# Methodology for evaluating Class 4 Mystery Shopper data

## Purpose

1. This document outlines the methodology the Department has used to evaluate the raw data from the 2016 mystery shopper exercise for clubs and non-clubs. The class 4 scenarios can be found in Appendix B.
2. The document provides full details of the procedure we used to assess each venue, potential limitations of the exercise and the categories used to analyse the data gathered from the mystery shop scenarios.
3. Note, this document can be read alongside the raw data provided for each society or club.

## Mystery shopping

1. Mystery shopping, in this context, is the use of trained researchers to act as ‘customers’ in order to monitor the quality of service delivery. The method is used extensively by both commercial organisations and government agencies; it allows a structured approach to measuring service delivery in everyday conditions.[[1]](#footnote-1)
2. In particular, it can be used to assess the performance of staff against the established standards expected and communicated by organisations and/or government agencies.[[2]](#footnote-2) As Wilson (1998) has written: *If an organisation is communicating the expectations of management and customers through setting service standards, there is thought to be a need for measurement of performance relative to these standards. Mystery shopping can provide this measurement as it aims to collect facts rather than perceptions. [[3]](#footnote-3)*
3. In this case, the standards expected are those promulgated in the Gamble Host Pack resources. The purpose of the mystery shopping exercise is to assess current host responsibility practice in class 4 venues identifying how well venue staff put their harm prevention and minimisation training into practice across a representative sample of class 4 venues.

## Sample and participants

1. A third party organisation experienced in mystery shopper exercises wascontracted to conduct the mystery shops on our behalf. The Department and third party trained the mystery shoppers on the scenarios and data recording. All recorded data was submitted to the Department for assessment and analysis.
2. The Department selected 120 class 4 venues for a mystery shop assessment through a random sampling procedure. The venues comprised 97 non-club venues and 23 clubs. The venues constitute 10 per cent of total class 4 venues in New Zealand.

## Non-Club venues

1. A total of 97 venues were visited, with an additional response assessed for each of the 42 venues in scenario four. The additional response that was tested in scenario 4 was a pre-visit to assess how venues would capture and manage information relating to harmful gambling from a third party. This resulted in a total of 139 responses being assessed. However, 19 responses could not be assessed for reasons outside the control of the Department. For example, the mystery shopper could not carry out the scenario in full due to factors outside the control of the exercise. The total number of responses actually tested was therefore 120.

## Clubs

1. A total of 23 clubs were visited, with an additional response assessed for each of the 9 clubs in scenario four. The additional response that was tested in scenario 4 was a pre-visit to assess how venues would capture and manage information relating to harmful gambling from a third party. This resulted in a total of 32 responses being assessed. However, 10 of these responses could not be tested for reasons outside the control of the Department. For example, some mystery shoppers were refused entry to clubs as they were not members of those clubs. The total number of responses actually tested was therefore 22.

## Results

1. Results were assessed for each response, with an overall result of ‘Expected’, ‘Partially Expected’, or ‘Not Expected’. The sum total of these results represented the number of responses actually tested. Where percentages are expressed in results, the percentages are for responses actually tested, and exclude ‘Not Tested’ results.

## Venue Characteristics

1. Results were assessed by a range of venues characteristics to identify any differences in results based on these characteristics. These characteristics include:

* *Rural/Urban location -* Based on Territorial Area that the venue is located, with venues designated as urban if within a major metropolitan city and rural if not.
* *Deprivation index of venue location -* Based on geo-coding of the location of the venue and deprivation statistics from Statistics New Zealand. Deprivation index was grouped as high deprivation (7-10), medium deprivation (4-6) and low deprivation (1-3).
* *Number of Electronic Gaming Machines (EGMs) in the venue -* Based on the number of EGMs operating, with high EGM count (18 or more EGMs), medium EGM count (9-17 EGMs) and low EGM count (1-8 EGMs).
* *Level of Gaming Machine Proceeds (GMP) generated at the venue* - Based on the annual GMP that the venue had generated in the 12 months prior to the Mystery Shopper exercise being conducted (GMP 01 October 2015 – 30 September 2016), with high GMP (>$1M/year), medium GMP ($200K-$1M/year) and low GMP (<$200K/year).

