



MASTER THESIS

VENDORS PUTTING THEIR SCRATCH CARDS ON THE TABLE

FACTORS INFLUENCING VENDORS' COMPLIANCE
BEHAVIOR

F.F.B. VAN DER REST
s1015087

22-05-2015

First supervisor
Dr. J.J. VAN HOOFF

Second supervisor
Dr. J.F. GOSSELT



UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE
FACULTY OF BEHAVIOURAL SCIENCES
COMMUNICATION STUDIES
Master Track Corporate Communication

UNIVERSITY OF TWENTE.

Abstract

Background

Vendors of gambling products are in the unique position to influence the sales of gambling products to minors. This research is the first to extensively explore the vendors' perspectives on the age limit of gambling products. More specific, it provides a view on 1) what vendors encounter on the shop floor, and 2) the vendors' knowledge, ability, and motivation to comply with the age limit.

Methods

First, mystery calls were conducted (n=69) with tobacconists, who sell gambling products. This, to measure the vendors' knowledge of the legislation and the advice function of the vendors towards parents. The second study was conducted with telephone interviews (n=43), to examine what vendors experience in their daily practice on the shop floor, and their knowledge, ability, and motivation to comply. Additionally, the second study focused on improvements to reduce minors' access with gambling products.

Results

On the shop floor, vendors encounter that minors' regularly try to buy gambling products and secondary purchasing is a major issue which is merely done by parents. Generally, vendors know the legislation and are convinced that they are able to comply with the age limit although the government does not provide any information on compliance. Vendors avoid non-compliance by making use of several tools. However, the fact that the age of the customer needs to be estimated and crowdedness in the shop are perceived as a negative influence on compliance. Vendors are motivated to comply, even though this motivation is mostly based on avoiding a penalty. Although vendors stated to comply, a few of the vendors believe gambling is harmless. According to vendors, also penalizing the minor when attempting to buy gambling products is a prevalent solution to reduce minors' access to gambling products.

Conclusions

The findings imply that vendors know the legislation, are motivated to comply but are not always able to. Although vendors are motivated to decrease non-compliance, youth access to gambling products is of less concern to them. Several implications are given to improve compliance and the work environment of vendors, and to prevent secondary purchasing. If the government wants to improve the current situation these implications are a good starting point.

Keywords

Compliance, off-premise gambling products, age limits, vendors, minors

Contents

- 1. Introduction..... 3
- 2. Theoretical framework 5
 - 2.1 Vendors' knowledge concerning compliance..... 5
 - 2.2 Vendor's ability to comply..... 6
 - 2.3 Vendors' motivation to comply..... 7
 - 2.4 Current research..... 9
- 3. Method..... 10
 - 3.1 Study 1: mystery calls 10
 - 3.2 Study 2: interviews 12
- 4. Results..... 14
 - 4.1 Study 1: mystery calls 14
 - 4.2 Study 2: interviews 18
- 5. Discussion 31
 - 5.1 Findings..... 31
 - 5.2 Practical implications 35
 - 5.3 Limitations and future research 38
 - 5.4 Conclusion..... 39
- References 40
- Appendix 1: Questions mystery call and the son's profile 46
- Appendix 2: Questions interviews 47
- Appendix 3: Coding scheme mystery calls 49
- Appendix 4: Coding scheme interviews..... 52

1. Introduction

Gambling was once considered to be an adult activity, however it is now well established that a significant proportion of adolescents gamble (Derevensky, Gupta, & Winters, 2003; Lemarié & Chebat, 2013). Since the potentially negative effects of gambling products are broadly acknowledged, society generally aims to protect minors from gambling products. Youth access regulations aim to prevent minors from obtaining gambling products from shops, which helps to reduce gambling initiation and current gambling participation among minors (Diemert, Dubray, Babayan, & Schwartz, 2013).

In order to reduce the risks of gambling, the Gambling Law was introduced in 1964. This law serves three main purposes: to give gambling and gamblers a legal position, to protect customers, and to prevent gambling addictions. Although the law distinguishes numerous forms of gambling (e.g., casino gambling, slot machines, racetracks, sports betting, card games, lotteries, scratch cards, pull-tabs, and internet gambling), a single age limit is set. In order to gamble, a person must be at least 18 years old to participate. In addition, vendors are prohibited to sell gambling products to customers who are under the age of 18. When aged 14 and over, Dutch inhabitants are obligated to carry a valid ID in all public places. The vendor of gambling products is allowed to ask for ID when in doubt if the customer meets the age limit.

In Europe, a growing interest in enforcing legal restrictions on purchasing risky products is connected to an increased use of mystery shopping, as a method to evaluate if vendors of age restricted products comply with the legislation (Mulder & de Greef, 2012). Worldwide mystery shopping studies indicate that vendors' compliance with age limit concerning gambling products is problematic (St-Pierre, Derevensky, Gupta, & Martin, 2011; Britt, Toomey, Dunsmuir, & Wagenaar, 2006; Landrine et al., 2010; Pearson, Song, Valdez, & Angulo, 2007). A recent Dutch study, where 288 mystery shopping purchases and gambling attempts have been conducted, found that gambling products are highly available among minors in the Netherlands. In all of the off-premise cases, under aged customers were able to obtain gambling products (Gosselt, Neefs, van Hoof, & Wagteveld, 2013).

In order to create an effective age limit, it is important to not only know if there is compliance but also why there is compliance or non-compliance. This can be established by examining how the age limit is viewed by vendors of gambling products, because they are the ones who perceive and decide what happens on the shop floor. However, there is a lack of information regarding vendors' view the age limit of gambling products. The efforts of the gambling industry will have little effect as long as it is not clear what vendors think of compliance with age limit, because these perceptions are important in order to tackle minors' access to gambling products (Pratten & Walton, 2008).

In order to obtain knowledge on why vendors do not comply, research is needed which examines vendors' perceptions on compliance with the age limit and with minors' access to off-premise gambling products.

Information derived from the vendors can help to decide which actions must be undertaken to reduce the access to gambling products among minors in the Netherlands.

Hence, this research addresses the aforementioned lack of knowledge by examining the issue of youth gambling access from the perspective of vendors who sell gambling products. More specifically, this research explores the factors that may affect compliance with the age limit in the context of the Dutch gambling legislation. The main attempt of the current studies is to get a perspective on what vendors encounter on the shop floor, how vendors experience the age limit, and how youth access to gambling products can be reduced. This provides an extensive view on the vendors' experience and vision regarding compliance and youth access to gambling products.

2. Theoretical Framework

Researchers have taken many different approaches to examine youth access to age restricted products. Factors that are associated with influencing compliance include the geographic area of the shop (Clark, Natanblut, Schmitt, Wolters, & Iachan, 2000), the type of outlet (St-Pierre et al., 2011; Hanson, Hatsukami, Boyle, & Brown, 2000), crowdedness in the shop (Britt et al., 2006), the day of visit (Gosselt et al., 2013; Paschall, Grube, & Kypri, 2009), the time of visit (O'Grady, Asbridge, & Abernathy, 2000; Clark et al., 2000), the gender of the minor (Landrine et al., 2010; Gosselt, van Hoof, & de Jong, 2012b; Forster, Hourigan, & McGovern, 1992; St-Pierre et al., 2011), and the age of the minor (Forster et al., 1992; Gosselt et al., 2012b; DiFranza, Savageau, & Aisquith, 1996).

Furthermore, certain characteristics of the vendor appear to influence compliance. A few studies found a connection between the age of the vendor and the compliance rate. The studies state that vendors with a similar age as the purchaser are more likely to sell age restricted products to minors than older vendors (Pearson et al., 2007; McDermott, Scott, & Frintner, 1998; Forster et al., 1992; Paschall et al., 2009; DiFranza et al., 1996). Although the results of the studies are not consistent, the gender of the vendor also seems to have an influence on compliance. Some studies indicate that male vendors are significantly more compliant than female vendors (Clark et al., 2000; Pearson et al., 2007; McDermott et al., 1998), whereas others report no differences between male and female vendors (Klonoff & Landrine, 2004; Gosselt et al., 2013). Also, findings concerning the role of the ethnicity of vendors are not unanimous. With a few studies indicating that non-black vendors, mainly of Asian descent, are least compliant with youth access legislations (Landrine et al., 2010; Klonoff, Landrine, & Alcaraz, 1997), others found no significant differences in compliance rates between vendors based on their ethnicities (St-Pierre et al., 2011; Voorhees et al., 1997).

Although the above mentioned factors might have an influence on the compliance rate, three vendor conditions are essential to attain a high compliance rate: the vendor should have sufficient knowledge of the legislation, be able, and be motivated to comply (Gosselt, 2011; Havinga, 2006). If one of those conditions is absent, the chance that a vendor will comply is very small.

2.1 Vendors' knowledge concerning compliance

First, the vendors who have to comply should know and understand the legislation concerning gambling products. Unfamiliarity with the rules may result in unintentionally violating them (Law Enforcement Expertise Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice, 2004). Therefore clear communication about the law is essential.

Furthermore, previous research demonstrates that educating vendors about the law concerning age restricted products is necessary but not sufficient to improve vendors' compliance. Programs that simply inform vendors about age limits have not been effective in preventing sales to minors (Stead & Lancaster, 2000; Woodruff, Erickson, Wildey, & Kenney, 1993; Blewden & Spinola, 1999).

2.2 Vendors' ability to comply

Second, in order to comply with the legislation it is necessary that vendors are able to prevent minors from buying gambling products. A common way for vendors in their attempt to comply is to ask for identification when in doubt if the customer meets the legal age. This is found to be a strong predictor of under aged sales refusal (Williams et al., 2014; Currie, Pokorny, Jason, Schoeny, & Townsend, 2002; St-Pierre et al., 2011). However, simply asking for ID is found to be insufficient because under aged are, although to a more limited extent, able to purchase age restricted products after showing their ID (Williams et al., 2014; Currie et al., 2002; St-Pierre et al., 2011). Previous research claimed that minors are using fake ID's and make use of someone else's ID in order to beat the age verification system (Nguyen, Walters, Rinker, Wyatt, & DeJong, 2011; Martinez & Sher, 2010). Hence, when validating an ID the vendor must determine if the customer corresponds with the owner of the ID and if the ID is valid. However, matching the right person to a photo is shown to be difficult (White, Kemp, Jenkins, & Burton, 2014). Moreover, the vendor has to calculate if the customer meets the age limit of 18 based on the date of birth on the ID. All three steps can be done manually, by the vendor himself. The last two; checking the validity of the ID and calculating the customers' age can also be done with an ID swiper (Oostdijk, Van den Nieuwenhuizen, & Van Noort, 2014). By putting the ID of the customer in the ID swiper at the counter, the age on and the validity of the ID is checked. A calculation tool, by means of a printed calendar or a digital one at the cash register, is solely used for checking if the date on the ID meets the legal date on which a customer is allowed to buy. There also exists a notification aid, which can be implemented in the cash register. This causes a noise when an age restricted product is scanned. However, tobacconists mainly sell age restricted products and vendors still need to estimate and check the validity of the ID. Therefore, this tool is seen as less useful for tobacconists.

All of the abovementioned tools are helpful, but ineffective when the vendor fails to ask for ID. With an age viewer however, a special company checks the customers' age with the use of a terminal. The customer is recorded at the counter and the cash register is locked until the external staff approves. When in doubt, the customer has to show its ID in front of the camera. The downside is that the age viewer is currently only available for alcohol and tobacco products and vendors need to be able to afford this device. The process of age verification at tobacconists is currently mostly done manually (Oostdijk et al., 2014).

Although there are several tools to help reduce the non-compliance rate, it is important to get insight in what vendors of age restricted products encounter regarding their ability to comply. In the study of Altman et al. (1992) vendors identified a number of key obstacles, such as: minors using false identification, and minors buying elsewhere if their shop refuses to sell, which interferes with their ability to prevent sales to minors. Another study found that secondary purchasing, aggression of young customers, estimating the age of the customer, being afraid of intervening, and crowdedness in the shop are the most important reasons of vendors not being able to comply with the legislations (Gosselt et al., 2012a). Also, a study by Jason, Pokorny, Sherk, Helzing and Rebus

(2003) shows that estimating the youths age is difficult. It appeared that 34 per cent of the vendors misestimated age and thought a 16 year old was 18.

The vendors' perspective on the ability to counter sales to minors is found to be much less frequent than in real life. Moreover, vendors assume that sales of age restricted products to minors occur, but that it is a problem primarily in shops owned by others (Altman et al., 1992; Gosselt et al., 2012a).

In order to ease the vendors' ability to comply, practical tools, which have been mentioned before, are provided such as calendars which help to calculate the age (Reinert, Carver, Range, & Pike, 2009). Also, mandatory trainings for vendors have shown to enhance the ability for vendors to comply (Wagenaar, Toomey, & Erickson, 2005b; Reinert et al., 2009; Derevensky, 2012). Furthermore, in the Dutch alcohol and tobacco industry, the required age for customers to show their ID was recently raised from 18 to 25 years old in order to make it easier for vendors to comply.

By knowing which obstacles vendors encounter when trying to comply with the age limit, the most appropriate actions can be executed to counter under aged sales.

2.3 Vendors' motivation to comply

Third, the vendors' motivation to comply is important, because vendors who refuse sales to minors have to be motivated to comply. Whether the gambling industry complies with the regulations may be affected by the vendors' personal support for these legislations. This can be influenced by the management through convincing the staff of its importance (Howard-Pitney, Johnson, Altman, Hopkins, & Hammond, 1991).

