MINIMIZING GAMBLING HARM IN MASSACHUSETTS THROUGH REGULATION, RESEARCH, AND SERVICES

MARK VANDER LINDEN & AMANDA HOUPT
The SEIG Report

BACKGROUND
SEIG Report

- Offers a theoretical framework for future socioeconomic impact studies
- An exhaustive review of the existing literature on the social and economic impacts of gambling
- Summarizes findings across studies
- Assesses quality of studies using set criteria
Theoretical Framework for Impact Studies

• Measure impacts rather than costs and benefits
• Comprehensively assess all potential economic and social
• Avoid applying arbitrary monetary value to impacts that are clearly non-monetary in nature
• Create a profile of economic and social impacts
• Apply basic economic principles to evaluate the positive or negative nature of economic impacts
• Recognize that assessing the overall positive or negative nature of the observed impacts is a qualitative assessment that often involves some subjectivity
• Identify how much money is involved, where it is coming from, and where it is going
• Establish both micro and macro geographic impacts
• Compare changes to those observed in control communities/regions
• Speculate what the situation would have been without the introduction of the new form of gambling
• Use longitudinal designs when possible
• Assess impacts for years before and years after the introduction of new gambling
• Report the limitations and parameters of your results
SEIG Report—What did they review?

• 492 studies
  – 293 were empirical investigations
  – Only 44 were rated GOOD
  – Only 7 were rated EXCELLENT
  – 70% were published since 2000
    • But of these, 55% examined impacts that occurred in the 1990s
  – The majority focused on the United States or other Western nations
Focus of Studies Reviewed

- Impact of Casinos: 57%
- Multiple Forms of Gambling: 26%
- EGMs: 10%
- Other: 7%

Multiple Forms of Gambling include:
- EGMs
- Other
For each study reviewed, they provide:

- A full reference
- Abstract
- Type
- Study quality rating
- Gambling format
- Location
- Years impacts examined
- Economic Impacts
- Social Impacts
## Economic Impacts Examined

- Government Revenue
- Public Services
- Regulatory Costs
- Infrastructure Value
- Infrastructure Costs
- Business Starts and Failures
- Business Revenue
- Property Values
# Social Impacts Examined

- Problem Gambling & Related Indices
- Crime
- Employment
- Socioeconomic Inequality
- Leisure Activity
- Public Attitudes
- Quality of Life
- Public Health
- Social Capital
- Values
General Trends Across Studies

- Many were **non-empirical**
- Majority did not use research methods that enable researchers to unambiguously determine correlates and causation
  - Very few pre/post comparisons
  - Very few control groups or comparison regions
  - Very few with both micro and macro scope
  - Very few examined impacts over a long period of time
  - Very few utilized large samples
- Most of the studies were consultancy reports rather than academic journal articles
Key Positive Impacts Identified

- Increase in government revenue
- Enhancement of public services such as health services and educational services
- Increase in regulatory costs associated with gambling introduction
- New gambling venues add to the physical assets and wealth of communities and reliably increases infrastructure value
- Increases infrastructure costs
- When patron base is from outside of the area, positively impacts other businesses and overall employment
Key Negative Impacts Identified

• Increase in problem gambling and its related indices (i.e., bankruptcy, divorce, suicide, treatment #s)
• Crime impacts are complex and studies yielded mixed results
• Increased socioeconomic inequality to a small extent
• Increase in negative attitudes toward gambling
Key Mediating Variables Identified

- The degree of change in gambling availability for the population studied
- The type of gambling introduced
- The length of time that gambling has been legally available prior to its introduction or the introduction of new forms
- Whether revenues are locally derived or derived from outside areas
- The type and extent of gambling opportunities in neighboring jurisdictions
- The strength of policies and programs to minimize negative effects
- Baseline levels of community impoverishment
- Whether macro or micro impacts are examined
- The length of time over which impacts are evaluated
- How gambling revenue is dispersed
7 Studies Rated “Excellent”

Blue Thorn Research et al. (2007)

• Examines impacts in British Columbia at 3 periods of time:
  – Before gambling venues open
  – One year after venues open
  – Two years after venues open

• Methods used:
  – Telephone surveys (n=2500)
  – Analyses of secondary social & economic data
  – Employee surveys
  – Surveys of residents of 4 host municipalities
  – Patron Surveys
  – Qualitative interviews
O’Neil et al. (2005)