## What is being assessed

1. The scenarios were developed to assess the following gambling harm indicators:

* long hours of play (assessed in scenario three);
* cash withdrawal behaviour at ATMs and EFTPOS transactions (including declines) (assessed in scenario two);
* verbal and non-verbal cues, including direct disclosure to venue staff and signs of agitation over multiple days (assessed in scenario 1);
* third party concerns by a family member about a gambler (assessed in scenario four).

1. The Department assessed venue responses to each scenario by how well venue staff responded to the mystery shopper’s potential gambling harm behaviour. The responses were evaluated using the following ratings:

* expected response (i.e. venue staff met the expected standard in their response);
* partially expected (i.e. venue staff only partially met the expected standard);
* not expected (i.e. venue staff did not meet the expected standards).

# Process for evaluating data

1. The following process was used to evaluate the raw data:

* The Department established three themes to assess each venue visit – monitoring, interaction, intervention.
* Sub-sets were created for the monitoring theme to reflect the various types of opportunities or engagement throughout the scenario by venue staff – venue records, comings and goings and gaming room. These are defined in Table one on page 4.
* The Department established that within each scenario, there were points of engagement. These are the connections made between the mystery shopper and venue staff, whether they were verbal or non-verbal. For example, when the mystery shopper entered the venue, this is the first “point of engagement” for venue staff to register who has entered their venue and then for the venue to be able to monitor their gambling activity. It was these points of engagement that were evaluated.
* It is important to note that several features of each scenario were not evaluated, i.e., the date and time in which the scenarios were undertaken. These were considered but did not require an evaluation as they had no impact on the overall assessment of harm minimisation practice. These elements are listed in Table 3.

1. Evaluation of each point of engagement in the scenarios was developed based on input and advice that all societies were invited to provide as well gamble host pack resources. Societies identified the behaviours their venue staff are trained and expected/encouraged to deliver when gamblers display gambling harm indicators. While scenarios were not developed with the sector, behavioural indicators and expected responses for some strong and general gambling harm signs were drawn from their feedback.
2. Additionally, internal feedback was provided on what the Department’s gambling inspectors would expect venue staff to deliver for the same gambling harm indicators.
3. The scenarios contain a range of general and strong signs of gambling harm and in some cases, combinations of these signs are spread over multiple days to see how venues identify, engage, track and monitor players.
4. The table below outlines how the various points of engagement have been categorised as monitoring, interaction or intervention. The definitions support the criteria for evaluation.

**Table 1: Outline of “themes”**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Actions demonstrated** | **Sub-set** | **Definition** |
| Monitoring | Comings and goings | Venue staff are aware of who is coming and going from their venue.  This can be demonstrated by either verbal or non-verbal acknowledgement received by the mystery shopper upon arrival and departure.  This is about establishing face-to-face rapport, and excludes CCTV monitoring of venue patrons. |
| Gaming room monitoring | Venue staff enter the gaming room providing an opportunity to observe mystery shopper gambling behaviour. This could be any number of visits by venue staff (one or multiple) into the gaming room.  This is not about observing or evaluating venue staff activities (sweeps) in the gaming room. It is to inform the presence (opportunities) of venue staff in the gaming room to observe gambling behaviour and activity. |
| Venue records | Venue records reflect venue response and ongoing monitoring to verbal or non-verbal cues relating to gambling harm. The venue records capture the overall picture of individual gambling activity and the opportunity to record and hand over information to all venue staff ensures that gambling activity is not seen as isolated incidences. |
| Interaction | Checking in | Targeted conversation directed at the mystery shopper’s gambling behaviour to check to see if they are okay i.e. asking questions based on concerns, time, money spent or behaviour exhibited. |
| Intervention |  | Venue offers help-seeking resource, contact numbers for gambling support or verbal guidance to interrupt/stop the mystery shopper’s gambling session. This is one step further than just asking if someone is okay (as per an interaction); it is then providing a resource of contact for support. |

# Limitations

1. Almost all research studies are subject to certain limitations, this exercise included. In undertaking this evaluation, the Department acknowledges that there are some inherent limitations to the outcome of each scenario. These limitations are listed below and are considered in each scenario evaluation.
2. It is important to note that the mystery shoppers may have missed a verbal or non-verbal cue from venue staff. For example, if the mystery shopper did not observe it, it does not mean it didn’t happen.