Previous research found different attitudes towards compliance with vendors. Dovell, Mowat, Dorland and Lam (1998) show that overall, vendors feel very satisfied when not selling risky products to minors and evaluate the sales to minors as an extremely serious problem. However, Pratten and Walton (2008) found that vendors are not overall positive about the gambling legislation and sometimes view it as unreasonable. In addition, a study by Turner, Wiebe, Falkowski-Ham, Kelly and Skinner (2005) found that a substantial amount of individuals does not even consider scratch cards (29%) or lottery (28%) as a form of gambling, which suggests that the support of compliance with vendors will be low.

A difference in the perceived harmfulness of gambling products can be explained by the two forms of gambling products sold in off-premise shops, lotteries and scratch cards. Several characteristics are associated with inducing an excessive gambling behavior. A widespread accepted addictive characteristic is the near miss design, which contains failures that are close to being successful and appear to encourage future play, because players get the illusion of coming close to winning a substantial prize (Reid, 1986; Griffiths, 1991). Furthermore, a short-payout interval, where there is a short period between placing the bet and the outcome, and a low threshold regarding accessibility and costs, appear to have an addictive potential (Griffiths & Woods, 2001). Scratch cards are viewed as more addictive than lotteries, due to the near miss design and the short-payment interval. Hence,

vendors of gambling products may have different attitudes towards minors' access to gambling depending on the kind of product.

In addition, programs are designed in order to enhance vendors' attitude towards compliance. However, a positive attitude towards the law does not automatically leads to compliance, it is just one reason to be motivated to comply (Woodruff et al., 1993; Diemert et al., 2013). Previous research showed several motivations to comply with the law. The outcomes of a study by Dovell et al. (1998) showed that the majority of the vendors that were motivated to comply were motivated because under aged sales is prohibited by law. Sanctions are also seen as an important motivation to comply.

Compliance checks combined with penalties for violators of the legislation are measures that are taken to enhance vendors' motivation to comply with age limits (Pokorny, Corbin, Driscoll, & Jason, 2008; Scribner & Cohen, 2001; DiFranza, 2005). The principle objective of these checks is to ascertain whether or not vendors are abiding the age limit. However, only checks in the form of passive enforcement (i.e. responding only to complaints) do not change the compliance behaviour of the vendor (Blewden & Spinola, 1999). In addition, the effects of enforcement checks are temporary and the common practice of conducting compliance checks annually or occasionally alone is not sufficient to decrease under aged sales (Wagenaar, Toomey, & Erickson, 2005a; Jason, Billows, Schnopp-Wyatt, & King, 1996). Levy and Friend (2000) claim that vendors' compliance is determined by a synergy between the number of compliance checks conducted at a given community, the level or severity of sanctions, and the vendors perceived costs for contravention of minors access laws. Gosselt et al. (2012a) state that a visible system of external surveillance, which affects the vendors' perceived risks of being caught for non-compliance is essential as well. Furthermore, feedback and warning letters have shown to motivate vendors and to reduce sales to minors (Van Hoof, Gosselt, Baas, & De Jong, 2012; Chapman et al., 1994). By being aware of the motivation of vendors, improvements can be found to change their motivation when needed.

In addition, Pratten and Walton (2008) state that where products could be regarded as ethically dubious, or socially undesirable or problematical, there is a greater expectation of responsible behavior of the vendor. Hence, compliance with the law may be insufficient and providing information on the harmfulness of gambling products is desirable (Pratten & Walton, 2008).

Previous research claimed that the vendors' sense of responsibility can be considered low. Altman et al. (1992) found, that 15% thought it should be illegal for the retailer to sell to minors, 26% thought it should be illegal for the minor to buy, 51% thought that both the minor and the seller should be penalized, and 8% thought there should be no laws regulating sales of tobacco to minors. In addition, Gosselt et al. (2012a) show that vendors believe that they are not exclusively responsible for minors' access to age restricted products. Parents, the minor, and friends of the minor are believed to be responsible as well. Furthermore, Pratten and Walton (2008) questioned vendors about responsibility in the gambling industry. The results suggest that while the firms appear to take their

responsibilities very seriously, some staff were sceptical about their responsibility towards youth access to gambling products.

2.4 Current research

This research is the first to address the aforementioned lack of knowledge of vendors' perspective on the age limit of gambling products by examining Dutch vendors. It is known that vendors do not comply with the age limit for gambling products (Gosselt et al., 2013). This research provides an extensive insight into the perceptions of vendors about the age limit, which presents reasons and improvements for non-compliance.

The first study measures the vendors' advice function using a mystery call approach: how do vendors respond to minors' access to gambling products when they are explicitly asked for advice? The second study first focuses on what vendors experience in their daily practice on the shop floor, then on vendors' knowledge, ability, and motivation to comply and last, it focuses on the improvements to reduce youth access to gambling products.

In order to reach these goals, the following research question is formulated:

What is the perspective of vendors of off-premise gambling products on the age limit of gambling products?

3. Methods

With the first study, the knowledge and support for the age limit of gambling products was investigated among vendors. A mystery call approach was used where a researcher, posing as a concerned parent, asked about the suitability of scratch cards for his child. The second study consisted of interviews with the same shops in order to gain insight into compliance-related issues in the daily practice at the shop floor.

3.1 Study 1: mystery calls

The “parent” asked the vendors about scratch cards and not gambling products in general, because it seemed more fitted in a credible situation. Scratch cards are chosen since they appear to be more addictive because of their near miss design and short-payout intervals (Griffiths & Woods, 2001). The mystery calls were conducted to investigate vendors’ 1) knowledge of the age limit 2) sense of responsibility towards the participation of under aged of gambling products, and 3) attitude towards this law when giving advice to parents. As many questions as possible were asked in order for the situation to stay credible. It was decided that the first question was asked at all times. Other questions were only asked if they would not harm the credibility of the situation, which means that a question was suitable in the conversation and realistic that a parent would ask this to a vendor. This was done in order to not arouse suspicion among the vendors that they had been talking to a researcher. The mystery calls lasted between one and four minutes.

3.1.1. Sample

Brancheorganisatie voor de tabaks- en gemakdetailhandel (2014) stated that tobacco and convenience shops are an important channel for the sale of gambling products in the Netherlands. In 2009, the total sales of the Lotto was 696 million euro. An amount of 457 million euro was spent in the tobacco and convenience industry. Therefore, the studies were conducted with vendors of tobacconists. The stores which were called, were almost equally spread over the regions in the Netherlands. The data were collected at privately owned tobacconists where one of the core businesses is selling scratch cards. This in order to increase the chance to speak to the same vendor in both studies. Hundred tobacconists were called in November and December 2014. Sixty-nine mystery calls¹ could be conducted, because 13 vendors did not pick up their phone, eleven of the outlets did not sell scratch cards and six telephone numbers were incorrect. One vendor immediately mentioned after the first question that he thought it was a weird question and that for information the “parent” could contact him in his shop or the parents should search the requested information on the Internet. Hence, that vendor is left out of the data analysis. A total of 37 men (53.6%) and 32 women (46.4%) participated in the mystery calls.

¹ The contact details of the tobacconists which participated are not provided for privacy reasons. The complete list can be obtained from the authors on request.

3.1.2 Procedure

Vendors were approached by telephone with a question from a concerned “father”. All the 69 mystery calls were conducted by the same male researcher. Vendors who answered the phone were not told that they participated in a study. The researcher asked the vendors for advice with regard to the age limit of a scratch card according to a fixed script. Vendors were asked: “Friends of my son often scratch scratch cards Friday afternoon after school, now my son would like to join them, but I was wondering how that actually works?” If the vendor did not answer completely or clearly the first time, the “parent” asked if the child could buy scratch cards and/ or if children were allowed to play with scratch cards. Question two was as follows: “If they do play with scratch cards, who is responsible?” Third, the vendors were asked: “But do you have a role in this?” . The fourth question was as follows: “Friends of his do play with scratch cards, what do you think of that?”. At the end of the call, the vendor was thanked for the advice. As mentioned earlier, most of the questions were not asked during the conversations, in order to stay credible. The researcher did standardize the tone, style and responses of all the calls. An overview of the script is shown in Appendix 1.

3.1.3 Data analysis

All of the interviews were verbatim transcribed, after which the transcriptions were analyzed using ATLAS.ti software. Five analysis steps for qualitative data by Baarda, De Goede and Teunissen (2011) were used, consisting of coding the data, linking codes, interpreting and defining code structure, defining main categories, and determining intersubjectivity. With the use of ATLAS.ti the thoughts of the vendors were thematically structured which took place by one coder based on a previous developed codebook. First, the interview transcriptions were coded deductively based on the themes discussed in Chapter 2. Second, open coding was applied on the remaining relevant data. The theme “remaining codes” was added. A second coder was appointed to analyze ten percent of the total sample. After consultation, satisfactory intercoder reliability was achieved. Moreover, a check was done whether there was a difference in answers depending on the gender of the vendors and location of the stores.

3.1.4 Coding

An individual Cohen’s kappa was calculated for each theme in order to get a good view on where the reliability of the measuring instrument was weak and which themes had to be modified. For all themes except one, the Cohen’s kappa was found to be high. The coding round resulted in Cohen’s Kappa’s of .79 (knowledge), 1.0 (ability), .57 (motivation), .83 (self reported compliance), and 1.0 (remaining). After discussion and a few adjustments in the codebook, an agreement between the two coders was reached on the theme motivation. In addition, the theme “self reported compliance” was merged to the theme “ability” because both coders concluded that this is more suitable. The final codebook can be found in Appendix 3.

3.2 Study 2: interviews

Respondents were asked a variety of questions concerning their daily practice experiences on the shop floor, knowledge, ability, motivation, and ways to improve compliance. Since some of the questions were delicate, complete confidentiality and anonymity was assured. The interviews lasted between three and 33 minutes. The immense difference in the duration is due to the fact that not every respondent wanted to answer all the questions because of crowds in the shop and some lasted long because the participant assisted customers during the interview. In 29 of the cases the person of the mystery call was the same as the interviewee.

3.2.1 Sample

All 69 vendors were asked to participate in a telephone interview, the 43 who agreed consisted of 20 men (47%) and 23 women (53%) and had an average age of 46, with the youngest being 20 and the oldest 68. Furthermore, it appeared that on average the vendors sold gambling products for 18 years, 1.5 year was the shortest period and the longest 42 years. Slightly more than half of the vendors asked, indicated that there was other personnel working in the shop, with an average of 2.8 employees. Of the participants 26% stated that he or she works only with their partner and 17% mentioned they work alone. A few mentioned that they work with one child in the shop. The shops of the vendors who participated, were almost equally spread over the regions. The interviews took place in January and February 2015.

3.2.2 Procedure

Respondents who refused to complete the telephone interview but did not decline participation outright were asked if another time suited better. For the interviews, a topic list was developed. This topic list was prepared carefully and slightly adapted after pretesting, which resulted in 20 questions. Each interview started with an explanation of the purpose of the study, after which the interview questions were asked. The interview focused on five themes; daily practice on the shop floor, knowledge, ability, motivation, and ways to improve compliance. At the end of the call, the employee was thanked for the interview. An overview of the interview questions is given in Appendix 2.

3.2.3 Data analysis

All of the interviews were verbatim transcribed, except for parts in the interview that were not of interest. Same as with the mystery calls, transcriptions were analyzed using ATLAS.ti software and the same analysis approach was used as described in Chapter 3.1.3. The codes were spread over five themes, earlier described in Chapter 2, based on a codebook that was developed previously. Furthermore, a check was done whether a difference existed in answers based on the gender and location of the stores.

3.2.4 Coding

Same as with the mystery calls, an individual Cohen's kappa was calculated for each theme in order to get a good view on where the reliability of the measuring instrument was weak and which themes should be modified. For all themes the Cohen's kappa was found to be high. The coding round resulted in Cohen's Kappa's of 1.0

(demographics), 0.85 (daily practice shop floor) 1.0 (knowledge), .96 (ability), .89 (motivation), and .79 (solutions for non-compliance). Although all themes scored high, changes were made after consulting with the second coder. The theme “demographics” has been split and now covers subthemes “gender” and “place”. The theme “shop floor features” was added. The subthemes “sale frequency” and “enforcement checks” were placed from the theme “ability” and “motivation” to the theme “shop floor features” due to the fact that both coders experienced this as a better fit. The final codebook can be found in Appendix 4.

4. Results

This chapter contains results of the first and second data collection round, per theme as described in Chapter 2. Furthermore, the results were compared based on gender and place of residence. The findings are presented and supported with quotes, which were translated from Dutch. The percentages given are based on the complete data set of that specific study.

4.1 Study 1: Mystery calls

A mystery call was conducted on 69 tobacconists. Hence, the percentages of this chapter are based on N=69.

4.1.1 Knowledge

In this paragraph the knowledge of the vendors will be discussed concerning 1) if vendors spontaneously mentioned the age limit or were helped, 2) if vendors know that minors are not allowed to buy gambling products, and 3) if vendors know that minors are not allowed to participate in gambling products .

Table 1: Observed knowledge of the vendors about the gambling legislation (n=69)

Topic	Yes	No	N/a
Vendor spontaneously mentioned age limit	57	12	0
Vendor was helped by mentioning age limit	12	57	0
Is a minor allowed to buy?	2	67	0
Is a minor allowed to participate?	13	45	11

As seen in Table 1, the vast majority of the vendors spontaneously mentioned the age limit on gambling products after the first question of the mystery call was asked by the researcher. The other vendors were helped by asking if there is an age limit.

