## Class 4 scenarios for 2016 Mystery Shopper exercise Scenario 1: Assessing staff response to gambling harm cues over a three days

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Scenario Detail |
| **Scenario 1**A collection of general signs* Length of play
* Social behaviours
* Money

This scenario in itself is a general sign i.e., gambles most days. Each visit in isolation displays general signs. However cumulatively this scenario displays strong gambling harm signs and gives operators the chance to observe and monitor patron play over 3 consecutive days  | Multiple visit scenario - shopper doing multiple visits to same venue. These are done on three consecutive days for a total of 4 hours each day. Shoppers need to start 4 hours before the scheduled closing time. Day 1 - Shopper enters venue gaming room at 6 pm (if closing time is 10pm) – stays for 4 hours (unless asked to leave the venue by the staff). If asked to leave by venue staff shopper says he’s had an unlucky day and leaves or shopper leaves on their own accord at closing time if not asked to leave.Day 2 - Shopper goes in day 2, four hours before closing time and plays until closing. After 3 hours, shopper either:* goes to bar – gets a drink (non-alcoholic) and complains to staff about losing and is agitated.

OR* during venue sweep complains to staff about losing and is agitated.

Shopper then plays for the final hour if not asked to leave before that.Day 3 - Shopper returns four hours before closing - plays until closing time again. After playing for 2 hours, uses EFTPOS at bar and withdraws $100.00 successfully and continues to play. An hour later, shopper goes back to the bar and tries to withdraw another $100 which declines. Says “let’s try for $40”. This is successful and shopper continues to play until closing or asked to leave.  |
| **To meet expectations, venue staff must:*** check-in with the mystery shopper on day two;
* provide the mystery shopper with help-seeking advice on day three; and
* record concerns, interactions and interventions in the log book.
 |

### Scenario 2: Assessing staff response to declined cash withdrawals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Scenario Detail |
| **Scenario 2**General sign* Money
	+ Multiple cash withdrawals
* EFTPOS repeatedly declines
* Leaves venue to find $’s

This scenario is designed to test multiple cash withdrawals, chasing losses and EFTPOS declines. It also displays verbal signs around borrowing money to enable further gambling. | Player goes to venue after 11am, buys a drink (non-alcoholic), asks for $100 cash out (successfully) and starts playing on machines for 45 minutes.Goes back to the bar to withdraw money from EFTPOS, asks for another $100.00 cash out (successful) and plays for another 45 minutes, asks for $50 .00 cash out which declines then tries again to withdraw $25.00 which declines and makes comment to staff member - “I’m just going to get some money from my mate because my machine is about to pay out.” Shopper exits the venue for half an hour comes back to venue and starts playing for another 30 minutes. |
| **To meet expectations, venue staff must:*** identify these interactions as general signs of gambling harm;
* check in with the mystery shopper either by way of a general comment, a more specific talk about their gambling, or the handing out of a harm minimisation leaflet; and
* record any observations, concerns, interactions and interventions in the log book.
 |

### Scenarios 3: Assessing staff response to long hours of play (6.5 hours)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Scenario Detail |
| **Scenario 3**Strong signsGeneral signs* Length of play
	+ Finds it difficult to leave venue
* Social behaviour

This scenario is purely testing general signs but not obvious signs i.e., length of play, shows signs of distress and gambling causing problems. However cumulatively this scenario displays strong gambling harm signs and gives operators the chance to observe and monitor patron play over 6 .5 hours. | A mum/dad goes into venue gaming room just after 9 am, plays for the day. She shows obvious signs of distress (head in hands) to venue staff sweeping room and makes a comment – “I can’t really afford to be here“ and around 2.45 or nearest sweep states “My phone is flat, do you have the time? I really need to pick the kids up from school by 3.15”. Leaves at 3.25pm. |
| **To meet expectations, venue staff must:*** notice that they had someone playing for a long time;
* check in with the mystery shopper;
* intervene by providing help-seeking advice or information at a later time in the day; and
* record any observations, concerns, interactions and interventions in the log book.
 |

### Scenario 4: Assessing staff response to the concern about a family member’s gambling

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Scenario Detail |
| **Scenario 4**Strong signs* Family raise concerns about the gambler

General signs* Behaviour during play
* Social behaviours

This scenario tests strong and general signs. It tests how venue staff treat information from third parties around problem gambling - venue’s internal process when faced with third party disclosure – internal process to capture, record and monitor such disclosure. | A family member visits bar and says to venue staff “I’m worried about my son/nephew, his name is Mike - here is a photo of him. We are trying to help him stop the pokies, as it’s a real problem for him”. The next day Mike goes into the venue gaming room and plays for 60 minutes, displays signs of frustration and says to a staff member “Damn… these machines are rigged…I’ve lost the lot!!” Mike then storms out.If venue staff speak to Mike about his problem gambling, Mike says something like “I don’t know why they’re worried”. |
| **To meet expectations, venue staff must:*** take the photo to identify the possible problem gambler;
* offer information about harm minimisation to the concerned family member;
* identify the mystery shopper when he comes into the venue;
* monitor the mystery shopper for any signs of gambling harm behaviour; and/or
* record any observations, concerns, interactions and interventions in the log book.
 |