**Table 2: Limitations to the exercise**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Limitation | Departmental evaluation |
| Monitoring – comings and goings  Venue staff are busy when mystery shopper enters or leaves venue | The Department recognises that the best way to build rapport is to meet and greet patrons.  Venue staff being aware of who is coming and going from their venue is a best-practice approach for monitoring the venue and patron behaviour.  An evaluation outcome of “not expected” may indicate that staff could not fulfil basic venue host responsibility. |
| Monitoring – gaming room  Presence of venue staff in gaming room (one or multiple times) | Presence of venue staff in gaming room is about the opportunity to monitor patron gambling behaviour. The evaluation does not distinguish between one or multiple opportunities. |
| Monitoring -  CCTV footage | Our evaluation does not take into account any non-face-to-face monitoring undertaken by venues using CCTV. Societies and clubs have been given an opportunity to retain any CCTV and review footage for their reference. |
| ATM machines (no EFTPOS available at venue) | The Department acknowledge some venues have a policy about withdrawing cash with patrons being required to use the venue ATM (or off-site ATM) rather than getting cash from the bar.  As some scenarios require a verbal cue to venue staff during the cash-out process and this has not been delivered by the mystery shopper, it has been evaluated as “not applicable”. |
| Actors not able to undertake scenario or certain elements of the scenario | In some cases, the mystery shoppers were unable to act out the scripted cues in the scenarios, for example if venue staff were not present in the gaming room or bar to hear verbal cues. In these cases the evaluation has been marked as “not applicable”. |
| Long duration between third party concern at venue and mystery shopper entering venue (Scenario 4) | There was inconsistency when mystery shoppers entered a venue after third-party concern about their gambling. In some cases the duration exceeded three days. This will be considered and will be discussed with individual societies and clubs around how the venue was evaluated. |

# Scenario observations excluded from the evaluation

1. The following categories across all scenarios were used to inform how the results in various columns of the raw data were evaluated. However, individually they were not included in the evaluation. They are outlined in the table below and need to be read alongside the raw data.

**Table 3: Evaluation exclusions**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Scenario | Elements of scenario not evaluated | Reasoning |
| All | Venue name | Raw data received around these parts of each scenario did not inform the overall outcome of assessing how well each venue was meeting their host responsibility obligations. |
| Date |
| Time arriving |
| Cash on arrival |
| Time leaving venue |
| Winnings |
| Conversations with staff | The mystery shopper response in these categories was not individually evaluated and was considered in evaluating other activities. |
| Asked to leave |
| Additional notes |
| Scenario 1 day 1 | Act out verbal cues  Response to verbal cues  Intervention  Intervention material  Log books | The response to the mystery shopper acting out the verbal cue was considered in the overall evaluation of scenario 1 not specifically for day 1.  We would not expect an intervention, intervention material to be given or a log book entry about our mystery shopper on day 1. |
| Scenario 1 day 2 | Act out Verbal cue  Act out at Bar  Intervention  Intervention material | The acting out of verbal cues was considered in how we evaluated the venue staff response to verbal cue.  We would not expect intervention material or an intervention to occur on day 2. |
| Scenario 1 day 3 | Intervention material | As a standalone element, this was excluded. However, if intervention material was provided, it was evaluated under column titled “intervention”. |
| Scenario 2 | Act out verbal cue | As a stand-alone element, this was excluded. However, it was considered in evaluating the venue staff response when mystery shopper re-entered venue. If verbal cues by the mystery shopper were not acted out, then we have marked the response to the verbal cue as “not applicable”. |
| Scenario 3 | Act out first verbal cue | As a stand-alone element, this was excluded. This was evaluated in combination with the response to first verbal cue. |
| Scenario 4 | Family member acknowledged on leaving venue (pre-visit) | This was a third-party concern, and we were not assessing them as a patron exhibiting signs of gambling harm. |
| Scenario 4 | Intervention material | As a stand-alone element, this was excluded. If intervention material was provided, it was evaluated under column titled “intervention”. |

# Categories

1. The Department used the following indicators to evaluate each point of engagement for all four scenarios. The indicators and their broad definitions are as follows.