In order to found out if vendors possess the right knowledge, vendors were asked if the son of 17 could buy and play with scratch cards. Two vendors indicated that minors could legally buy scratch cards, but with the others it became clear that they are aware of the legislation concerning buying scratch cards. They mentioned that they cannot sell scratch cards to minors because individuals have to be at least 18 and that this rule is legally defined by the government. This is consistent with the Dutch gambling law. Also, most vendors claimed that under aged are not allowed to play with scratch cards. Here as well, vendors stated that minors cannot play because they legally have to be 18, which is also consistent with the Dutch gambling law. A few (18.8%), said that minors could play. The reasons they gave were basically all the same, that there is no regulation concerning this issue and parents should decide for themselves whether they want their under aged child to play or not.

4.1.2 Ability

This paragraph covers the ability of vendors based on what vendors spontaneously mentioned during the mystery calls. These are divided in five topics: 1) the self reported compliance of vendors, 2) vendors' view on secondary purchasing, 3) what vendors do in order to comply, 4) reasons why vendors cannot always prevent under aged sales, and 5) reasons why vendors cannot prevent under aged participation.

During the mystery calls many vendors (n=35) mentioned spontaneously that no scratch cards are sold to minors in their shop.

Also, a few vendors (n=4) indicated that they actively prevent secondary purchasing to minors through adults: *"If I see an adult standing here and he gives it to a child standing outside on the street, then I won't sell it"* (respondent 13). Others (n=7) mentioned that it is hard to control and they are not able to prevent secondary purchasing.

Almost half of the vendors (n=33) explicitly indicated that they ask for ID to stop non-compliance : *"[...] as soon as we think that a person is not yet 18 years old, then we ask for ID"* (respondent 29). On the other hand, one vendor mentioned that it is impossible to check because minors can bring fake identification cards and it is not always possible to see whether it is the same person as on the card.

Eleven vendors indicated that it can happen that once in a while a minor slips through and is able to buy scratch cards. Several reasons are given why vendors cannot always prevent under aged sales. Some of the vendors (n=6) mentioned that they have trouble with complying with the regulations because it is very hard to estimate someone's age: *"[...] basically he can get it because of course we cannot see whether he is 17 or 18 years old"* (respondent 26). Others (n=12) indicated that it is impossible to prevent secondary purchases to minors through adults: *"[...] they will probably send someone who is 18 years old"* (respondent 65).

Some vendors named reasons why vendors cannot prevent under aged participation. During eight of the mystery calls the vendor indicated that if parents want to let their children play with scratch cards, there is nothing that they can do against it: *"If you give him that, then there is nothing that I can do about it [...]"* (respondent 38). Furthermore, a few (n=7) mentioned that if minors want to play with scratch cards, there is surely some place where they can get it: *"[...] You can't watch them all day to see what they are doing, if they want to have those things they will do it anyway, then you can say that you don't want them to play, but it's the same with other things"* (respondent 5).

At last, twelve vendors mentioned that although they don't sell scratch cards to minors, they have no idea if other outlets comply: *"[...] I always check. But I sometimes hear that other shops do not"* (respondent 57).

4.1.3 Motivation

This section covers two main topics: 1) who vendors think is responsible when minors gamble, and 2) what is their attitude towards minors gambling.

Table 2: The vendors attitudes towards responsibility (n=43)

Who is responsible when minors do gamble?	#	%
Parents	18	26.1
Vendors	8	11.6
Minor (son)	4	5.8
The one providing it to the minor	2	2.9
Vendor & parents	3	4.3
Vendor & minor (son)	2	2.9
Parents & minor (son)	2	2.9
Parent, minor & vendor	1	1.4
No idea	3	4.3

As shown in Table 2 forty-three vendors answered the question: “who is responsible when minors play with scratch cards”. Eighteen participants claimed that this is the parents’ responsibility. One of the reasons was: “[...] parents have a particular role in saying it is a gambling game and that gambling, smoking, and drinking can be addictive” (respondent 30). Furthermore, four vendors named the minor as the most responsible: “I think he himself is responsible if he gets it somewhere.” Two vendors mentioned that the ones providing the scratch cards to the minor are responsible: “[...] if someone buys it for him and gives it to him, then the responsibility lies with that friend of his, the one who buys it for him” (respondent 55).

Table 3: The vendors’ attitudes towards minors gambling (n=27)

Vendors’ advice towards minors gambling	#	%
Minors should bring someone else of above 18	12	17.4
It is fine at home	11	15.9
Depends on the age; the older the child, the less bad it is	4	5.8
As long as it does not run out of control it is fine	3	4.3
Negative	2	2.9
Does not mind an occasional slip	2	2.9

Note. Some vendors showed multiple attitudes towards minors having access to gambling products.

During the mystery calls it appeared that vendors have different attitudes concerning youth access to scratch cards. As shown in Table 3 twelve of them advised the “parent” that if the son wants scratch cards, they should bring someone who is 18 year or older: “[...] he should bring someone who is 18 or older, then it does not matter” (respondent 59). Others (n=11) indicated that it is no problem if parents want to let their under aged children play with scratch cards: “[...] if you buy scratch cards he may scratch them at home” (respondent 53). Moreover, there are a few vendors (n=5) who said there is a difference in being almost 18 and being way too young: “If there is someone in front of me and that’s a youngster of 14 or 15, he won’t get scratch cards from me. But if someone of 17 or 18 slips through, which is inevitable, that’s not such a big deal” (respondent 22). Two vendors stated that they have under aged kids and give their child a scratch card every once in a while. A total overview is given in Table 3.

4.1.4 Additional statements

There are also a few important statements which were hard to subdivide and these are illustrated below. One of the vendors said that he was extra careful, because there are three big schools in the neighbourhood. Another one mentioned that if he gets his first penalty for selling to a minor, he will immediately close his shop. Furthermore, one stated to pay more attention after the conversation. Also, two vendors advised the “parent” to search on the Internet for further help and information. And last of all, one of the vendors advised the “parent” to contact the Lotto, so the “parent” can file in a complaint if he wants.

4.1.5 Differences in gender and place of residence

After comparing the different answers to each code, it turned out that there is no difference in answers depending on the sex or the geographical place of the store. Codes with only a few statements were not checked because the chance of coincidence is too high.

4.2 Study 2: Interviews

Of the 69 vendors who were asked to participate in the telephone interview, 43 agreed. Hence, the percentages of this chapter are based on N=43.

4.2.1 Shop floor features

In this paragraph different topics will be discussed, all related to what vendors encounter on the shop floor: 1) the most popular gambling products among youth, 2) the frequency minors visit the particular tobacconist, and 3) the frequency of enforcement checks.

Table 4: Popular off-premise gambling products among 18 to 25 year olds (n=43)

Products	#	%
Toto	27	62.8
Scratch cards	26	60.5
Lotto	5	11.6
State lottery	4	9.3
"Everything"	3	7.0
Euro jackpot	1	2.3

Note. Some vendors mentioned multiple gambling products.

When asked which gambling products are the most popular among youth, it appeared that two excelled; Toto where one predicts on sports competitions and scratch cards.

As shown in Table 5, most vendors mentioned that minors are trying to purchase gambling products a few times a week (34.9%).

Table 5: The frequency of minors trying to buy gambling products in that particular tobacconist (n =43)

Frequency minors in shop	#	%
Never	3	7.0
Almost never	11	25.6
A few times per month	9	20.9
A few times per week	15	34.9
Daily	5	11.6

Furthermore, twelve vendors mentioned that in the past, minors tried to buy gambling products in the shop more often than nowadays. The most common reason the vendor gave (n=4) was that minors know by now that they never sell to under aged and that they will fail if they try. Another reason mentioned (n=2) was that minors know the regulations by now and one vendor stated that youth can now gamble on the Internet of their mobile phones.

Approximately equally as many vendors stated that they did have an enforcement check in their shop concerning gambling products (n=17) than that did not (n=16).

Table 6: Enforcement checks in vendors' shops (n=39)

Enforcement checks concerning gambling products	#	%
Never had an enforcement check in their shop	17	39.5
Did have an enforcement check in their shop	16	37.2
Does not know if there has been an enforcement check in their shop	3	7.0
Thinks enforcement checks are taking place less often in other shops	3	7.0

Several sellers (n=5) indicated that regularly someone visits their shop to discuss the regulation. Furthermore, participants mentioned (n=6) that they had an enforcement check and that the monitor stood outside the shop to check if gambling products were not sold to minors. Others (n=5) stated that they have a check-up on a regular basis and the monitor lets them know when they visited. Two mentioned that they have had an enforcement check, but it was a very long time ago. One claimed that the shop gets enforcement checks, but monitors do not reveal this to the vendor because they always comply. Moreover, a few (n=3) mentioned that they are checked more often than other shops: *"[...] what I personally find, look we get checked very often, but smaller tobacco shops that are not members of any association are never checked, so I do think that they should be more strongly disciplined. That not only we, but that they also have to bear the sanctions"* (respondent 27). Vendors claimed that the Lotto (n=8) and the Nederlandse Voedsel- en Warenautoriteit (n=1) conducted the enforcement checks at their shop.

4.2.2. Knowledge

Thirty-eight of the participants were asked if they are aware of the current legislation concerning gambling, all of them answered that they are.

Table 7: Measures which are taken to ensure that vendors comply with the legislation (n=20)

How employees get informed about compliance	#	%
Vendors keep an eye on each other and give a signal when they think the other vendor should ask for ID	7	16.3
Vendors consult and discuss with each other about compliance	6	14.0
Employees get instructions from their leaders	5	11.6
Vendors get information from the NSO tobacco industry	4	9.3
The boss is always present in the shop and keeps an eye on the other vendors	3	7.0
The vendor is threatened to get fined when he/she does not comply	1	2.3

Note. Some vendors mentioned several ways employees get informed about compliance.

In addition, the vendors were asked about the knowledge of the other employees when the vendor had pointed out that there are other vendors working in the shop. The low response rate to this question is due to the fact that more than half of the vendors have no employees or colleagues. It was asked how is it ensured that the employees adhere to the regulation. As seen in Table 7, most participants (n=7) mentioned that they work together and therefore control each other and when in doubt, the other signals their colleague to ask for ID.

Others claimed that they mutually discuss the regulations with one another (n=6) or that they get instructions from their bosses (n=5).

4.2.3 Ability

Vendors were asked to indicate the chance that a minor gets a gambling product in their shop. Most participants stated (n=22) that it is very unlikely that a minor acquires a gambling product, but did not rule out that occasionally a minor could slip through. All the others asked (n=20) stated that they are sure that 0% of the under aged slips through since their perceived compliance rate is 100%.

Table 8: Vendors' opinion about the chance that minors can buy gambling products at other shops (n=40)

Compliance in other shops	#	%	Arguments
Same as own shop	4	9.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Vendors cannot believe that other shops would think and act differently than themselves concerning compliance (n=2) - They are convinced that other shops are as strict as them (n=2)
Worse than own shop	17	39.5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With supermarkets it is poorly enforced because they do what they want (n=9) - There are tobacconists who do not pay much attention to compliance (n=5) - I know because minors say they will go somewhere else instead (n=3) - I know because minors come with winning tickets, so they had to buy it somewhere else(n= 2) - Varying staff is a problem which is more difficult (n=2) - There are illegal gambling halls where everybody knows of but these are tolerated (n=2) - In some shops the compliance rate is the same but with others shops a lot lower (n=1)
Better than own shop	1	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It is more strictly with supermarkets, because employees get fired if they do not comply (n=1)
No idea	18	41.9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I have no insights in other shops (n=14) - Minors stated that they will go to another shop because they can get it there, but I believe them (n=2)

Respondents were also asked to rate the extent to which minors can purchase gambling products from other shops, tobacconists and supermarkets. Seventeen of the vendors mentioned that it works differently in other shops. One person stated the compliance rate is even higher in supermarkets because employees get fired in case of non-compliance. The other 16 believe that there are other shops where it is easier for minors to buy gambling products. The most common reason is that the age limit is poorly enforced at supermarkets. The complete set of reasons is shown in Table 8. Moreover, four of the vendors stated that they think the situation is the same as in their own shop, two of them mentioned that they cannot believe that other vendors would think and act differently than themselves and two mentioned that they know that other shops are as strict as them.

Of the 18 vendors that have no idea what happens in other shops, there are three vendors who stated that the minors claim to visit another shop because there they do get gambling products.

Initially vendors all claimed to comply with the legislation, later they were asked what could cause non-compliance. Some vendors were not asked because they firmly mentioned that non-compliance is not happening, others did not give an answer to this question.

Table 9: Reasons of vendors to non-comply (n=24)

Reasons for non-compliance	#	%
Crowdedness in the shop	10	23.3
It is hard to estimate the age of the customer	9	20.9
Secondary purchasing: parents buying for minors	5	11.6
Secondary purchasing: friends buying for minors	4	9.3
When minors bring a fake ID (n=2)	1	2.3
When you are not paying attention for a moment	1	2.3
When there is a replacement in the shop because I cannot work	1	2.3
When it is a small amount of money than I think it is nonsense	1	2.3

Note. A few of the participants mentioned multiple reasons.

Ten vendors claimed that crowdedness in the shop could result in non-compliance, but mentioned that this happens only very occasionally: “[...] it might be that one time when it’s super crowded, if it’s very busy and that someone slips through because of the speed that you are working at or something like that, that you did not notice so quickly, but the chances are very small” (respondent 44). Another participant mentioned: “[...] look if there is a queue waiting at the cash register then you do not really ask every customer [for ID]... because that is just not possible, then people have to wait way too long, they don’t want that. This is also due to society, people don’t want to wait anymore” (respondent 42).

Secondly, vendors considered (n=9) estimating the age of the customer to be difficult: “Well if it doesn’t ring a bell concerning you are too young, or you do not look young, nowadays with the beard growth we have and so forth[...]” (respondent 34).