- Compared Australian communities with EGMs to Australian communities without EGMs using a matched comparison approach.
- Methods:
  - Key informant interviews with host community leaders
  - Telephone surveys
  - Analyzed secondary social and economic data for trends
  - Using primary and secondary data collected, compare communities selected to determine impact
Williams, et al. (2011)

- This study follows up on a series of general population surveys conducted in Alberta, Canada from 1992-2010
  - Methods:
    - Secondary analysis of economic and social indicators
    - Population surveys (attitudes, behavior, PG prevalence)
      - Summer of 2008 (n=3001)
      - Summer of 2009 (n=1004)
      - Online panel (2008 n=2018; 2009 n=1006)
    - Primary data collection during construction & operational phases
    - Key informant interviews and focus groups
Review of Major Points:

- The SEIG study is a really great resource
- The majority of existing studies examined impacts only after gambling was introduced
- Very few collected a baseline and thus, lack an accurate point of comparison
- This makes their findings less reliable and less useful
- We can use the SEIG Report’s findings & recommendations to improve future studies and future responses to gambling impacts
References

AN OVERVIEW OF THE MASSACHUSETTS GAMING COMMISSION

THE EXPANDED GAMING ACT OF 2011
On November 22, 2011, Governor Deval Patrick signed Chapter 194 “An Act Establishing Expanded Gaming in the Commonwealth”
PRINCIPLES OF THE GAMING ACT

• Transparent and competitive bidding of licenses
• Maximum long-term value to the Commonwealth
• Expansion of economic development benefits across regions of the state
• Protecting host and surrounding communities by addressing all social impacts and costs
• Ensuring rigorous public safety, regulatory and enforcement mechanisms will be the best in the country
OUR MISSION: FAIR, TRANSPARENT & PARTICIPATORY

MISSION STATEMENT

The mission of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission is to create a fair, transparent, and participatory process for implementing the expanded gaming law passed by the Legislature and signed by the Governor in November, 2011. In creating that process, the Commission will strive to ensure that its decision-making and regulatory systems engender the confidence of the public and participants, and that they provide the greatest possible economic development benefits and revenues to the people of the Commonwealth, reduce to the maximum extent possible the potentially negative or unintended consequences of the new legislation, and allow an appropriate return on investment for gaming providers that assures the operation of casino-resorts of the highest quality.
The Gaming Act created an independent body responsible for overseeing and implementing the licensing process.

The Commission consists of:

- 5 full time commissioners
- Chair appointed by Governor
- One appointed by Attorney General
- One appointed by State Treasurer
- Remaining two appointed by all three appointing authorities (GOV, AG, TRE)
MEET THE COMMISSIONERS

Steve Crosby, Chairman
- Founding Dean of McCormack Graduate School of Policy and Global Studies at UMass Boston
- Appointed by Governor

James McHugh, Secretary
- Former Associate Justice of the Appeals Court
- Appointed by Attorney General

Enrique Zuniga, Treasurer
- Former Executive Director at Mass Water Pollution Abatement Trust
- Appointed by State Treasurer for experience in corporate finance and securities

Gayle Cameron
- Retired as a Deputy Superintendent (second highest rank) with the New Jersey State Police
- Appointed by all three appointing authorities for experience in gaming

Bruce Stebbins
- Previously served as business Development Administrator for the city of Springfield
- Appointed by all three appointing authorities
LEGISLATION DETAILS: THREE REGIONS

- Allows for 3 destination resort casinos in 3 geographically-diverse locations
- No more than 1 in each region
- Allows for one slots parlor statewide (not restricted to regions)
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LICENSE SELECTION PROCESS
Commission issues request for applications

Applications are filed
- Final application must contain, among other things:
  - Host and surrounding community agreement defining all responsibilities between the community and the applicant
  - Certification that applicant will comply with “state and local building codes and ordinances and bylaws”
  - Certification that the agreement has received a binding vote in the host community or in the host ward of the three largest cities
  - Studies showing the regional impact and economic effect of the project

Commission investigates
- Two part inquiry
  - Phase 1: Applicant’s financial and ethical suitability
  - Phase 2: Remaining application components
  - Commission determines, if necessary, who the surrounding communities are