**Table 4: Evaluation categories**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Indicators | Definition |
| Expected | The evaluation meets the criteria in how the sector and Department would expect venues to respond. |
| Partially expected | The evaluation meets some of the criteria of how the sector and Department would expect venues to respond. |
| Not expected | The evaluation meets none of the criteria of how the sector and Department would expect venues to respond. |
| Not applicable (not assessed) | The point of engagement was not able to be rated due to factors beyond the control of the Department i.e. mystery shopper was unable to act out cues in scenario. |
| Gambling Harm Intervention - Could Not Complete | The mystery shopper was unable to undertake or complete the scenario due to having previously been identified by the venue/casino. |

## Evaluation of scenarios

1. The following table provides the evaluation criteria for each scenario. This is what the Department used to assess the raw response data from the mystery shoppers.
2. Note, we requested log books from each society and club on 2 December 2016, as soon as the field work concluded, to give societies and clubs an opportunity to provide six weeks of log book entries from each venue. We reviewed each log book entry to assess if our mystery shopper carrying out the scenarios had been recorded.

**Table 5: Scenario evaluation**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Scenario | Points of engagement | | Response evaluation | Theme |
| **Scenario 1** | | | | |
| Scenario 1 day 1 | Acknowledged on arrival | | Expected: acknowledgement, either verbal or non-verbal  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 1 day 1 | Venue staff entering gaming room | | Expected: presence of venue staff in the gaming room for opportunities to monitor gambling. One or multiple entries by venue staff into gaming room will trigger this rating.  Not expected: gaming room not monitored  Assumption: Staff will go into gaming room for a variety of reasons but we would expect, whatever the reason, that “monitoring” the gamblers would always be done. | Monitoring – gaming room |
| Scenario 1 day 1 | Acknowledged on leaving venue | | Expected: Verbal or non-verbal acknowledgement  Not expected: no acknowledgment on leaving | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 1, Day 2 | Acknowledged on arrival | | Expected: acknowledgement, either verbal or non-verbal  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 1, Day 2 | Venue staff entering gaming room | | Expected: presence of venue staff in gaming room. One or multiple entries by venue staff into gaming room will trigger this rating.  Not expected: gaming room not monitored  Staff will go into gaming room for a variety of reasons but we would expect, whatever the reason, that “monitoring” the gamblers would always be done | Monitoring – gaming room |
| *Internal check to validate “Response to verbal cue”* | *Mystery Shopper acted out verbal cue* | | *Expected: Acted out cue at either bar or in gaming room*  *N/A: Acted out in one of the above. (Two options for MS to act out cue)*  *Partially expected: Only acted out either verbal or non-verbal part of cue*  *Not expected: Didn’t act out cue* |  |
| Scenario 1, Day 2 | Response to verbal cue (agitated gambler) | | Expected: Interaction involving checking in with mystery shopper and entering detail into the venue records  Partially expected: Interaction involving checking in with MS, however no venue record made  Not expected: No or inappropriate response to shopper’s gambling harm cue e.g. “That’s bad luck you are losing.” Flippant or general conversation with no focus on checking in with mystery shopper  N/A: could not act out cue | Interaction – checking in  Monitoring – venue records  Note: A rating of “expected” denotes a checking-in of the shopper plus an entry into venue records. We are not counting venue records as a stand-alone entry in this instance as it would create a false result with double counting |
| Scenario 1, Day 2 | Acknowledgment on leaving venue | | Expected: Verbal or non-verbal (this could be eye contact or some form of acknowledgement)  Not expected: no acknowledgment | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 1, Day 3 | Acknowledged on arrival | | Expected: Verbal or non-verbal (this could be eye contact or some form of acknowledgement)  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 1, Day 3 | Venue staff entering gaming room | | Expected: presence of venue staff in gaming room. One or multiple entries by venue staff into gaming room will trigger this rating.  Not expected: gaming room not monitored  Staff will go into gaming room for a variety of reasons but we would expect whatever the reason that “monitoring” the gamblers would always be done | Monitoring – gaming room |
| Scenario 1, Day 3 | 1st EFTPOS transaction (successful) | | Expected: cash provided  Not expected: We would not expect any interaction or intervention on the first EFTPOS transaction | Interaction – general  EFTPOS transaction |
| Scenario 1, Day 3 | 1st EFTPOS decline | | Expected: Interaction checking in to assess situation and intervention material provided and an entry in the log book.  Based on this scenario being a three-day visit, we would expect a targeted conversation about gambling harm to be had with the shopper, intervention material provided and have this detail entered into venue records.  Not expected: No engagement around gambling behaviour and/or encouraged to use ATM to withdraw further money | Interaction – checking in  Monitoring – venue records |