Nine of the vendors reported secondary purchasing as a reason for non-compliance. However, this is an invalid argument because contrary to what some vendors seem to think, it is legal to sell gambling products to someone who is legally old enough when the gambling products is obviously meant for a minor. The most prevalent reason reported (n=5) is that the minors are accompanied by their parents: “[...] the parent gives it sometimes to their child and then I say: that is officially not allowed eh. And then the parent says: it’s my responsibility and I say its fine, so what should you do otherwise, you cannot pull it out of their hands” (respondent 32). The other vendors mentioned (n=4) that minors bring friends who are 18 or older and therefore there is nothing that they can do about it: “[...] unless indeed they enter the shop with three and the one person who comes to play does have an ID because he is 18 and there are two more, then yes, I cannot do anything about it. If that person also returns it, then there is nothing that I can do of course” (respondent 26).

After asking what could cause non-compliance, vendors were asked which practical resources they were using to avoid non-compliance and a few examples were given; an age viewer, an ID swiper, and stickers and posters to illustrate what was precisely asked.

Table 10: Practical resources vendors have in their shop to stimulate compliance (n=42)

Tool	#	%	Benefits	Downsides	Actual usage
ID swiper	22	51.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ID swiper is faster than myself (n=2) - When people see the ID swiper, they immediately put it in, I do not have to ask anymore (n=2) - Do not have to ask customers for their age, lower threshold (n=1) - Puts the problem with the device, easier to say that device does not agree (n=1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I am personally faster than the ID swiper, takes too much time (n=5) - ID can be from someone else (n=2) - Takes too much space on the counter (n=1) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Yes: (n=13) - Yes, but also controls it themselves (n=2) - Only when doubting authenticity ID (n=1) - No: (n=4)
Calendar to check legal age	7	16.3		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It's a swindle (n=1) - Too expensive (n=1) 	/
Poster/stickers NIX18 ²	8	18.6		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ID can be from someone else (n=2) 	/
Nothing	9	20.9		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ID can be from someone else (n=1) - Too expensive (n=1) 	/

Note. Some participants mentioned multiple resources.

None of the vendors appeared to have an age viewer, but almost half of them do have an ID swiper (n=22). Overall it was evaluate as a helpful device, with mainly benefits but it also has a few downsides, with as result that not everybody uses the ID swiper. Also, vendors claimed to make use of a calendar (n=7) to check the legal age and posters or stickers of the NIX18 campaign (n=8). Furthermore, some of the vendors who did not make use of an ID swiper were asked for a reason and a few others mentioned it themselves. All of them (n=11) claimed that the ID swiper is unnecessary for them, because they are currently doing well without the ID swiper: “[...] the only ID swiper that is most correct, is yourself. Because with an ID swiper you can insert a different card and it would concur. So we do that ourselves” (respondent 25). None of the vendors without an ID swiper mentioned doubting to purchase one in the near future, probably because almost all indicated it as unnecessary.

² Stickers and posters of the Dutch national campaign, which aims at no tobacco and alcohol access to minors. Further information can be found at: www.nix18.nl.

While analyzing the data, it appeared that many vendors answered the previous question not only directly about practical tools but also more general about what they do to avoid non-compliance and this is therefore added to the results.

Table 11: Overall resources vendors use to stimulate compliance (n=39)

Overall resources to stimulate compliance	#	%
Ask for ID	29	67.4
In the long run minors know they cannot get it over here	18	41.9
Made up rule: ask ID until customers of 25 years old	14	32.6
I have mainly regular costumers	13	30.2
Just not give it to minors	4	9.3
Made up rule: vendor warns/threatens the secondary purchaser	2	4.7
Vendor knows the people in the neighborhood	2	4.7
Made up rule: vendors should pay the penalty themselves	1	2.3
Sense that someone is not 18	1	2.3

Note. Some vendors mentioned multiple resources to help them stimulate compliance.

The most mentioned solution (n=29) was to simply ask for ID: *“[...] they just need to be 18 years old. And if you cannot prove it, then you have bad luck, too bad, although you have the car keys with you. It is not allowed”* (respondent 23). The fact that after asking a few times, the word spreads around with minors is also named several times (n=18): *“[...] When the new school year has started, the first three, four weeks are really intense and then it diminishes because they know that we always ask for ID”* (respondent 13). Furthermore, 13 vendors stated that they have regular customers and therefore unknown minors stand out more: *“[...] Anyway, with someone you don’t know already, you start by asking for identification, you have regular customers”* (respondent 21). Some vendors (n=4) told that you just should not give it to minors: *“[...] I just do not give it to them and that’s the end!”* (respondent 15). In addition, it appeared that vendors make up their own rules, the most common one was to ask for ID until the age of 25 (n=14), which is not in line with the Dutch gambling law. Reasons for maintaining this regulation vary: some believe that they are obliged to do it and others execute it because they already have to apply this with tobacco products. Two other vendors mentioned that they warn secondary purchasers to not give gambling products to minors, and threaten customers with camera recordings and fines. In one case the employees are threatened to pay the penalty when they sell to minors. Also, knowing the children in the neighborhood and their age are claimed to be a way to avoid non-compliance (n=2): *“[...] And I am a local entrepreneur of course so I know how old the children are in the neighborhood”* (respondent 17). At last, the sense that someone is not 18 (n=1) is important: *“[...] you notice whether they are nervous or they are overly friendly. Look you feel it at some point, we are doing it for years already”* (respondent 13).

Twenty-three of the vendors mentioned that there are parents in the shop buying gambling products for their children.

Table 12: Vendors' view on secondary purchasing (n=35)

Issue	Secondary purchasing	#	%
Believe of existence	Happening	32	76.7
	Especially happens with December calendars	12	27.9
	Not happening	3	7.0
The persons buying for the minor	Parents	23	53.5
	Friends of at least 18	8	18.6
	Other customers	5	11.6
Counteract on secondary purchasing	It is not my responsibility	17	39.5
	Cannot see what is happening outside the shop	9	20.9
	I try to stop it	8	18.6

Note. Some vendors gave several views on secondary purchasing.

Especially December scratch cards are named as an example where parents buy gambling products for their children (n=12): *"[...]It's a scratch card with the appearance of an advent calendar, which is the most popular product you can buy during Christmas and the Saint Nicholas period. Those are young children of five and six years old that scratch those things at home. You must be 18 years old to buy them and you also can't hand them in under the age of 18, but anyone below ten or twelve years scratches that Christmas advent calendar, because it's so exciting"* (respondent 4). Others (n=5) claimed that minors ask other customers outside the shop to buy gambling products for them and some stated that friends who are above 18 buy it for minors (n=8).

Eight vendors stated that they actively try to discourage secondary purchasing when they see it: *"[...] when there is a minor in here which didn't get anything and two minutes later there's an adult coming for the same thing that the minor wanted, then I refuse. Then I say very firm that I won't have any of it and that it's not allowed"* (respondent 44). Most vendors (n=17) claimed that it is not their responsibility, 15 of them believed the parents to be responsible and that therefore they can do nothing about it when a parent buys a gambling products for a minor. Others stated that there is nothing that they can do, because they cannot see what happens outside their shop (n=9).

As presented in Table 12, almost all vendors were convinced that secondary purchasing is something that happens in this society (n=32). Furthermore, some vendors were not asked because some vendors indicated to be busy and not able to answer all questions.

When directly asked if the vendors face problems in their shop, several times it occurred that they said no, but later on it appeared that they do deal with problems (n=7).

Table 13: Overview of problems vendors are facing (n=21)

Problems	#	%
It is very difficult to estimate a customer's age and therefore I often ask very old customers for ID	10	23.3
Customers get angry if you ask them for ID	6	14.0
Some parents stimulate their under aged child to gamble and there is nothing that we can do	6	14.0
Minors get angry if you do not give it to them	4	9.3
Some parents get angry because we do not sell gambling products to their child	1	2.3
The pictures on ID's are often old, hard to tell if it is the same person. It should be changed more often	1	2.3
Supermarkets do sell gambling products but do not cash out, so people come to my shop.	1	2.3
Some minors do not know that they have to be 18 to gamble	1	2.3

Note. Some vendors mentioned facing several problems.

In total 19 vendors mentioned that they never have problems. The most frequent problem of vendors is that they find it very hard to estimate their customers age and therefore regularly ask them for ID while they are already much older than the legal age (n=10). Furthermore, vendors claimed that customers and minors get angry when they ask them for ID.

4.2.4 Motivation

Also, the motivation for the gambling law was discussed in the interview, by asking to what extent they find the gambling law important and useful.

Table 14: Overview of the vendors' attitudes towards the gambling law (n=43)

Attitude towards law	#	%	Reasons
Positive	11	25.6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Gambling is not suitable for children (n=4) + The boundary should lie somewhere or else it gets out of control (n=2) + I do not want minors in my shop (n=1)
Negative	3	7.0	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Nothing till 18 is too strict, vendors should have more control (n=3) - Minors can easily gamble on the internet, why so strict for us? (n=2)
Neutral	1	2.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not have an opinion, just comply with it
Generally positive but negative about interpretation	28	65.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Gambling is not suitable for children (n=1) + The boundary should lie somewhere or else it gets out of control (n=1) - We get a penalty while it has no effects on the minor (n=14) - The age limit for certain games is too high (n=8) - There is an unfair competition because others do sell to under aged: other 'normal' shops (n=4), the Internet (n=5), illegal shops (n=3) and fun fairs (n=1), why should we be so strict? - We have to act like police officers and take measures, but do not get paid for it (n=5) - The penalty for non-compliance is too high (n=4) - They will get it anyway, why so strict? (n=3) - Age limits are only triggers to minors (n=3) - Minors can easily go abroad where there are milder rules in border areas (n=2), it's also much cheaper there (n=1) - The required age for ID check is too low (n=1) - The law is patronizing (n=1) - Required ID check until 25 makes no sense (n=1) - Ridiculous that we officially can't sell when we know the parents will give it to their children (n=1) - its hypocrite that you can buy state lottery tickets unlimited but scratch cards only 50 a time (n=1) - Vendors should have more control (n=1) - There are more and more kinds of gambling products but we have to slow down the sales, that is crooked (n=1)
Adapting the law	13	30.2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The penalty should be both for the vendor and the minor if he/she succeeds (n=11) - The minor should get the penalty instead of the vendor when he/she succeeds (n=2) - The gambling law should be aligned in entire Europe (n=1) - The required ID check should be higher, to 45 so everybody gets used to it (n=1) - The age limit should be lowered to 16 (n=1)

Note. All participants (N=43) stated their attitude towards the law. A few others (n=13) also stated that the law should be adapted, which is placed in: "adapting the law".

The majority of the vendors (n=28) thought that gambling legislation is generally positive but reacted negative on its interpretation. The most prominent reason was that vendors get fined and that under aged sales have no effect on the minors, although they are aware of the fact that they are not allowed to buy gambling products. Eleven vendors thought only positive about the law because gambling "is not suitable for children". Three were negative

about the law and believed that nothing until 18 is too strict and that vendors should have more control to decide this per situation. One participant stated to not have an opinion, just complied with it. Some of them took it a bit further and stated (n=13) that the law should be adapted. An overview is given in Table 14.

Apart from the five vendors who indicated to view the interpretation of the legislation as negative because they feel like a police officer due to the regulations that have been imposed on them, seven others also mentioned to sometimes feel like a police officer or an educator. They feel this way because minors are still coming to their shop and they constantly have to say that they are not allowed to gamble: *"[...] At some point you feel like a police officer sometimes, it's not nice to say that they are not allowed (to play). Especially since it's the youngsters who would like to bet on football matches and which I can understand. Look it's not about eleven or twelve year olds, they don't do that, you don't see them in here, but they are around 17 years olds who are just under 18"* (respondent 6).

Although most vendors acknowledge the addictiveness of gambling products, a few (n=7) mentioned that they doubt that gambling is harmful for children: *"[...] A lot of parents buy it and wrap it in a nice packaging, well actually we do that already and a few moments later that 18+ border is away. But is it harmful? I think the Lindt chocolate advent calendar is more harmful if I'm honest"* (respondent 34).

Although vendors are not completely confided with the law, they claim to comply with it. As shown in Table 15 four distinct reasons were found why vendors comply with the law.

Table 15: Overview of reasons to comply with the gambling law (n=41)

Reasons to comply	#	%
Sanctions	30	69.8
Gambling products are unsuitable for children	12	27.9
It is the law	12	27.9
Vendors do not like children in shop	2	4.7

Note. Some vendors named multiple reasons to comply.

By far the most frequently cited reason was the risk of a sanction: *"[...] I don't know if you noticed how high the penalty is but that's a year's work for nothing"* (respondent 11). The second reason participants mentioned, was that gambling products are not suitable for children: *"[...] because we do not support it and it is very simple, you need to be an adult to play the game"* (respondent 25). Third, the law abiding nature of the vendors is named as a reason to comply with the law: *"because it's the law and I am obliged to obey the law."* The fourth and last reason mentioned was that vendors do not like to have children in their shop: *"[...] well you can do it one time, but if they come back more then you have a problem because you easily get the reputation of: hey you can hand it in over there. So first you will get one and then there are ten per week to deliver it and that's just not the intention"* (respondent 41).

Furthermore, vendors were asked to specify their thoughts on the most suitable age for individuals to start gambling for money, as shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Most appropriate age that people should start gambling according to vendors (n=38)

Age	#	%
<18	5	11.6
18	25	58.1
Minimal 18	1	2.3
>18	2	4.7
Depends on frequency, once in a while is not a big deal	3	7.0
Depends on game, scratch card more addictive than Toto	1	2.3
No opinion	1	2.3

The majority of participants stated (65.1%) that they are content with the current age limit of 18 years and older. Five preferred a lower age than 18, but with a minimum of at least 16. One stated at least 18 and two vendors think 21 is the most appropriate age.

