature

Psychological assessment as a therapeutic intervention.
- Large effect size on therapy process variables
- Moderate effect size on therapy outcome

Poston & Hanson, 2010
Review of the Literature

Large literature of personalized feedback for college student drinking.

- Stand alone (no therapist)
  - Small to moderate effect size when compared to assessment only.

- In-Person
  - Better than no-therapist or computerized
  - Effects stronger when feedback incorporates MI

Cadigan et al., 2015; Riper et al., 2009; Samson & Tanner-Smith, 2015
Review of the Literature

Personalized feedback engages clients in treatment.

Smokers with SMI not seeking treatment
- 32% vs 11% contacted provider
- 28% vs 9% attended the first session

VA Dual Diagnosis SUD Patients
- 61% vs 28% to attend SUD treatment

Lozano et al., 2013; Steinberg et al., 2004;
Review of the Literature

Gambling Disorder Treatment
  – Personalized Feedback in College Students
    • Prevention and intervention (SOGS ≥ 3)
    • Found reductions in gambling frequency, amount risked, and negative consequences
    • Stronger effects for in-person feedback
    • Improves other mental health outcomes

Cielo & Lisman, 2014; Geisner et al., 2015; Larimer et al., 2011; Martens et al., 2015; Neighbors et al., 2015; Petry et al., 2009;
review of the literature

larimer et al. (2011)

– 147 participants (sogs \geq 3) randomized to:
  (1) In-person personalized feedback session
  (2) Four session group cognitive behavioral therapy
  (3) Assessment only

– 84% completed the feedback session
– 60% attended \geq 1 CBT sessions
Review of the Literature

Larimer et al. (2011)

– Six months later found for the personalized feedback in relation to the assessment only:
  1. Significant reductions in gambling frequency, gambling-related negative consequences, and number of DSM-IV PG diagnostic criteria endorsed
Review of the Literature

Larimer et al. (2011)

**Negative Consequences**

- Baseline
- 6-Month Follow-up

**DSM-IV PG Criteria Endorsed**

- Baseline
- 6-Month Follow-up

Legend:
- Blue: Personalized Feedback
- Yellow: Assessment Only
Review of the Literature

Cunningham et al. (2012)
- 209 participants (PGSI > 3) randomized to:
  1. Personalized normative feedback (mailed)
  2. Personalized feedback (no norms; mailed)
  3. Wait-list control

Found reductions in gambling frequency for personalized feedback only.
Mechanism of Action

How does personalized feedback work?

– Correcting perceived norms
– Highlighting the behavior
  • “I had no idea I gambled that much!”
– Builds discrepancy between current behavior, values, and goals
– Improves therapeutic process
Creating Personalized Feedback

Numerous Methods

1. Some assessments tools come with software that generates feedback reports.
2. Create your own.
   • Use Excel to enter data and generate the feedback form.
How To Deliver Feedback

In a manner consistent with Motivational Interviewing

– Empathetic
– Supportive
– Non-judgmental
– Yet allow client to experience distress and discrepancy
How To Deliver Feedback

– Open Ended Questions
  • “What’s your reaction to this information?”
  • “What patterns do you see here?”
  • “Does the amount of money spent gambling reflect your priorities?”

– Reflections
  • “This is eye opening for you.”
  • “This information is not easy to take in.”
  • “Sometimes it feels hard to change your gambling”
How To Deliver Feedback

– Summarizing
  • “Your gambling has really gotten out of control. You had no idea how much time and money you were spending. Now you are starting to consider what changes you need to make.”

– Suggestions
  • “I have some suggestions on ways to change. Would it be okay if I shared them with you?”
Example Feedback - CheckYourGambling.Net

How Many Types of Gambling?

In the past year you reported taking part in 4 different type(s) of gambling. This means that you take part in more types of gambling than 83.3% of Canadian adult men.

You told us that you took part in the following gambling activities:

- Instant win (or scratch) tickets, or daily lottery tickets
- Lottery tickets such as Lotto 6/49, Super 7, raffles or fund-raising tickets
- Playing cards or board games with family or friends
- Casino games other than coin slots or VLTs (for example: poker, roulette, blackjack, Keno)

In the last year the largest amount you’ve spent on any given day was $100.00.

You also reported spending between $501 and $1000 on gambling in the last year. This means you spent more money on gambling in the last year than 90.1% of Canadian adult men.

Cunningham et al. (2012)
Example Feedback - CheckYourGambling.Net

**How much do I Spend on Gambling?**

Based on the information you gave us, you spent approximately $200.00 in the last month on gambling.

*With this money, you could have bought:*

- 20 movie passes

Cunningham et al. (2012)
Example Feedback - CheckYourGambling.Net

Problem Gambling Index (PGI)

The PGI score shows whether a person’s gambling should be considered a problem. High scores usually mean serious problems. The chart below is in the shape of a pyramid to show that there are more people with low PGI scores than high PGI scores.

Your PGI score is 11. The green area of the chart shows where your score falls:

- **Problem Gambler (greater than 8)**
- **Moderate Risk Gambler (3-7)**
- **Low Risk Gambler (1-2)**
- **Non Problem Gambler (0)**

Here are the explanations of PGI scores:

Cunningham et al. (2012)
Often, many gamblers tend to believe that there’s a reliable way or special code that helps them predict or control gambling outcomes.

You reported having the following beliefs about gambling:

- I pick my favourite places to play.
- I try to figure out a way to win.
- I think about how much money I could win.
- I try to keep a winning attitude.
- I spend time with people who I think are lucky.
- I go with my gut instincts and feelings.

Although we realize that responsible gambling can be fun and exciting, researchers have looked into these beliefs and have found that the following is true:

**The truth is you can’t control your luck**

Cunningham et al. (2012)
Example Feedback – University of Missouri

Your Gambling Compared to Others

According to the information you provided, on average you gambled 11 times per month over the previous two months, and you estimated that the typical MU student gambled 4 times per month. Campus-wide data indicates that the typical MU student gambles less than one time per month.*

*Note: This information comes from a random sample of 3,073 students.

Martens et al. (2015)
Hazardous Gambling

Using a scale assessing low- to high-risk for problems associated with gambling, you are considered a pathological gambler. Only about 6% of male college students meet this classification. Your classification is highlighted in red in the chart below.

How College Men Gamble

Martens et al. (2015)
Example Feedback – University of Missouri

**Ability to Refuse Gambling**

Below are some situations where you indicated it can be difficult for you to avoid gambling:

- When I'm in places where I usually gamble
- When my friends were gambling
- When I saw other people gambling
- When someone offered me the chance to gamble
- When I was thinking that it is likely that I would win
- When I was remembering wins I have had in the past
- When I was thinking about how I have good luck when I gamble
- When I was thinking of ways to solve my money problems
- When I was thinking how much money I have lost
- When I was thinking of things I could do to help me win
- When I was feeling happy

Martens et al. (2015)
Role Play

Divide up into groups of 3 people.
  – Roles: (1) Therapist; (2) Client; (3) Observer

Take a moment to familiarize yourself with the feedback report.

Role play (x3):
  ~ 8 minutes to role play the delivery of feedback.
  ~ 2 minutes of discussion about role play.
Thank you!

Sample feedback courtesy of:

– John Cunningham, PhD – Centre for Addiction and Mental Health
– Matthew Martens, PhD – University of Missouri
– James Whelan, PhD – The Gambling Clinic, University of Memphis

QUESTIONS?