| Scenario 1, Day 3 | Intervention | | Expected: Help-seeking advice or resource provided to the mystery shopper  Not expected: No help-seeking material provided. | Intervention |
| Scenario 1, Day 3 | Acknowledgment on leaving venue | | Expected: Verbal or non-verbal (this could be eye contact or some form of acknowledgement)  Not expected: no acknowledgment | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| **Scenario 2** | | | | |
| Scenario 2 | | Acknowledged on arrival | Expected: acknowledgement, either verbal or non-verbal  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 2 | Venue staff entering gaming room | | Expected: presence of venue staff in of gaming room. One or multiple entries (either 1st or 2nd time entering venue) by venue staff into gaming room will trigger this rating.  Combinations of evaluation: This table outlines the combination of both gaming room entries and identifies if there was a presence in the gaming room in the mystery shopper’s total time in the gaming room.   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | Total evaluation outcome | Evaluation outcome  1st entry | Evaluation outcome  2nd entry | | Included | Expected | Expected | | Included | Expected | Not-expected | | Not-included | Not-expected | Not-expected | | Not-included | Not-expected | N/A |   Not expected: gaming room not monitored  Staff will go into gaming room for a variety of reasons but we would expect whatever the reason that “monitoring” the gamblers would always be done | Monitoring – gaming room |
| Scenario 2 | 1st EFTPOS transaction (successful) | | Expected: cash provided  Not expected: We would not expect any interaction (checking-in) or intervention on the first EFTPOS transaction | EFTPOS transaction |
| Scenario 2 | 2nd EFTPOS transaction (successful) | | Expected: Cash provided  Not expected: We would not expect any interaction (checking-in) or intervention on the second EFTPOS transaction  Not applicable: EFTPOS transaction unable to be made | EFTPOS transaction |
| Scenario 2 | 3rd EFTPOS transaction (1st decline) | | Expected: Interaction checking in to assess situation or intervention material provided and/or an entry in the log book.  Not expected: No engagement with mystery shopper around gambling behaviour and/or encouraged to use ATM to withdraw further money, venue staff acknowledge EFTPOS limit reached and directs mystery shopper to cash machine or venue staff encourage gambling. | Interaction – checking in  Intervention  Monitoring – venue records |
| Scenario 2 | 4th EFTPOS transaction (2nd decline).  This is evaluating venue staff response to the 2nd decline and the verbal cue from the shopper advising they will go and borrow money from a friend.  If the shopper has had to use an ATM to act out the declines but still delivers verbal cue to staff about borrowing money; this will still be evaluated within this group and will receive a not-expected rating. | | Expected: Interaction checking in to assess situation, intervention material provided, entry in log book.  Partially expected: Any number of the above in isolation of each other, for example interaction checking in as well as log book entry, but no intervention material provided.  Not expected:  Inappropriate response to shopper’s gambling harm cue e.g., “That’s bad luck you are losing.” Flippant or general conservation with no focus on checking in with mystery shopper. Venue staff acknowledge EFTPOS decline and directs mystery shopper to cash machine or venue staff encourages mystery shopper’s gambling. | Interaction – checking in  Intervention  Monitoring – venue records |
| Scenario 2 | Intervention  This evaluation is a combination of rows “intervention” and “intervention material” | | Expected: Yes  Not-expected: No | Intervention |
| Scenario 2 | Re-entered venue acknowledgement | | Expected: acknowledged and recognised as returning with reference to the shopper being back.  Partially expected: acknowledgement only  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings  Interaction – checking in |
| Scenario 2 | Acknowledgment on leaving venue | | Expected: Verbal or non-verbal acknowledgement  Not expected: no acknowledgment | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 2 | Log book entry  This is not a point of engagement – it is an action following engagement or intervention. It is here as we are evaluating log book entries | | Expected: Would expect a log book entry containing:   * Situation outlined * Response to be taken   Partially expected: activity or incident noted but venue has not responded to situation. Venue has not interacted or put in place ongoing monitoring  Not expected: No entry | Monitoring – venue records |
|  | | | | |
| **Scenario 3**  Note: We evaluated all EFTPOS transactions based on the venue response to our shoppers. We put N/A if our shopper did not act out the cue. | | | | |
| Scenario 3 | Acknowledged on arrival | | Expected: acknowledgement, either verbal or non-verbal  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 3 | Venue staff entering gaming room | | Expected: presence of venue staff in of gaming room. One or multiple entries by venue staff into gaming room will trigger this rating.  Not expected: gaming room not monitored  Staff will go into gaming room for a variety of reasons but we would expect whatever the reason that “monitoring” the gamblers would always be done | Monitoring – gaming room |