As shown in Table 17, several responses were given to a question about who is responsible for ensuring that minors are not gambling.

Table 17: Vendors' opinion on who is responsible that minors are not gambling (n=38)

Who is responsible for minors not gambling?	#	%
Parents	14	32.6
Parents & vendors	5	11.6
Minors & vendors	5	11.6
Parents & minors	3	7.0
Minors	3	7.0
Vendor	1	2.3
All three of them	7	16.3

Fourteen of the vendors thought it is only the responsibility of the parent: *"[...] The upbringing is laid upon us. I was recently on the phone with a lady: you have sold my son of 17 years old a Toto, I say yes ma'am and? She says: but he is not 18 yet. I say: yes but if he cannot show identification and it is a big guy and I think that he might be 18, because they all say they are 18. I say: is that not also due to his upbringing, that he is not supposed to lie to people, I say: that rests with you, is that my responsibility? You just did not raise a fair boy"* (respondent 15). Three participants claimed that this responsibility lies upon the under aged themselves because "they are the one trying". Also, one vendor said it is the vendors' responsibility. Others stated there is not one person to blame. A complete overview is given in Table 19.

Also, the vendors were asked to indicate to which extent they feel responsible for the fact that minors do not gamble. Twenty-four stated that their responsibility reaches up to not selling to minors: *"[...] Well I can do nothing about that, just give nothing and that's that"* (respondent 12). Others (n=4) claimed to also inform and draw

attention to the fact that gambling is addictive: “[...] If someone scratches too much than you say: well I think it’s been enough. Come back next time and then you might have much better luck. It must remain within the limits” (respondent 21).

4.2.5 Improvements

Although vendors were asked what should be changed in order to raise the compliance level, several solutions were focused on counteracting youth access to gambling products instead of preventing non-compliance. Therefore, the improvements are divided, as shown in Table 18 and 19.

Table 18: Vendors’ view of improvements to increase compliance (n=38)

Ways to improve compliance	#	%	Improvements
Vendors	7	16.3	- Vendors must adhere to the regulations (n=3) - More enforcement checks should be conducted (n=3) and more illegal shops should be checked (n=3) - Vendors should be more alert (n=1) - When crowded it’s better to stand behind the counter with two vendors (n=1)
Consumers	1	2.3	- Youngsters should show their ID immediately when purchasing a gambling product (n=1)
Implementing practical tools	2	4.7	- Make the age viewer mandatory for every shop that sells gambling products (n=1) - Let minors change the picture on their ID more frequently, so you can better check if it is them (n=1)
Have no idea	6	14.0	/
No improvement possible	9	20.9	/

Note. A few vendors mentioned multiple solutions. A complete overview is given in Table 18.

Multiple solutions were adduced to increase compliance, which are divided into solutions concerning the vendors or consumers, and by implementing practical tools. According to the vendors, more enforcement checks will improve compliance (n=6), also compliance will be improved if all vendors would adhere to the regulations (n=3).

Furthermore, other improvements were adduced to counter the access to gambling products among youth. These are divided into: adjusting with the regulations, solutions concerning the vendors, and by implementing practical tools.

Table 19: Vendors' view of improvements to counter youth access to gambling products.

Ways to counter youth access	#	%	Improvements
Adjusting regulations	16	37.2	- Hold minors responsible when buying or possessing a gambling product by means of a sanction (n=16) - Align the regulations concerning gambling in entire Europe (n=2) - Raise the vendors' legal age to 18 for selling gambling products (n=1)
Consumers	6	14.0	- Everybody should be more informed that gambling products are not allowed or suitable for minors (n=5) - Inform consumers about the dangers of gambling, so they do not want it anymore (n=1)
Implementing practical tools	2	4.7	- Make the signs of the minimum age more visible on gambling products (n=1)

The most frequent improvement named (n=16) was holding minors responsible when buying or possessing gambling products by means of a sanction. The participants are convinced that if the minors risk a fine, they will stop trying to purchase gambling products. Also, vendors believed that everybody should be more informed concerning the dangers and the unsuitability of gambling products with minors (n=5), because currently not everybody is fully aware of this. Furthermore, the gambling regulations should be aligned with the rest of Europe (n=2). Although the age limit is the same, it is claimed that compliance levels are lower abroad, which is probably due to less enforcement checks and a lower perceived risk.

Moreover, eight vendors mentioned that there is nothing that can be done against secondary purchasing.

4.2.6 Differences in gender and place of residence

After comparing the different answers to each code, it turned out that there is no difference in answers depending on the gender and the place of residence of the vendor. Codes with only a few statements were not checked because the chance of coincidence is too high.

5. Discussion

In this chapter the findings are discussed, followed by the practical implications. Furthermore, an overview is provided of the limitations of this research, including suggestions for further research. Finally, a short conclusion is given.

5.1 Findings

If minors are to be discouraged from gambling, it is important that society restricts easy access to gambling products. To achieve this, the collaboration of government, parents, youth, and vendors is necessary. The purpose of these studies is to indicate what the perspective of off-premise gambling product vendors is regarding youth access to gambling products and compliance with the age limit. This could provide starting points for more specific research on the subject of compliance in the gambling industry.

This research revealed that scratch cards and Toto (lottery ticket) are by far the most popular among youth. This is partly corresponding with the findings of Schrijvers, Risselada and Meerkerk (2010) where it was stated that adolescents mostly participate in scratch cards and barely in any lotteries. Toto seems to be an exception of a lottery play where a lot of young adults (18-25 years) participate in. Although some of the vendors indicated that currently less minors try to buy gambling products, possibly due to the increased awareness of age limits, this study shows that minors still frequently try to buy gambling products. Hence, vendors frequently have to check the age of their customers. Gambling companies stated to regularly check on compliance, but more than half of the vendors claimed to never have had an enforcement check in their shop.

5.1.1 Vendors' knowledge

In the theoretical framework, three general determinants of compliance were identified. First, vendors must know the rules (Gosselt, 2011; Havinga, 2006; Law Enforcement Expertise Centre of the Dutch Ministry of Justice, 2004). During the mystery calls it appeared that almost all vendors are aware of legislation that minors are not allowed to buy gambling products. All of the participants mentioned that they fully know and understand the legislation concerning gambling products. Although most vendors indicated that minors are not allowed to participate in gambling, a small but also relevant part of them thinks this is allowed. This indicates that there is a small knowledge deficit on this topic. However, this does not lead to non-compliance, but can lead to erroneous advice about the participation of minors in gambling to parents.

Although gambling industries state to stimulate compliance among vendors, no information or instruction is provided to vendors. This research shows that vendors get informed on compliance by exchanging knowledge with colleagues or their bosses in order to stimulate compliance. This suggests that compliance is a topic of interest among vendors.

5.1.2 Vendors' ability to comply

Secondly, in order to comply vendors should be able to follow the legislation. A few years ago, in a mystery shop research a compliance rate of 0% among Dutch tobacconists was found (Gosselt et al., 2013). The self reported compliance in this research however, is extremely high. All of the vendors mentioned to comply with the legislation and only half of them stated that an occasional slip through is possible. In contrast to perceptions of the performance of their own shops, almost half of the vendors are convinced that minors could occasionally obtain gambling products from other shops. Especially supermarkets are claimed to non-comply. This suggests that vendors are dealing with illusory superiority which can lead to unrealistic optimism (Hoorens, 1993). A study by Altman et al. (1992) concluded likewise and mentioned that the discrepancy in these perceptions likely results from vendors believing that sales to under aged occurs, but that it is primarily a problem in other shops.

Vendors not only suspect minors can get gambling products by buying it in other shops, but also to a large extent with the aid of others, known as secondary purchasing. This is in line with other research where it is stated that gambling with off-premise gambling products constitutes a popular pastime among minors (Meyer, Hayer, & Griffiths, 2006). A substantial part of the vendors indicated that parents buy gambling products for their children, presumably because off-premise gambling products are not seen as harmful but merely as a form of entertainment (Turner et al., 2005; Gupta & Derevensky, 2014). The December calendar (scratch card) is often mentioned as a gambling product which is frequently bought and is even specifically developed for children. This is in line with Derevensky, Gupta and Cioppa, 1996; Wood and Griffiths, 2004) who stated that many of those who start prior to adolescence are usually introduced to gambling via parents and family members. Also, friends at the age of 18 and other customers are claimed to buy for the under aged.

Respondents identified crowdedness in the shop as a key obstacle which can result in non-compliance. This is in line with the findings of previous compliance studies where shops with customers in line in front of the counter were more likely to sell age restricted products to under aged than shops with no customers in line (Britt et al., 2006; Forster, Wolfson, Murray, Wagenaar, & Claxton, 1997). Also, estimating the age of the customer is claimed to be difficult. This is in line with a study by Jason et al. (2003) where 34% of the vendors misestimated age and thought a 16 year old was 18. Some vendors claimed secondary purchasing as a reason for non-compliance. However, this is an invalid argument because contrary to what some vendors seem to think, it is not illegal to sell gambling products to someone who is legally old enough even though the gambling product is obviously meant for a minor.

In order to counter non-compliance half of the vendors have an ID swiper and most of them claimed to use it frequently to always. Several benefits are found (e.g., "the speed at which the device works", "customers know it and put their ID in without asking", and "it is not necessary to ask for the customers age any longer"). A few others claimed to never use it and also downsides were mentioned (e.g., "I am personally faster than the ID swiper", "the ID can be from someone else", "the ID swiper is too expensive", and "the swiper takes too much space on the counter"). Furthermore, some vendors have awareness stickers with NIX18 in their shop or

mentioned to use a calendar which points out at which date someone is 18. Only a quarter of the vendors indicated not to make use of some sort of practical tool because almost all of those vendors thought practical tools are unnecessary. The use of practical tools with the participants is in line with a study by Oostdijk et al. (2014), who stated that tobacconists are often still searching for the most effective and efficient method for age verification.

Generally, vendors claimed to combat non-compliance by simply asking for ID. This can be considered to be wise, because previous research found that asking for identification is a strong predictor of under aged sales refusal (Williams et al., 2014; Currie et al., 2002; St-Pierre et al., 2011). However, simply asking for ID is found to be insufficient because under aged are, although to a more limited extent, able to purchase age restricted products after showing their ID (Williams et al., 2014; Currie et al., 2002; St-Pierre et al., 2011). Previous research claimed that minors are using fake ID's and make use of somebody else's ID in order to beat the age verification system (Nguyen, Walters, Rinker, Wyatt, & DeJong, 2011; Martinez & Sher, 2010). Hence, when validating an ID the vendor must determine if the customer corresponds with the owner of the ID and if it is valid. However, matching the right person to a photo is shown to be difficult (White, Kemp, Jenkins, & Burton, 2014). In addition, at first the vendor has to correctly estimate when to ask a customer for ID, which appears to be difficult. In order to make sure every minor is asked for ID, some vendors claim to check the ID of the customer until the age of 25, which they legally have to do for tobacco products. This indicates that the ability to comply is a topic of interest to vendors. Due to the fact that vendors have to and try to comply with the legislation, they face several problems (e.g., "they check customers who appear to be much older because it is very difficult to estimate age", "some parents stimulate their under aged child to gamble and there is nothing that we can do", "customers get angry if you ask them for ID and the youth gets angry if you do not give it to them", "parents get angry if vendors do not sell gambling products to their child", "the pictures on ID's are often very old, hard to tell if it is the same person, the picture should be changed more regularly with children", and "some minors do not know that they have to be 18 to gamble"). However, according to vendors, these problems are troublesome, but have no effect on the compliance rate. Customers getting aggressive when asking for ID and sales denial are also found in previous research (Altman et al., 1992; Gosselt et al., 2012a).

5.1.3 Vendors' motivation to comply

Third, vendors must be willing to obey the rules in order to comply with legislation. Essentially, most vendors think it is good that there is legislation concerning minors not gambling, but are negative about the interpretation of this legislation (e.g., "we get a penalty while under aged sales have no effects on the minor", "the age limit for certain games is too high", "due to the legislation there is an unfair competition because others do sell to under aged: other 'normal' shops, the internet, illegal shops, and fun fairs so why should we be so strict", "the penalty for non-compliance is too high", "minors will acquire it anyway, why so strict", some mentioned that "age limits only trigger minors and that minors can easily go abroad where there are milder rules in border areas and gambling products are much cheaper there"). This is in line with a study by Pratten and Walton (2008) who also found that vendors in the gambling industry found the legislation unreasonable at some points and hinted at a more liberal approach.

Furthermore, the legislation and minors frequently trying to buy gambling products, is experienced as a burden by some vendors who claim to feel like police officers and educators.

Although vendors merely do not totally agree with the legislation, all claimed to comply with it. This is due to the risk of a sanction in case of non-compliance, which is also found in previous studies (Mulder & de Greef, 2012; Pokorny et al., 2001; DiFranza, 2005). Only occasionally vendors claimed to comply because it is not suitable for children or they mentioned their law abiding nature. This indicates that vendors are not highly concerned with minors gambling. Moreover, some vendors explicitly mentioned to doubt that gambling is harmful for children. This suggests that vendors are not fully aware of the dangers of gambling, which also became evident with the advice vendors gave to the “parent” during the mystery calls. Vendors advised that the minor should bring someone else of 18 or older to buy gambling products for the minor and vendors find no harm in minors playing at home. This can also be caused by the vendors’ knowledge deficit on the fact that minors are legally not allowed to participate in gambling, which is in line with previous research that stated that often under aged gambling is viewed as a legitimate form of entertainment supported by society and parents (Gupta & Derevensky, 2014). In addition, Turner et al. (2005) found that a substantial amount of individuals do not consider scratch cards (29%) or lottery (28%) as a form of gambling, which shows that vendors do not seem to be aware of the necessity to comply with the legislation. Nevertheless, overall vendors think 18 is an appropriate age to start gambling for money. Except for one vendor, none mentioned the difference in addictiveness of scratch cards and lotteries and scratch cards being even less suitable for minors (Griffiths & Woods, 2001).