Public hearing in the host community

Commission decides
License criteria include:

- Maximize economic development
- Promote local small businesses and the tourism industry.
- Maximize job generation while protecting existing jobs
- Maximize capital investment
- Promote diversity in the workforce and among suppliers
- Coordination with regional and economic development plans
- Mitigate compulsive gambling statewide and other negative consequences in host and surrounding communities
THE RESEARCH AGENDA
The Commission oversees an annual research agenda to:

1. understand the **social and economic effects of expanding gaming** in the commonwealth and

2. obtain scientific information relative to the **neuroscience, psychology, sociology, epidemiology and etiology of gambling**.
1. A baseline study of the existing occurrence of problem gambling in the commonwealth;

2. A review and evaluation of existing programs available that prevent and address the harmful consequences of problem gambling

3. Comprehensive study of the social and economic impacts of gambling in the commonwealth
MEASURING SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACTS

- review of existing federal, state, local and Indian tribal government policies and practices with respect to the legalization or prohibition of gambling
- relationship between gambling and levels of crime
- pathological or problem gambling, including its impact on individuals, families, businesses, social institutions and the economy
- impact of gambling on individuals, families, businesses, social institutions and the economy generally, including the role of advertising in promoting gambling and the impact of gambling on depressed economic areas
- extent to which gaming has provided revenues to other state, local and Indian tribal governments
- costs of added infrastructure, police force, increased unemployment, increased health care and dependency on public assistance
- impact of the development and operation of the gaming establishment on small businesses in host communities and surrounding communities
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FUNDING STRUCTURE
LEGISLATION DETAILS:
LICENSING AND FEES

Type I License (Resort Casinos)
- Initial license period of **15 years**
- **$ 85 million** initial license fee
- **$ 500 million** minimum investment
- Taxed at **25%** of gross gaming revenues

Type II License (Slots Parlor)
- Initial license period of **5 years**
- **$25 million** initial license fee
- **$125 million** minimum investment
- Taxed at **40%** of gross gaming revenue
- Another 9% of gross gaming revenue is credited to the racehorse development fund

Additional fees include
- Application fee of not less than **$400,000**
  - Not less than **$50,000** to cover host and surrounding community impact studies and negotiating mitigation agreements
- Community impact fees for host and surrounding communities
  - Must be in agreements between applicants and communities
- Annual slot machine license fee of **$600 per machine**
  - Funds Commission’s ongoing operations
- **Annual fee of not less than $5,000,000 to provide programs to deal with compulsive gambling and other addictions**
Revenues derived from gaming are allocated by law to:

- Local Aid Stabilization Fund
- Manufacturing Fund
- Community College Fund
- Mass Cultural Council
- Gaming Economic Development
- Mass Tourism Fund
- Local Capital Projects Fund
- Debt Reduction
- Health Care Payment Reform Fund
- Community Mitigation Fund
- Public Health Trust Fund
  - 5% of Category 1 GGR ~ $12.5 - $15 million / year
- Race Horse Development Fund
- Gaming Local Aid Fund
- Transportation Infrastructure and Development Fund

- An additional minimum of $5 million / year for the costs of service and public health programs dedicated to addressing compulsive gambling or other addiction services
Public Health Trust Fund: created by the Legislature to assist social services and public health programs dedicated to addressing problems associated with compulsive gambling including, but not limited to, gambling prevention and addiction services, substance abuse services, educational campaigns to mitigate the potential addictive nature of gambling and any studies and evaluations necessary, including the annual research agenda to ensure the proper and most effective strategies.

- **5.0%** of the revenue from Category 1 Licensees is distributed to the Public Health Trust Fund
- Annual fee of not less than $5,000,000 to provide programs to deal with compulsive gambling and other addictions
**Community Mitigation Fund**: created by the Legislature to address impacts after a gaming facility is operational

- **6.5%** of the revenue from Category 1 Licensees is distributed to the Community Mitigation Fund

- In addition, **10%** of the gaming licensing fees, with the exception of initial licensing fees, is also placed in the Community Mitigation Fund

- Funds to be expended “to assist the host community and surrounding communities in off-setting costs related to construction and operation of a gaming establishment including,” water/sewer, education, transportation, infrastructure, housing, environmental issues and public safety

- A Community Mitigation SubCommittee and Local Community Mitigation Committees, including members from host and surrounding communities, will advise the Commission
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KEY COLLABORATIONS
KEY RELATIONSHIPS

Responsible Gaming / Problem Gambling

Massachusetts Council on Compulsive Gambling
An Executive Committee bound by MOU and supported by statute. Key elements include:

- **Executive Committee of the Public Health Trust Fund** shall be established for purposes of setting the overall budget and protocols for expenditures.