| *Scenario 3* | *MS acting out first verbal cue*  *Internal check to validate “Response to verbal cue”* | | *Expected: Acted out*  *Not expected: Didn’t act out*  *N/A: no opportunity to act our verbal cue* |  |
| Scenario 3 | Response to 1st verbal cue  Partially expected relates to interaction – general. This is to eliminate the double counting of multiple categories | | Expected: Interaction checking in to assess situation, log book entry  Partially expected: Acknowledgement of the cue but no appropriate response i.e., checking in  Not expected: No response or flippant response e.g., venue staff saying “think positive” | Interaction – checking in  Monitoring – venue records  Intervention |
| Scenario 3 | Response to 2nd verbal cue  Partially expected relates to interaction – general. | | Expected: Interaction checking in to assess situation, help seeking advice given after long hours of play (intervention), log book entry.  Partially expected: Acknowledgement of the cue but no appropriate response i.e., checking in  Not expected: No response or flippant response | Interaction – checking in  Monitoring – venue records  Intervention |
| Scenario 3 | Intervention material | | Expected: Yes, help seeking advice/material was provided to the mystery shopper.  Not expected: No help-seeking advice/material was provided to the mystery shopper | Intervention |
| Scenario 3 | Acknowledgment on leaving venue | | Expected: Verbal or non-verbal acknowledgement  Not expected: no acknowledgment | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 3 | Log book entry  This is not a point of engagement – it is an action following engagement or intervention. It is here as we are evaluating log book entries | | Expected: Would expect a log book entry containing:   * Situation outlined * Response to be taken   Not expected: No entry | Monitoring – venue records  Monitoring - patron |
| **Scenario 4** | | | | |
| Scenario 4 - Pre-visit | Family member acknowledged | | Expected: acknowledgement, either verbal or non-verbal  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 4 - Pre-visit | Staff response to family member | | Expected: Photo accepted, information on help-seeking advice and how to access counselling services and/or advice on exclusion process.  Partially expected: Photo accepted with no information or help-seeking advice provided  Not-expected: disinterest, photo not accepted, no assistance or information offered | Intervention |
| Scenario 4 - Pre-visit | Log book entry  This is not a point of engagement – it is an action following engagement or intervention. It is here as we are evaluating log book entries | | Expected: Would expect a log book entry or venue record containing:   * Situation outlined * Venue response to be taken if person in photo comes into venue   Not expected: No entry | Monitoring – venue records |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | Acknowledged on arrival | | Expected: acknowledgement, either verbal or non-verbal  Not expected: no acknowledgement | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | Venue staff entering gaming room | | Expected: presence of venue staff in of gaming room. One or multiple entries by venue staff into gaming room will trigger this rating.  Not expected: gaming room not monitored  Staff will go into gaming room for a variety of reasons but we would expect, whatever the reason, that “monitoring” the gamblers would always be done | Monitoring – gaming room |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | Recognised by venue staff | | Expected: Yes. This could either be a verbal face-to-face with mystery shopper, or a log in the venue records  Not expected: No | Monitoring – venue records  Interaction – checking in |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | Intervention material | | Expected: Yes, help seeking advice/material was provided to the mystery shopper  Not expected: No help-seeking advice/material was provided to the mystery shopper | Intervention |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | MS acting out first verbal cue  Internal check to validate “Response to verbal cue” | | Expected: Acted out  Not expected: Did not act out  N/A: no opportunity to act our verbal cue |  |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | Response to verbal cue | | Expected: Mystery Shopper is approached by venue staff having been recognised from their photo being dropped off. Venue staff have provided us with information in log books to reflect this. This is checking that the venue has a formal process to manage this.  Partially expected – Acknowledgement of the cue but no appropriate response i.e., checking in  Not expected: No response or flippant response. Staff respond with “Oh really?” | Interaction – checking in |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | Acknowledged on leaving venue | | Expected: Verbal or non-verbal acknowledgement  Not expected: no acknowledgment | Monitoring – comings and goings |
| Scenario 4 – Mystery shopper visit | Log book entry  This is not a point of engagement – it is an action following engagement or intervention. It is here as we are evaluating log book entries | | Expected: Would expect a log book entry containing:   * Log advising patron had been into venue * Situation outlined * Venue response   Not expected: No entry | Monitoring – venue records |