Both with the mystery calls and the interviews, vendors indicated that parents are responsible if minors do participate in gambling. Only occasionally vendors believed they were responsible, which is also found in previous research (Siegel & Alvaro, 2003; Gosselt et al., 2012a). When talking about secondary purchasing, vendors generally stated that they are not able, or do not want to stop secondary purchasing because it is not their responsibility but of the one providing the gambling product to the minor. These findings show that there is lack of knowledge on how to prevent secondary purchasing of gambling products. Because secondary purchasing is not illegal, there is therefore nothing that a vendor can do to fully discourage youth access to gambling products.

By comparing the same responsibility question both in a reported (mystery call) and a self reported (interview) setting, it can be concluded that vendors were in both cases consistent, when speaking to a parent or an interviewee. Hence, this shows that there is a small chance that participants might have distorted their answers by social desirability (Podsakoff, Mackenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

5.1.4 Improvements

In order to improve compliance, vendors recommended to make it mandatory that minors change the picture on their ID immediately when they turn 18, or change the behavior of youngsters to the point that they show their ID immediately when purchasing a gambling product. Furthermore, vendors should be more alert and simply have to adhere to the regulations. Also, more enforcement checks should be conducted because shops that are not

regularly subjected to checks are less likely to comply. This is in line with Wagenaar et al. (2005a) and in Mulder and de Greef (2012) who stated that the perceived risk is a very important factor to enhance compliance and therefore regular enforcements checks should be conducted.

In addition to recommendations to improve compliance, vendors mentioned improvements to decrease youth access to gambling products. Mostly by adjusting the current legislation to a situation where the minor is being punished when attempting to buy gambling products, because that will stop them from trying. Currently, this is the case with alcohol; Dutch minors can get a penalty when caught with alcohol in a public place. Fines range from € 45 between twelve till 16 and € 90 for 16 to 17 years olds (Rijksoverheid, 2015). However, Altman et al. (1992) claimed that it is undesirable to fine minors as it diverts attention from the primary causes of the problem; gambling companies and vendors. If it appears that these penalties have a positive effect on the use of alcohol among minors, this sanction can also be considered with gambling products.

The focus should not only be on minors but also on parents. The knowledge and behavior of the parents should change, since not all consumers are familiar with the legislation or the harmfulness of gambling products.

According to the vendors, the gambling industry should also make some adjustments, because some gambling products are particularly developed for children. This causes parents to buy gambling products for their children and these products are therefore still easily available for minors. This can be solved by increasing the visibility of minimum age signs on gambling products.

Furthermore, a few of the vendors believe that it is not impossible to improve compliance and that minors have access to gambling products due to the fact that it is seen as harmless and therefore parents give it to their children. In addition, since online gambling has become legal in the Netherlands in 2015, vendors believe that it is impossible to exclude minors.

5.2 Practical implications

This research provides several practical implications if the government, who implemented the gambling age limit, wants to diminish vendors' non-compliance, create more transparency on compliance related factors for a better work environment, and to combat secondary purchasing.

5.2.1 Diminish non-compliance

Vendors could use some help to counter the factors that cause non-compliance to improve their ability to comply. While the government implemented an obligatory age limit with a risk of a penalty for vendors, the government does nothing to help vendors with the execution of it. Vendors have to buy ID swipers or age viewers themselves, while these are relatively expensive for those small businesses. Estimating age and crowdedness in the shop are two main factors that are mentioned to negatively influence the ability to comply. Hence, adjustments against non-compliance should primarily focus on these two matters. An accurate and fast estimation of the customers age is desirable. Vendors can be supported to comply in a fast and accurate way. Making an age viewer legally required and provide every tobacconist with one is an example of this. In addition, by supplying the age viewer, the responsibility lies no longer with the vendor, but with the organization checking the age of the customer. A less expensive solution is to ask customers for ID until the age of 25. Although a legalization was enacted in 2014 that instructs all vendors to request ID from all alcohol and tobacco customers appearing 25 or younger, no comparable legislation exists for gambling products. Given the fact that requiring ID is a strong predictor of vendors' compliance with risky products (Currie et al., 2002; Klonoff & Landrine, 2004; Paschall et al., 2007; Pearson et al., 2007), implementation of a mandatory age verification policy for gambling products is warranted. This can solve the problem of misestimating a customer's age and therefore probably enhance vendors' compliance. In addition, training for vendors is needed. Currently, no trainings are offered to the vendors of off-premise gambling shops. Vendors are obliged to comply, but get no clear explanation on how they are able to determine who to ask for ID and getting routine in the age verification in an effective and easy way. Training programs that teach vendors when to ask for ID and how to properly verify ID, as well as how to deal with aggressive customers, should be implemented and actively promoted. This is in line with St-Pierre et al. (2001), who claim that decision-makers must consider the development of education and training programs, which take the needs and characteristics of different vendors into account. Diemert et al. (2013) stated that innovative strategies can be used to effectively educate vendors, including mailed toolkits, face-to-face programs, as well as online training programs, and webinars. In addition, training programs should include role-playing to ensure that vendors can effectively ask for ID and refuse the sales to minors (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration Center for Tobacco Products, 2014).

In addition, the vendors' motivation is mostly based on avoiding a penalty, but only half of the vendors had an enforcement check while on average the vendors were already selling gambling products for 18 years. This indicates that the perceived risk is low and more enforcement checks and feedback should be executed in order to prevent non-compliance in the future because of the low perceived risk of getting caught.

5.2.2 Improve vendors' work environment

This research provides recommendations for the government to create more transparency on compliance related factors for a better work environment by providing open and clear communication to vendors and the society.

Vendors believe that other shops are less checked upon and that across the border the age limit is maintained differently. According to vendors, this makes it easier for minors to buy gambling products somewhere else. A study by Feighery, Altman and Shaffer (1991) demonstrated that the main reasons for non-compliance of vendors are the perception that minors can easily purchase tobacco from other local stores and the knowledge that the law is not actively enforced. Currently, the vendors claim to not receive any information on the executed enforcement checks. Therefore, communication about conducted enforcement checks and the importance of compliance with the age limit is desirable. Moreover, vendors indicated that they encounter several problems and that the legislation is crooked at some points. These findings can serve as focus points in the communication to ensure that vendors are informed and get the idea that they are heard and understood.

In addition, more awareness in the community is desired. Although in the Netherlands it is mandatory to carry ID in public places, this research shows that vendors are sometimes confronted with angry customers when asked for ID. An explanation might be that the Dutch 'NIX18' campaign is only focused on alcohol and tobacco, while gambling is also not allowed until 18. By creating more awareness in the community about vendors' necessity to ask for identification can create a better work environment for the vendor.

5.2.3 Prevent secondary purchasing

The findings suggest that secondary purchasing of off-premise gambling products occurs. Vendors do not feel responsible for secondary purchasing. However, secondary purchasing can potentially diminish the effectiveness of the age limit. If the government wants to diminish the access of gambling products to youth, it is important to also focus on secondary purchasing. In order to prevent parents purchasing gambling products for their children, parents should be informed that gambling products are not suitable for minors. This can be done by prohibiting gambling products that are particularly developed for children by the gambling industry. At the moment, these products cause parents to buy gambling products for their children which makes them easily available for minors. This can be solved by a change of the design and the visibility of the minimum age sign on gambling products and in stores.

Currently, secondary purchasing is not illegal, however if the government wants to discourage youth access to gambling products measures must be taken to avoid secondary purchasing. Vendors indicate that secondary purchasing frequently occurs and there is nothing that they can do about it when there is someone above 18 in the company of the minor. Vendors are therefore in a unique position to influence sales, but not minors' access to gambling products. However, this is the case with alcohol and tobacco, a vendor may not sell these when it is clear that the buyer will provide it to a minor. Nevertheless, if this is implemented with the sales of gambling products, this causes more responsibility and assessment skills of the vendors. Hence, if this is also realized with

the sales of gambling products, the vendors should get clear explanation on how to execute this in a proper and easy way.

This research also provides several ways to counter youth access to gambling products. Especially also penalizing the minor when attempting to buy gambling products is seen as effective. Further research is needed to create more support for these suggestions.

In short: no help from the government, and secondary purchasing potentially diminishes the effectiveness of the age limit. By decreasing non-compliance, improve the work environment for vendors, and counter secondary purchasing, the current situation can be enhanced. Therefore, support from the government to prevent non-compliance, transparency on compliance related factors, and broadly clarify to parents that gambling products are not suitable for minors is needed. This decreases youth access to gambling products and helps to improve the work environment of vendors.

5.3 Limitations and future research

Multiple limitations to this research are worth noting. First, due to the qualitative studies this research suffers from the limitation that the results cannot be generalized. Although a large part of the Dutch tobacconists were called, franchises and big companies were excluded to increase the chance to speak to the same person in both data collection rounds. Hence, it is difficult to provide solid, general conclusions for all off-premise selling points and to be able to generalize these results to organizations of different sizes and types. The main objective of this research however, is exploration instead of generalization, which makes qualitative research the most suitable (Baarda et al.,2011). Future research should involve organizations in different sizes and types, such as gas stations and supermarkets.

The second limitation concerns the perspective of the vendor. A bigger difference could not exist, the compliance rate with gambling products in off-premises was 0% in 2013. This research shows that almost 100% of the vendors think that non-compliance is not happening in their shop, and when they do only to a very minimal extent. Although the gambling legislation has not been altered in the past years, other age restricted products did undergo changes such as asking for ID until 25 and raise the legal age until 18. The campaign NIX18 was developed and this resulted in a lot of media attention for age limits which can explain some difference in outcomes, and this is also a possible reason why less minors are trying to buy gambling products. Yet, a complete shift is unlikely and is probably due to vendors' illusory superiority which leads to unrealistic optimism (Hoorens, 1993). Another mystery shop study can conclude if there is a shift and whether the compliance rate has risen or that vendors have a totally wrong image of their current situation.

The third limitation concerns the lack of similarities of vendors with the two data collection rounds. Of the 69 mystery calls only seventeen participants were asked the same question concerning responsibility. In addition, the question can be interpreted in slightly different ways, resulting in possible different answers by the same

person. Because only one vendor gave a total dissimilar answer, everything seems to point out that sellers give the same answer in a real situation as in a situation where they are aware of participating in a study.

Finally, the outcomes of this research are not automatically representative for other countries or other age restricted products. To illustrate, the Dutch way of operating is used which can be different in other countries, such as: contrasting age limits, sanctions, level of surveillance, and different shop floor features.

5.4 Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to get a view on the perspectives of the vendors on the age limit of gambling products. This provides a status quo on the current situation and shows that vendors feel disadvantaged, as they are restricted by the age limit and the only ones held responsible. Other parties only experience benefits from gambling products. To illustrate: the government claims a share of the gambling profit, gambling industries create gambling products designed for children and for parents who buy gambling products for their children. In addition, minors can endlessly try to buy gambling products and Internet gambling has become legal. This makes vendors consider gambling products widely available to minors and causes them to feel that everyone else can do whatever they want. Furthermore, the findings imply that vendors know the legislation, are motivated to comply but are not always able to. Although vendors are motivated to decrease non-compliance, youth access to gambling products is of less concern to them. Several implications are given to diminish non-compliance, improve the work environment of vendors, and to prevent secondary purchasing. If the government wants to improve the current situation these implications are a good starting point, but future research is needed to find the real current compliance rate in order to reveal the numbers behind the scratch cards.

Acknowledgement

I would like to mention some people who contributed to this master thesis. First, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisors Joris van Hoof and Jordy Gosselt for the useful comments, remarks and guidance through the learning process of this master thesis. Secondly, I would like to thank Pieter Cornelissen for helping me with the data collection. Thirdly, I would like to thank Julia Schnetgöke, Benthe Bemelman, Pim Lemmens and my parents for their support and contribution to read and revising this report. Last but definitely not least, Kirsty Macgillavry and Ester van de Ven who stood by me from day one of my study.

References

- Altman, D.G., Linzer, J., Kropp, R., Descheemaeker, N., Feighery, E., & Fortmann, S.P. (1992). Policy Alternatives for Reducing Tobacco Sales to Minors: Results from a National Survey of Retail Chain and Franchise Shops. *Journal of Public Health Policy*, 13 (3), 318.
- Baarda, D.B., De Goede, M. P. M., & Teunissen, J. (2011). *Basisboek kwalitatief onderzoek: Handleiding voor het opzetten en uitvoeren van kwalitatief onderzoek*. Groningen, The Netherlands: Noordhoff Uitgevers.
- Blewden, M.B., Spinola, C. (1999). Controlling youth access to tobacco: A review of the literature and reflections on the New Zealand programme of controlled purchasing operations. *Drug and Alcohol Review*, 18 (1),83-91.
- Brancheorganisatie voor de tabaks- en gemaksdetailhandel. (2014). *Algemene informatie Kansspelen*. Retrieved on November 26th, 2014, from: http://www.tabaksdetailhandel.nl/assortimenten/kansspelen/algemene_informatie
- Britt, H., Toomey, T.L., Dunsmuir, W., & Wagenaar, A.C. (2006). Propensity for and correlates of alcohol sales to underage youth. *Journal of Alcohol & Drug Education*, 50, 25-42.
- Chapman, S., King, M., Andrews, B., McKay, E., Markham, P., & Woodward S. (1994). Effects of publicity and a warning letter on illegal cigarette sales to minors. *Australian Journal of Public Health*, 18 (1), 39-42.
- Clark, P.I., Natanblut, S.L., Schmitt, C.L., Wolters, C., & Iachan, R. (2000). Factors associated with tobacco sales to minors: Lessons learned from the FDA compliance checks. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, 284, 729-734.
- Currie, C. J., Pokorny, S. B., Jason, L. A., Schoeny, M. E., & Townsend, S. M. (2002). An examination of factors influencing illegal tobacco sales to minors. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 24, 63-76.
- Derevensky, J.L. (2012). *Teen gambling: Understanding a growing epidemic*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Derevensky, J., Gupta, R., & Cioppa, G. (1996). A developmental perspective of gambling behavior in children and adolescents. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 12 (1), 49-66.
- Derevensky, J.L., Gupta, R., Winters, K. (2003). Prevalence Rates of Youth Gambling Problems: Are the Current Rates Inflated? *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 19 (4), 405-425.