- 75% of the monies in the Fund shall be set aside each year for services to be provided by the Department of Public Health (DPH).

- The Director of Problem Gambling Services at DPH and the Director of Research and Problem Gambling at MGC shall work cooperatively to ensure that there are no inconsistencies, redundancies, or conflicts in their respective duties and responsibilities.
The SEIGMA and MAGIC Studies:

Cornerstones of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission’s Research Agenda
Overview

SEIGMA STUDY
Essential Elements of MGC Research Agenda

- Understanding the social and economic effects of expanded gambling;
- Implementing a baseline study of problem gambling and the existing prevention and treatment programs that address its harmful consequences; and
- Obtaining scientific information relative to the neuroscience, psychology, sociology, epidemiology and etiology of gambling.
Overarching Features of SEIGMA

- An experienced, multi-disciplinary, scientifically rigorous research team
- Collaborative orientation
- Uses a state of the art analytical framework
- Uses multiple methods
- Comprehensive analysis at multiple geographical levels
- Measures impacts before and after the introduction of new gambling venues
SEIGMA Overview

Executive Team

Project Manager

Data Manager

Data Management Center

Social & Health Impacts Analysis
- General Population Surveys
- Targeted Population Surveys
- Online Panel Surveys
- Secondary Data

Economic & Fiscal Analysis
- Secondary Data
- Gambling Venue Data
- Patron Surveys
- License Plate Surveys
- Focus Groups
- Key Informant Interviews

Problem Gambling Services Evaluation
- Helpline Data Analysis
- Key Informant Interviews
- Focus Groups
- Clinical Data
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SOCIAL & HEALTH IMPACTS ANALYSIS
Social & Health Indicators

- Problem Gambling & related indices
- Crime
- Leisure activities
- Housing
- Education
- Socioeconomic Inequality
- Attitudes
- Quality of life
- Health
- Transportation
- Environment
Primary Data Collection

• General Population Surveys
  – n=10,000
  – Addressed-Based Sampling Approach
  – Multi-mode interviews (web→questionnaire→phone)

• Targeted Population Surveys
  – n=1,000 in each set of host & surrounding communities
  – Addressed Based Sample
  – Multi-mode approach

• Online Panel Survey
  – n=5,000
Secondary Data Collection

• Data Sources:
  • Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)
  • American Community Survey
  • All Payer Claims Database
  • Acute Hospital Case Mix
  • Other sources as needed
Progress to Date:

• General Population Survey is out of the field
  – Data cleaning & analysis in progress
  – Topline results expected in September 2014

• Targeted Populations Surveys in the field

• Online Panel is complete
  – Data analysis in process

• Secondary Data
  – 10 year trends for most variables
  – Experimenting with data sharing
Assessing Crime Impacts

• Section 71 of Section 23K
  – Specifically requires an assessment of:
    • The relationship between gambling availability and levels of crime
    • Existing enforcement and regulatory practices intended to address any such relationship
What kind of crime?  Which are more important?

- DUI
- Alcohol-related car accidents
- Public intoxication
- Drug offenses
- Assault
- Property crime
- Burglary
- Robbery
- Murder
- Passing counterfeit money
- Gang activity or organized crime
- Citations issued

- Simple assault
- Sexual assault
- Domestic violence
- Family offenses
- Prostitution
- Suicide or suicide attempt
- Illegal gambling
- Race fixing
- Cheating
- Loan sharking
- Money laundering
- General calls for service
- Perception of crime and safety
Key crime question

What is the best way to link crime measures to the new gambling venues, in order to discern which changes in these measures over time are attributable to the venues?
What influence does gambling introduction have on crime?