Translating the raw data into results for each venue

1. In evaluating the overall outcome of each venue and club for the mystery shop exercise, the results have been taken of how the venue or club interacted, intervened and recorded the mystery shopper.
2. The following criteria were applied in evaluating their responses to the mystery shopping scenarios:

* if a venue met all expectations around the gambling harm indicator, they received an “expected response” rating;
* if a venue met some expectations around the gambling harm indicator being assessed, they received a “partially-expected response” rating; and
* if a venue met no expectations around the gambling harm indicator being assessed, they received a “not-expected response” rating.

1. The criteria for how each venue was assessed is outlined in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: Evaluation ratings for each gambling harm indicator**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gambling harm indicator | Expected response  (standard met) | Partially expected  (standard partially met) | Not-expected  (standard not met) |
| **Long hours of play –**   * **Class 4 – 6.5 hours** | * Interaction check- in with mystery shopper AND * Provide help seeking advice AND * Record behaviour in log book | * General conversation that acknowledges cue with some focus on checking in with mystery shopper about their gambling AND/OR * Log book entry made but no monitoring or put in place | * No conversation * No record of mystery shopper in log book * Mystery Shopper plays uninterrupted over long period of time |
| **Cash withdrawal – This indicator presented venues with a gambler making multiple cash withdrawals including EFTPOS declines** | * Interaction check- in with mystery shopper AND * Provide help - seeking advice AND * Record behaviour in log book | * Interaction or help-seeking advice provided in isolation of each other AND/OR * Record of behaviour in log book | * Acknowledgment of multiple cash withdrawals (one or more declines) with no reference to gambling support * Encouragement to continue playing machines * No log book entries made |
| **Verbal and non-verbal cues – This indicator presented venues with a gambler who portrayed strong or general signs of gambling harm** | * Interaction check in with mystery shopper AND * Provide help- seeking advice AND * Record behaviour in log book | * General conversation with no focus on checking in with mystery shopper AND/OR * Log book entry made but no monitoring put in place | * No conversation * No record of mystery shopper in log book * Mystery Shopper plays uninterrupted over long period of time |
| **Third party concern (Class 4 only)**  **This indicator presented venues with a third party raising concerns about a gambler.** | * Photograph retained by venue along with provision around help-seeking advice or counselling services support and log book entry made * Mystery shopper recognised and log book entry made for future monitoring | * Photograph retained and/or * Log book entry made and/or * Provision of help- seeking advice or counselling services support | * Photograph not retained and no concern given by venue * No recognition of mystery shopper |
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