- Diemert, L., Dubray, J., Babayan, A., & Schwartz, R. (2013). *Strategies affecting Tobacco Vendor Compliance with Youth Access Laws: A Review of the Literature*. Toronto: Ontario Tobacco Research Unit.
- DiFranza, J.R. (2005). Best practices for enforcing state laws prohibiting the sale of tobacco to minors. *Journal of Public Health Management and Practice*, 11 (6), 559-565.
- DiFranza, J. R., Savageau, J. A., & Aisquith, B. F. (1996). Youth access to tobacco: The effects of age, gender, vending machine locks, and "It's the Law" programs. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86, 221-224.
- Dovell, R.A., Mowat, D.L., Dorland, J., & Lam, M. (1998). Tobacco Access to Youth: Beliefs and Attitudes of Retailers. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*, 89, 1.
- Feighery, E., Altman, D.G., & Shaffer, G. (1991). The effects of combining education and enforcement to reduce tobacco sales to minors. A study of four northern California communities. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 266 (22), 3168-3178.
- Forster, J.L., Hourigan, M., & MCGovern, P. (1992). Availability of Cigarettes to Underage Youth in Three Communities'. *Preventive Medicine*, 21 (3), 320-328.
- Forster, J.L., Wolfson, M., Murray, D.M., Wagenaar, A.C., & Claxton, A.J. (1997). Perceived and measured availability of tobacco to youths in 14 Minnesota communities: The TPOP Study. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 13 (3), 167-175.
- Gosselt, J.F. (2011). *Off Limits. The effectiveness of age limits in reducing underage sales*. Enschede, the Netherlands: University of Twente.
- Gosselt, J.F., Neefs., A.K., van Hoof., J.J., & Wagteveld, K. (2013). Young Poker Faces Compliance with the Legal Age Limit on Multiple Gambling Products in the Netherlands. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 29 (4), 675-687.
- Gosselt, J.F., van Hoof, J.J., & de Jong, M.D.T. (2012a). Why should i comply? Sellers' accounts for (non-) compliance with legal age limits for alcohol sales. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*, 7, 5.
- Gosselt, J.F., van Hoof, J.J., & de Jong, M.D.T. (2012b). Media Rating Systems: Do They Work? Shop Floor Compliance with Age Restrictions in The Netherlands. *Mass Communication and Society*, 15 (3), 335-359.

- Griffiths, M., & Wood, R. (2001). The psychology of lottery gambling. *International Gambling Studies*, 1 (1), 27-45.
- Gupta, R., & Derevensky, J.L. (2014). Reflections on underage gambling. *Responsible Gambling Review*, 1 (1), 37-50.
- Hanson, K., Hatsukami, D., Boyle, R., & Brown, S. (2000). Minors' access to snuff: Purchase outcomes at corporate owned and independently owned convenience shops. *Addictive Behaviors*, 25, 289-293.
- Havinga, T. (2006). Private regulation of food safety by supermarkets. *Law & Policy*, 28, 515-533.
- Hoorens, V. (1993). Self-enhancement and Superiority Biases in Social Comparison. *European Review of Social Psychology*. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 4 (1), 113-139.
- Howard-Pitney, B., Johnson, M.D., Altman, D.G., Hopkins, R., & Hammond, N. (1991). Responsible alcohol service: a study of server, manager, and environmental impact. *American Journal of Public Health*, 81, 197-199.
- Jason, L., Billows, W., Schnopp-Wyatt, D., & King, C. (1996). Reducing the illegal sales of cigarettes to minors: analysis of alternative enforcement schedules. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis*, 29 (3), 333-344.
- Jason, L. A., Pokorny, S. B., Sherk, J. L., Helzing, D. M., & Rebus, P. J. (2003). Selling tobacco to minors: Can merchants accurately determine a customer's age? *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 8, 67-73.
- Klonoff, E.A., & Landrine, H. (2004). Predicting youth access to tobacco: The role of youth versus shop-clerk behavior and issues of ecological validity. *Health Psychology*, 23, 517-524.
- Klonoff, E. A., Landrine, H., & Alcaraz, R. (1997). An experimental analysis of sociocultural variables in sales of cigarettes to minors. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87, 823-826.
- Landrine, H., Corral, I., Klonoff, E.A., Jensen, J., Kashima, K., Hickman, N., & Martinez, J. (2010). Ethnic disparities in youth access to tobacco: California statewide results, 1999–2003. *Health Promotion Practice*, 11, 132-139.
- Lemarié, L., & Chebat, J.C. (2013) Resist or comply: Promoting responsible gambling among youth. *Journal of Business Research*, 66 (1), 137-140.

Levy, D.T., & Friend, K.B. (2000). A simulation model of tobacco youth access policies. *Tobacco Control*, 8 (3), 323-6.

Martinez, J.A. & Sher, K.J. (2010). Methods of "fake ID" obtainment and use in underage college students. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*, 35, 738-740.

McDermott, S. R., Scott, K. L., & Frintner, M. P. (1998). Accessibility of cigarettes to minors in suburban Cook County, Illinois. *Journal of Community Health*, 23, 153-160.

Meyer, G., Hayer, T., & Griffiths, M. (2009) Problem Gambling in Europe: Challenges, Prevention, and Interventions. *International Gambling Studies*, 9 (2), 179-180.

Mulder, J., & de Greef, J. (2013). *Eyes on ages: A research on alcohol age limit policies in European Member States. Legislation, enforcement and research*. Dutch Institute for Alcohol Policy (STAP). Retrieved on October 11th, 2014, from: http://ec.europa.eu/health/alcohol/docs/eyes_on_ages_report_en.pdf

Nguyen, N., Walters, S.T., Rinker, D.V., Wyatt, T.M., & DeJong, W. (2011). Fake ID ownership in a US sample of incoming first-year college students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36 (7), 759-761.

O'Grady, W., Asbridge, M., & Abernathy, T. (2000). Illegal tobacco sales to youth: A view from rational choice theory. *Canadian Journal of Criminology*, 42 (1), 1-20.

Oostdijk, A., Van den Nieuwenhuizen, D., Van Noort, M. (2014). *De toepassing van (elektronische) leeftijdsverificatiesystemen bij alcohol- en tabaksverkoop. Uitkomsten van een praktijkinventarisatie*. Utrecht: Berenschot.

Paschall, M.J., Grube, J.W., Black, C., Flewelling, R.L., Ringwalt, C.L., & Biglan, A. (2007). Alcohol outlet characteristics and alcohol sales to youth: Results of alcohol purchase surveys in 45 Oregon communities. *Prevention Science*, 8, 153-159.

Paschall, M. J., Grube, J. W., & Kypri, K. (2009). Alcohol control policies and alcohol consumption by youth: A multi-national study. *Addiction*, 104, 1849-1855.

Pearson, D.C., Song, L., Valdez, R.B., & Angulo, A.S. (2007). Youth tobacco sales in a metropolitan county: Factors associated with compliance. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 33, 9-97.

Podsakoff, P.M, Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88 (5), 879-903.

Pokorny, S.B., Corbin, S., Driscoll, M., & Jason, L.A. (2008). The effect of enforcement history and ordinance provisions on merchant compliance with tobacco-control laws. *Journal of Social Work Practice in the Addictions*, 8, 228-243.

Pratten, J.D., & Walton, S. (2008). Policy and reality: corporate social responsibility in the UK gambling industry. Published in Leeds: University of Leeds.

Reinert, B., Carver, v., Range, L.V., & Pike, C. (2009). Retailers' views of tobacco policy and law enforcement. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy*, 16 (3), 260-265.

Rijksoverheid. (2015). *Vanaf welke leeftijd mag ik alcohol kopen of bij me hebben in het openbaar?* Retrieved on March 26th, 2015, from: <http://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/alcohol/vraag-en-antwoord/vanaf-welke-leeftijd-mag-ik-alcohol-kopen-of-bij-me-hebben-in-het-openbaar.html>

Schrijvers, C., Risselada, A., & Meerkerk, G. (2010). *Aard en omvang van kansspelverslaving in Nederland in 2010*. IVO Addiction Research Institute. Retrieved on March 17th, 2015, from: <http://www.gokkendebaas.nl/getdoc/b5d1effd-2307-4db9-a83f-8f16ceaa2dc6/10-11-09-Aard,-omvang-kansspelverslaving-NL-in-201.aspx>

Scribner, R., & Cohen, D. (2001). The effect of enforcement on merchant compliance with the minimum legal drinking age law. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 31, 857-866.

Siegel, J.T., & Alvaro, E.M. (2003). Youth tobacco access: adult attitudes, awareness, and perceived self-efficacy in two Arizona counties. *Journal of Community Health*, 28,6.

Stead, L.F., & Lancaster, T. A. (2000). Systematic review of interventions for preventing sales to minors. *Tobacco Control*, 9 (2), 169-176.

St-Pierre, R.A., Derevensky, J.L., Gupta, R., & Martin, I. (2011). Preventing lottery ticket sales to minors: factors influencing retailers' compliance behavior. *International Gambling Studies*, 11 (2), 173-191.

Turner, N.E., Wiebe, J., Falkowski-Ham, A., Kelly, J., & Skinner, W. (2005). Public awareness of responsible gambling and gambling behaviours in Ontario. *International Gambling Studies*, 5, 95-112.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Food and Drug Administration Center for Tobacco Products. (2010). *Tobacco Retailer Training Programs: Draft Guidance*. Rockville, Maryland: Food and Drug Administration. Retrieved on April 2th, 2015, from:

[http://www.fda.gov/downloads/TobaccoProducts/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/UCM218906 .pdf](http://www.fda.gov/downloads/TobaccoProducts/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/UCM218906.pdf)

Van Hoof, J.J., Gosselt, J.F., Baas, N., & De Jong, M.D. (2012). Improving shop floor compliance with age restrictions for alcohol sales: effectiveness of a feedback letter intervention. *European Journal of Public Health*, 22 (5), 737-742.

Voorhees, C. C., Swank, R. T., Stillman, F. A., Harris, D. X., Watson, H. W., & Becker, D. M. (1997). Cigarette sales to African-American and White minors in low-income areas of Baltimore. *American Journal of Public Health*, 87, 652-654.

Wagenaar, A.C., Toomey, T.L., & Erickson, D.J. (2005a). Preventing youth access to alcohol: Outcomes from a multi-community time-series trial. *Addiction*, 100 (3), 335-345.

Wagenaar, A.C., Toomey, T.L., & Erickson, D.J. (2005b). Complying with the minimum drinking age: Effects of enforcement and training interventions. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 29 (2), 255-262.

White, D., Burton, A. M., Jenkins, R. Kemp, R. (2014). Redesigning photo-ID to improve unfamiliar face matching performance. *Applied Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 20 (2), 166-173.

Williams, R., Kobayashi, L., Fujimoto, T., Swartz, K., Whitehead, T.K., & Bonifacio, N. (2014). Trends in Underage Tobacco Sales: An Update on the Past Decade of Compliance Checks in Hawaii. *Hawai'i journal of medicine & public health*, 73 (10), 315-321.

Wood, R.T.A., & Griffiths, M.D. (2004). Adolescent lottery and scratchcard players: do their attitudes influence their gambling behaviour? *Journal of Adolescence*, 27 (4), 467-475.

Woodruff, S.I., Erickson, A.D., Wildey, M.B., & Kenney, E.M. (1993). Changing retailer knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors related to cigarette sales to minors. *Journal Of Community Psychology*, 21 (3), 234-245.

Appendix 1: Questions mystery call & the son's profile

Questions mysterycall

Answers:

Good day, you are speaking with Bart Visser/ Maarten Smits.

Knowledge

1. My sons friends often scratch scratch cards on Friday afternoon after school. My son would also like to join, but I am wondering what exactly is the situation?

Sense of responsibility

2. And if they do play, who is responsible?

Attitude

3. Do you (also) have a role in all this?

Attitude

4. Friends of his do play with scratch cards, what do you think of that?

Knowledge

1. Do vendors know the legislation? On the one hand that minors are not allowed to buy and, on the other hand, that minors are not allowed to play with scratch cards?

Sense of responsibility

2. Who is responsible for minors participating in scratch card games according to vendors?

Attitude

3. Do vendors think minors should be allowed to participate in scratch card games?

Attitude

4. What do sellers think about minors participating in scratch cards games?

Profile son

Name: Daan Visser

Age: 17 years old

Place of residence: He comes from the city where the shop is located which is called

Study: Last year of secondary school

Gambling: Father does not know whether his son gambles regularly

Friends who scratch: Group of about 10 boys, aged 17 and go to with school with him

Location scratching: At the sports canteen and sometimes at home

1. These names are chosen because they are very common in the Netherlands

2. There is chosen to keep the script as credible as possible and contains of questions 'real parents' could ask

3. The tone of voice was neutral in all of the conversations, to make sure the answers of the vendor were not affected by the tone of voice

Appendix 2: Questions interviews

Good day you speak with Ferie van der Rest of the University of Twente. We are currently doing a research about young people and gambling products and specifically the sale of gambling products to minors. As you might also experience this topic gets a lot of media attention, but in our vision the opinions and experiences of vendors are under exposed, and that while you play a very important role in this whole process. That is why we would like to map the opinions and experiences of vendors of gambling products. I would therefore like to ask you to participate in this telephone interview. Your answers will be processed anonymously and confidentially. The call will take about five minutes. This can take place right away, or at a time when it suits you best.