**Theory #1**
New Casino Related Crime
- More problem gamblers
- Increase in gambling

**Theory #2**
New Casino
- Increased economic activity
- Decrease in crime

**Theory #3**
New Casino
- Increase illegal money activity
- Increase in crime

**Theory #4**
New Casino Crime
- Increase in alcohol
- Increase alcohol related
A Model Method to Collect & Analyze Crime Data

- Ongoing meetings with local Chief of Police in host and surrounding communities
- Incentive of mitigation funding
- Special interest of Commissioner Cameron
- Employ expertise of crime analyst, state police and other law enforcement experts
What will we learn?

- Public Attitudes about gambling
- Current gambling behavior/participation rates—demographics, frequency, expenditures
- Population prevalence of problem gambling
- The substance abuse and mental health comorbidities of PGs in MA
- Determine community-specific impacts of gambling expansion, including crime
- What types of crime are attributable to new gambling venues
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ECONOMIC & FISCAL IMPACTS ANALYSIS
Objectives:

• Measure and determine the economic and fiscal impacts of casino facilities at the local, regional, and state level through primary and secondary data collection and estimating methods
  – Government finance
  – Business dynamics
  – Labor market conditions
  – Property values
Economic & Fiscal Indicators

- Government revenue
- Public services
- Regulatory costs
- Business starts & failures
- Business revenue
- Tourism
- Personal income
- Employment
- Housing
- Infrastructure value & costs
- Origin & costs of gambling supplies & servicing
Two complementary approaches:

- **Direct impacts and primary data** collected directly from the casino operations such as employees, wages, construction investment, and local expenditures modeled with REMI to isolate economic impacts.

- **Secondary data sources** primarily from public government data sets to track conditions over time (e.g., unemployment rate, household income, and property values) and compare trends before/after and with comparison regions.
Methods Used:

- Modeling impacts using REMI
- Matched Control Communities
  - Choosing a “basket” of communities without a casino that are similar to one with a casino
  - Comparing communities to approximate what would have happened without the casino
Progress To Date:

• Secondary Data Analysis:
  – Established baseline trends for past 5-10 years
  – Refined strategy for selecting matching communities
  – Matched community analysis in process

• Primary Data Collection:
  – Refining methods and research plans
  – Building relationships with collaborators
What will we learn?

• Whether jobs created are new jobs or jobs displaced from existing businesses
• Whether workers are hired within or outside of MA
• The net economic impact of gambling venues
• Municipal officials’ perceptions of the impacts of the new gambling venues on economic development
Overview

PROBLEM GAMBLING SERVICES EVALUATION
Primary Data Collection

- Analysis of items from General Population Surveys
- Focus Groups with treatment providers
- Key Informant Interviews
Secondary Data Collection

- MCCG Helpline Data Analysis
- Retrospective clinical data analysis
Progress To Date:

• General Population Survey Items:
  – Analysis in progress

• Helpline Data Analysis
  – Analysis & report writing in process

• General Progress:
  – Refining methods for other aspects of evaluation
What will we learn?

- What prevention and treatment services currently exist in Massachusetts
- Who is using these services
- How adequately these services address and mitigate impacts of problem gambling
- How existing services match up with best practices in problem gambling prevention, intervention, and treatment
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DATA MANAGEMENT CENTER
Role of the Data Management Center

• Creating Data Management Plan
• Collecting, cleaning, and storing all SEIGMA data
• Creating Data Use Agreements
• Determining what raw data can be shared with whom and sharing it as widely as possible
• Disseminating key findings and results of SEIGMA analysis in unique ways
• Ensuring IRB compliance and ethical integrity
Blog

**SEIGMA’s Annual Meeting**

Amanda Houpt, Social and Economic Impacts of Gambling in Massachusetts (SEIGMA) Project Manager, reports on the recent Annual Meeting of the team, held at the University of Massachusetts Amherst.

For most Americans, mid-April marks tax season and the return of spring. For the SEIGMA Research Team, April has additional significance as the anniversary of our project’s start date. It’s hard to believe it, but just a little over one year ago, the SEIGMA study launched. The team has been a flurry of activity ever since. To commemorate the one year anniversary of the project, we held a three-day meeting on April 14-16. Expert advisors, principal investigators, team members, and members of the Massachusetts Gaming Commission converged in Western Massachusetts to update each other on progress made, collaborate, and plan for the next year.

