Independent Expert Evidence for the Perth Casino Royal Commission

November 2021

Kahlil S. Philander, Ph.D.

## **Table of Contents**

1	Overview
2	Qualifications as Expert
3 sam	Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.1 and to the commentary by the authors on the ne topic on page 27 in section 5.1;
4	Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.2;
5 wha Cro	Professor Rockloff's answer to question 4.1 and to the commentary by the authors regarding at they call the "informed choice" or "Reno model" in section 5.1, excluding comment on wn's Responsible Gambling framework
6 redu app que	Approaches proposed by Professor Rockloff as having most potential for preventing and ucing gambling harm associated with EGMs and being consistent with the public health roach: Pre-commitment (and the authors' further comments on this topic in answering stion 4.2(f))
7 redi app	Approaches proposed by Professor Rockloff as having most potential for preventing and ucing gambling harm associated with EGMs and being consistent with the public health roach: Structural features of EGMs
8 like	Professor Rockloff's answers in section 4.2 to whether the following measures are, or are ly to be, effective:
9 indu	Professor Rockloff's criticism of the members of the RGAP on the basis of their receipt of ustry funding
Ref	erences

## 1 Overview

This expert witness report was requested by Allens on the behalf of Crown Resorts Limited. I was retained by Crown Resorts Limited on September 1, 2021 to provide independent expert evidence on Responsible Service of Gambling issues arising during the Royal Commission into Crown Perth's suitability to hold its Perth casino licence.

On November 8, 2021, I was requested by letter (Addendum A) to prepare an independent expert report addressing the questions (described below) relating to the report entitled '*Gambling Harm and Harm Minimisation in Western Australia*' (the **Rockloff Report**) dated October 2021 by Matthew Rockloff, Nerilee Hing, Matthew Browne, Alex M.T. Russell, Hannah Thorne, Philip Newall, and Tess Visintin (the *authors*). The report is required to be produced to the Perth Casino Royal Commission on November 10, 2021.

The following documents were provided by Allens for review in preparation of this report:

I. 'Gambling Harm and Harm Minimisation in Western Australia' (October 2021) by Matthew Rockloff, Nerilee Hing, Matthew Browne, Alex M.T. Russell, Hannah Thorne, Philip Newall, and Tess Visintin.

## 1.1 Assumptions

I was instructed to prepare a written report that contains my observations on the following parts of the Rockloff Report:

- 1 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.1 and to the commentary by the authors on the same topic on page 27 in section 5.1;
- 2 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.2;
- 3 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 4.1 and to the commentary by the authors regarding what they call the "informed choice" or "Reno model" in section 5.1, excluding comment on Crown's Responsible Gambling framework;
- 4 The following of the approaches proposed by Professor Rockloff as having most potential for preventing and reducing gambling harm associated with EGMs and being consistent with the public health approach:
  - (i) Pre-commitment (and the authors' further comments on this topic in answering question 4.2(f)); and
  - (ii) Structural features of EGMs.
- 5 Professor Rockloff's answers in section 4.2 to whether the following measures are, or are likely to be, effective:
  - (i) Question 4.2(a) Charging a fee to enter casinos
  - Question 4.2(e) Low betting limits for individual EGM games (to the extent not already addressed in response to 4(b))

- Question 4.2(g) A low daily maximum spend of around \$40 per session/day
- (iv) Question 4.2(i) Restrictions on the amount that can be won on EGM jackpots (to the extent not already addressed in response to 4(b)).
- 6 Professor Rockloff's criticism of the members of the RGAP on the basis of their receipt of industry funding.

I rely on no other facts and make no other assumptions in providing my opinions.

1.2 Acknowledgements

I have read and complied with the Federal Court of Australia expert evidence practice note and agree to be bound by it.

My opinions are based wholly or substantially on specialized knowledge arising from my training, study, and experience.

I have made all the inquiries that I believe are desirable and appropriate and that no matters of significance that I regard as relevant have, to my knowledge, been withheld from the Perth Royal Commission.

I may have additional opinions or updated and/or revised opinions if new information and/or documents are provided.

## 2 Qualifications as Expert

2.1 Kahlil S. Philander, Ph.D.

I am a university professor with 12 years of experience in researching the gaming industry. Among other content, my research has focused on responsible gambling programs in gaming organizations, gambling policy, and consumer behavior in gambling.

I currently serve as an Assistant Professor (tenure-track) within the School of Hospitality Business Management, Carson College of Business, Washington State University. I also hold a position as an Honorary Lecturer in the Department of Psychology at the University of Sydney.

Previously, I was the Director of Social Responsibility at the British Columbia Lottery Corporation where I oversaw the GameSense program, an award-winning responsible gambling consumer education program for online and retail products that has been adopted in multiple North American jurisdictions. I also was the Senior Policy Researcher at the non-profit Responsible Gambling Council, Center for the Advancement of Best Practices where I researched responsible gambling interventions designed to reduce consumer risk and mitigate problem gambling.

I received my doctorate from the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in Hospitality Administration, my Master of Arts in economics from the University of Toronto, and my Bachelor of Commerce with Honors in finance and economics from the University of British Columbia.