- Which gambling products are often bought by young people in your shop? (from 18 until 25)
- How often does it happens that a minor tries to buy a gambling product in your shop? (never, a few times a month, a few times a week, daily)
- Do you think you have sufficient knowledge of the law in order to carry this law out in a proper way?
- Imagine there is a minor within the shop, how do you assess the chance that the minor is sold a gambling product?
- And how do you assess this chance in other tobacco shops?
- What are your reasons and causes to comply with this age limit?
- Do you use practical tools which help you comply? (for example, an age viewer, posters/ stickers or an ID swiper)
- To what extent do you think the legislation is important and useful?
- Could you indicate which age you consider as most appropriate for people to start gambling for money?
- Do you have the idea that secondary purchases take place?
- What are the main reasons or causes which causes that a minor slips through and is able buy a gambling product in your shop?
- To what extent are you experiencing practical problems which make it difficult to comply with the legislation?
- What should there be changed in general in order to raise the compliance rate?
- Who do you think is responsible for ensuring that young people are not gambling?
- What do you think that you as a vendor should do to counter the participation of gambling products with minors?

Furthermore, I have a handful of very short questions:

- For how long are you selling gambling products?
- And may I ask how old you are?
- Are there working other vendors of gambling products in the shop? (how many?) (And how is it ensured that they all comply?)
- Have you ever had an enforcement check in the shop concerning gambling products?
- Are there any other things you want to elaborate on concerning this subject that I have not specifically requested?

Appendix 3: Coding scheme mystery calls

Theme	subtheme	Category	Subcategory	Description
Demographics				
	sex			
		Woman		The vendor who says this is a woman
		Man		The vendor who says this is a man
	Place			
		North		The location of the shop is in the north of the Netherlands
		East		The location of the shop is in the east of the Netherlands
		West		The location of the shop is in the west of the Netherlands
		South		The location of the shop is in the south of the Netherlands
Knowledge				
	Recall & recognition			
		Helped		Indicates that the vendor is helped by mentioning the age limit after the first question
		Spontaneously		Indicates that the vendor mentioned the age limit spontaneously after the first question
	Legislation buying & participating			
		Allowed to buy		Indicates that son / minor is allowed to buy scratch cards
			Reason	Explains <u>why</u> the son / minor is allowed to buy scratch cards
		Not allowed to buy		Indicates that son / minor is not allowed to buy scratch cards
			Reason	Explains <u>why</u> the son / minor is not allowed to buy scratch cards
		Allowed to play		Indicates that son / minor is allowed to play with scratch cards
			Reason	Explains <u>why</u> the son / minor is allowed to play with scratch cards
		Not allowed to play		Indicates that son / minor is not allowed to play with scratch cards
			Reason	Explains <u>why</u> the son / minor is not allowed to play with scratch cards
		Unknown		Indicates that the vendor does not know if the son / minor can play and /or can purchase scratch cards
			Reason	Explains <u>why</u> the vendor does not know if son / minor can play and / or can purchase scratch cards
	Sanctions			
		Penalty parent		Indicates that the parent may receive a penalty as a result of an enforcement check
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the parent can receive a penalty as a result of an enforcement check
		Penalty son/minor		Indicates that the son/minor may receive a penalty as a result of an enforcement check
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the son/minor can receive a penalty as a result of an enforcement check
		Penalty vendor		Indicates that the vendor may receive a penalty as a result of

				an enforcement check
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the vendor can receive a penalty as a result of an enforcement check
Ability				
	Self reported compliance			
		Complies with legislation		Indicates that the vendor complies with the legislation
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the vendor complies with the legislation
		Does not always comply with legislation		Indicates that the vendor does not comply with the legislation
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the vendor does not always complies with the legislation
	Secondary purchasing			
		Not able to prevent secondary purchasing		Indicates that it is impossible for vendors to counteract secondary purchasing
		Prevention secondary purchasing		Indicates that if the vendor is convinced that the buyer will give the scratch card to a minor, the sale is canceled
	Reasons why vendors are not able to prevent buying			
		It is hard to estimate age		Indicates that the vendor is not always able to comply because it is hard to estimate age
		An occasional slip through is unstoppable		Indicates that the vendor is not always able to comply because an occasional slip through is unstoppable
		Secondary purchasing is unstoppable		Indicates that the vendor is not always able to comply because secondary purchasing is unstoppable
		Ask for ID		Indicates that the vendor asks for ID when in doubt if a minor meets the age limit
	Reasons why vendors are not able to prevent participation			
		Unstoppable at home		Indicates that if parents approve that minors gamble at home, there is nothing a vendor can do about it
		If minors want it, they will get it anyway		Indicates that if minors want to gamble, they will get it somehow
Motivation				
	Responsibility			
		Vendor		Indicates that the vendor is responsible when minors play with scratch cards
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the vendor is responsible when minors play with scratch cards
		Son/ minor		Indicates that the son/minor is responsible when minors play with scratch cards
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the vendor is responsible when minors play

				with scratch cards
		Parent(s) of the minor		Indicates that the parent(s) is/are responsible when minors play with scratch cards
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the parent(s) is/are responsible when minors play with scratch cards
		The one providing		Indicates that the one providing is responsible when minors play with scratch cards
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the one providing is responsible when minors play with scratch cards
		Unknown		Indicates that the vendor does not know who is when minors play with scratch cards
			Reason	Indicates <u>why</u> the vendor does not know who is when minors play with scratch cards
	Vendors' attitudes towards gambling minors			
		As long as it does not run out of control it is fine		Indicates that as long as the gambling of the minor does not run out of control it is fine
		Does not mind an occasional slip		Indicates that the vendor does not mind an occasional slip
		Negative		Indicates that the seller thinks negatively about under aged gamblers
		Innocent		Indicates that the vendor believes that gambling among minors is innocent
		It is fine at home		Indicates that the vendor believes that it is fine when parents agree with minors playing with scratch cards at home
		Minors should bring someone else of above 18		Indicates that minors should bring someone of above 18 to buy scratch cards for him/her
		Depends on the age, the older the child, the less bad it is		Indicates that there is a difference between the age of the minor. The older the child, the less bad it is when it gambles
Remaining codes				Displays all codes that cannot be placed in a different code
	Other shops			Indicates that other shops might sell gambling products to minors

Appendix 4: Coding scheme interviews

Theme	subtheme	Category	Subcategory	Description
Demographics				
	Sex			
		Woman		The vendor who says this is a woman
		Man		The vendor who says this is a man
	Place			
		North		The location of the shop is in the north of the Netherlands
		East		The location of the shop is in the east of the Netherlands
		West		The location of the shop is in the west of the Netherlands
		South		The location of the shop is in the south of the Netherlands
	Age vendor			Indicates the age of the vendor
	Number of years selling gambling products			Indicates for how long the seller has been selling gambling products
	Other vendors in shop			Indicates whether/ how many other vendors are working in the shop
Features shop floor				
	Popular products among youth			
		Toto		Indicates that Toto is often bought by 18 till 25 year olds
		Scratch cards		Indicates that scratch cards are often bought by 18 till 25year olds
		Other gambling products		Indicates all other products often bought by 18 till 25year olds
	Minors in shop			
		Frequency asking for ID		Indicates how often the vendor asks for ID
		Frequency minors in shop		
			Never	Indicates how often a minor in the shop = <u>never</u>
			Almost never	Indicates how often a minor in the shop = <u>almost never</u>
			A few times per month	Indicates how often a minor in the shop = <u>a few times per month</u>
			A few times per week	Indicates how often a minor in the shop = <u>a few times per week</u>
			Daily	Indicates how often a minor in the shop = <u>daily</u>
			Previously more than now	Indicates that there used to be more minors visiting the shop than currently
	Enforcement checks			
			Did have an enforcement check	Indicates that the vendor has had an enforcement check concerning gambling
			Never had an enforcement check	Indicates that the vendor never had an enforcement check concerning gambling
			Enforcement check concerning NSO or tobacco	Indicates that the vendor has had enforcement check(s) of the NSO or concerning tobacco
			Enforcement checks less often in	Indicates that the vendor thinks enforcement checks occur less often at other shops

			other shops	
			Unknown	Indicates that the vendor does not know if an enforcement check ever took place in his shop
Knowledge				
	Knowledge vendor			Indicates whether the vendor is aware of the current legislation
	Employees getting informed			Indicates everything concerning the knowledge of other vendors in the shop
Ability				
		Chance own shop		
			No chance	Indicates that the probability is zero that a minor buys a gambling product in the vendors' shop
			A very small chance	Indicates that the probability is very small that a minor buys a gambling product in the vendors' shop
			Other chances	Indicates all other chances that a minor buys a gambling products in the vendors' shop
		Chance other shops		
			No idea other shops	Indicates what the vendor does not know what the chances are that a minor can buy a gambling product in another shops
			Same as with own shop	Indicates the probability that a minor can buy a gambling product in another shop is as great as with its own shop
			Different as with own shop	Indicates the probability that a minor can buy a gambling product in another store is different as with its own shop
	Problems in shops			
		Problems concerning aggression		Indicates that aggression occurs in shop
		Other problems		Indicates other problems that vendors encounter
	Reasons non-compliance			
		Crowdedness		Indicates that crowdedness could cause that a minor slips through
		Estimating age		Indicates that wrongly estimating the age of the customer could cause that a minor slips through
		Fake ID		Indicates that if minors show a fake ID could cause that a minor slips through
		Secondary purchasing		Indicates that secondary purchasing could cause that a minor slips through
		Remaining causes		Indicates all remaining reasons that could cause that a minor slips through
	Reasons compliance			
		Practical resources		
			Age viewer	Indicates that the vendor has an Age viewer
			ID swiper	Indicates that the vendor has an ID swiper
			Stickers/ posters	Indicates that the vendor has stickers and/or posters in their shop
			Noting	Indicates that the vendor has no practical resources in the shop
		Ask for ID		Indicates that the vendor asks for ID in order to prevent non-compliance

		Made up rules		Indicates to deploy additional rules to prevent non-compliance
		Only regular customers		Indicates that the vendor has a lot of regular customers
		In the long run minors know they cannot get it over here		Indicates that In the long run minors know they cannot get it over here and stay away
		Sense that someone is not 18		Indicates that the vendor senses it when someone is below 18 years old
		Just not give it to minors		Indicates that you just should not sell gambling products when someone is under aged
	Secondary purchasing			Indicates everything what the vendor mentions on secondary purchasing
Motivation				
	Responsibility			
		Vendor		Indicates that the vendors are responsible for ensuring that minors are not gambling
		Minor		Indicates that the minors themselves are responsible for ensuring that minors are not gambling
		Parent(s) of minor		Indicates that the parent(s) of the minor is/are responsible for ensuring that minors are not gambling
		The one providing		Indicates that the ones providing are responsible for ensuring that minors are not gambling
		Unknown		Indicates that the vendor does not know who is responsible for ensuring that minors are not gambling
		Multiple persons		Indicates that multiple people are responsible for ensuring that minors are not gambling
	The extent to which the vendor feels responsible			
		Responsibility up to only not selling to a minor		Indicates that the vendor feels responsible that minors do not gamble to the extent of not selling to a minor
		Responsibility up to not selling and guidance		Indicates that the vendor feels responsible that minors do not gamble to the extent of not selling and providing guidance to a minor
	Attitude gambling legislation			
		Positive		Indicates that the legislation is useful/ important
		Generally positive but negative about interpretation		Indicates that the legislation is positive but is negative about the interpretation
		Negative		Indicates that the legislation is not useful/ important
		Neutral		Indicates that the vendor does not give a clear indication whether finding the legislation useful / important
		Adapting law		Indicates that the current legislation should be adjusted at certain points
		Age limit is currently too high		Indicates that the age limit of 18 for gambling products is too high

		Educator/ police officer		Indicates that the vendors feels like an educator/police officer by carrying out the legislation
		Harmless		Indicates that the vendor believes that minors gambling is not harmful
	Most appropriate age limit			Indicates which age the vendor finds most appropriate that people should be allowed to gamble
	Reasons to comply			
		Sanctions		Indicates to comply because of the sanctions when the vendor non complies
		It is the law		Indicates to comply because it is stated by law
		Unsuitable for children		Indicates to comply because it is not suitable for children
		Do not like children in their shop		Indicates to comply because children are not wanted in the shop
Solutions for non-compliance				
	Solutions non-compliance directly to minors			
		Concerning vendors		Indicates all solutions concerning things vendors should do to increase compliance
		Concerning consumers		Indicates all solutions concerning things that consumers should do to increase compliance
		Concerning adjusting legislation		Indicates that the legislation should be modified to increase compliance
		Concerning implementing tools		Indicates that practical tools should be implemented to increase compliance
		No improvement possible		Indicates that the compliance rate is satisfactory at the moment or that there is nothing that can be done to increase the current compliance rate
		Unknown		Indicates not to know what can be done to increase compliance
	Solutions non-compliance secondary purchasing			
		Changes in order to prevent secondary sales		Indicates what needs to be changed to prevent secondary purchasing
		No improvement possible		Indicates that nothing can be changed to prevent secondary purchasing
Remaining				Displays all codes that cannot be placed in a different code