Read more
### Dissemination Example: Trends

#### Unemployment Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Percent Change 2002-2012: **27.2%**

#### Labor Force Participation Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>66.3%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>65.0%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relative Percent Change 2002-2012: **-4.9%**

#### Graph: Unemployment Rate with Labor Force Participation, 2002-2012

- **MA**
- **US**
- **MA Participation Rate**

- Unemployment Rate
- MA Labor Force Participation Rate
- US Labor Force Participation Rate

- 2002: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2003: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2004: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2005: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2006: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2007: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2008: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2009: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2010: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2011: 6.7%, 66.0%
- 2012: 6.7%, 66.0%
Dissemination Example: Maps

2012 High Needs (%) by Municipality
Utility of the Data Management Center

• Other researchers will be able to replicate our analyses
• Other researchers and interested parties will be able to conduct unique analyses
• The general public will be able to look at different measures within their own communities
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MAGIC STUDY
Essential Elements of MGC Research

Agenda

• Understanding the social and economic effects of expanded gambling;

• Implementing a baseline study of problem gambling and the existing prevention and treatment programs that address its harmful consequences; and

• Obtaining scientific information relative to the neuroscience, psychology, sociology, epidemiology and etiology of gambling.
Comparing SEIGMA to MAGIC

DEFINING KEY TERMS
Type of Study

SEIGMA: REPEAT CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDY

• Collecting data “snapshots” at designated points in time over a period of time
• Not the same group of individuals over time

MAGIC: LONGITUDINAL COHORT STUDY

• Collecting a kind of “moving picture” of data by collecting data at designated time points
• Following the same group of people over a period of time
Incidence vs. Prevalence

MAGIC gives you Incidence

- # of new cases in the population
- People who go from not having a condition to having a condition
- =the raw # of new problem gamblers in MA

SEIGMA gives you Prevalence

- # of existing cases in the population
- Includes both new cases and existing cases
- =the raw # of existing problem gamblers in MA
Etiology

• The study of causation, or what causes a particular condition
• The study of how a condition, in this case problem gambling develops over time
Overview

MAGIC’S METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH
Approach

- 2,600 adult residents of MA drawn from SEIGMA Baseline Population Survey
  - 1,300 general population random sample
  - 1,300 high risk sample

- Assessments:
  - Wave 1: Launched Sept 2013
  - Wave 2: Launch Fall 2014
  - Wave 3: Launch Fall 2015
  - Wave 4+: Launch Fall of each year
What will we learn?

• The individual, social, and environmental variables that predict or mediate the development of problem gambling
• The variables that are most predictive of recovery from problem gambling
• Safe levels of gambling involvement that do not lead to problem gambling
• The characteristics that make problem gamblers more likely to seek treatment
SIGNIFICANCE OF MAGIC STUDY

Overview
Existing Cohort Studies:

• Leisure, Lifestyle, Lifecycle Project
  – Alberta, Canada
  – 2006-2011

• Quinte Longitudinal Study
  – Ontario, Canada
  – 2006-2011

• Swedish Longitudinal Gambling Study
  – 2008-present

• Victorian Gambling Study
  – Victoria, Australia
  – 2008-present
Limitations of Existing Studies:

- A circumscribed demographic
- A very small sample size or very small # of people who became problem gamblers over the course of the study
- Short time span/ limited assessment period
- Studied either gambling or problem gambling, but not both
- Short questionnaire that did not fully capture all etiologically relevant variables
Significance of MAGIC Study:

Limitations of Past Studies:
- Limited Demographic
- Small # of people who develop gambling problems
- Limited assessment period
- Short time span
- Limited focus
- Short questionnaire

MAGIC’s Improvements:
- General Population Sample
- Individuals at high risk of developing gambling problems are oversampled
- Uses shorter time interval between assessments & shorter recall period
- Goal of 10 year study period
- Comprehensive focus on both gambling & problem gambling
- Use of comprehensive questionnaire
Review of Major Points

• MGC’s Research Agenda has 3 components
• A research team from UMass is leading two large-scale research studies to address them
• The first study involves collecting data annually from a large, representative sample and comparing it to secondary data
• The second study involves collecting data from a single group of people over a long period of time
• Both studies will have tremendous utility for planning effective prevention and intervention at the individual, community, and policy level
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