I am an Associate Editor at the peer-reviewed journal, International Gambling Studies. I am on the editorial board at the Brief Addiction Science Information Source, a periodical of the Division on Addiction, Cambridge Health Alliance, a Harvard Medical School teaching hospital. I am a member of the editorial board at the UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal. I am an Advisory Board member at Conscious Gaming, a non-profit philanthropic organization. I am the co-chair of the Technology, Risk-Taking, and Gambling Seminar series.

I have published 29 peer-reviewed journal articles and have spoken widely at academic and industry conferences worldwide. I received the Research of the Year award from the National Council on Problem Gambling in 2015 and 2021. The British Columbia Lottery Corporation won the Corporate Social Responsibility Award from National Council on Problem Gambling under my leadership in 2015. I am the co-author of the Positive Play Scale, a responsible gambling measurement tool that is adopted globally by gaming operators.

Attached with this report is my curriculum vitae, inclusive of publication and testimony list.

- **3** Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.1 and to the commentary by the authors on the same topic on page 27 in section 5.1
- 3.1 Section 2.1 of the Rockloff Report discusses "What is gambling related harm?"
- 3.2 I generally agree with the definitions cited by the authors from Langham et al. and Ferris & Wynne,<sup>1</sup> but my opinion is that authors overstate importance of the findings in measurement of gambling-related harm from Browne et al. (2016) when they stated that, "<u>most of the harms produced by gambling are suffered by people who do not have a gambling problem.</u>"<sup>2,3</sup>
- 3.2.1 The 2016 report by the authors was a meaningful and ambitious step forward in harm measurement, but I do not find the empirical estimates to be statistically valid and the methodology is not widely accepted.
- Delfabbro and King articulate criticisms of the approach that I find reasonable and 3.2.2 compelling.<sup>4</sup> For example, in one publication they state:<sup>5</sup> "<u>Although the evidence in both</u> studies supports the view that disruptions to people's personal budgets and leisure activities is likely to be a genuine feature of problem gambling and, to a lesser extent, lower risk gambling, both studies raise an important question worthy of further debate. This is: where does one draw a line between what one might consider harm as opposed to a relative cost associated with the choice? Every consumer choice to spend money (e.g., to go out for an expensive meal vs. play a gaming machine) involves a choice to spend time and money on one activity rather than another. Thus, a person who is an ardent football supporter will, by definition, reduce his or her savings, incur greater credit card debt and limit other leisure activities, including time with family. Such decisions represent an opportunity cost which can be, in theory, measured in relation to the subjective utility forgone by not engaging in the other activities. In other words, engaging in one activity (e.g., gambling) and investing time and money might not really be a harm. A potential problem, therefore, with the items used by Browne et al. (2016) is that several of the items which were particularly identified as harms associated with lower risk gambling could potentially be just a leisure choice and nothing more."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Erika Langham et al, 'Understanding Gambling Related Harm: A Proposed Definition, Conceptual Framework, and Taxonomy of Harms' (2015) 16(1) *BMC Public Health* 80 ('Understanding Gambling Related Harm'); Jacqueline Ann Ferris and Harold James Wynne, *The Canadian Problem Gambling Index* (Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse Ottawa, ON, 2001).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Page 8, lines 18 - 20.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Matthew Browne et al, 'Assessing Gambling-Related Harm in Victoria: A Public Health Perspective'

<sup>&</sup>lt;a href="https://prism.ucalgary.ca/handle/1880/51519">https://prism.ucalgary.ca/handle/1880/51519</a> ('Assessing Gambling-Related Harm in Victoria').

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Paul Delfabbro and Daniel King, 'Prevention Paradox Logic and Problem Gambling: Does Low-Risk Gambling Impose a Greater Burden of Harm than High-Risk Gambling?' (2017) 6(2) *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 163 ('Prevention Paradox Logic and Problem Gambling'); Paul Delfabbro and Daniel L King, 'Challenges in the Conceptualisation and Measurement of Gambling-Related Harm' (2019) 35(3) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 743; Paul Delfabbro, Neophytos Georgiou and Daniel L King, 'Measuring Gambling Harm: The Influence of Response Scaling on Estimates and the Distribution of Harm Across PGSI Categories' (2021) 37(2) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 583 ('Measuring Gambling Harm').

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Delfabbro and King, 'Challenges in the Conceptualisation and Measurement of Gambling-Related Harm' (n 4).

- Separately they also state:<sup>6</sup> "The danger of overextending the [prevention paradox] 3.2.2.1 argument is that it can lead to an overreach of policy and regulation into lower risk behaviors. Although it is valid to draw some parallels between gambling and other potentially addictive behaviors (e.g., smoking and alcohol), it is important to recognize that low-level gambling is not the same as smoking. Smoking is known to cause harm even at low levels. Similarly, there is evidence that even those with lower levels of total alcohol consumption engage in binge drinking on occasions. To advance this area of research, we suggest that several methodological and conceptual issues need to be considered. First, it is important to ensure that [low-risk] gamblers are appropriately defined and do not include people that other studies would consider moderate-risk gamblers. Second, we are not suggesting that measures, such as excessive expenditure or reducing one's savings, are invalid items for measuring harm. Such behaviors may indeed be a major source of reduced quality of life for people, including some problem gamblers. What we believe is that one needs to consider some meaningful threshold for these behaviors and that they are seen to reduce people's quality of life or compromise their psychological, physical, or social well-being. Third, we caution against attempts to classify very minor types of harm and then aggregate them. Such approaches may lead to the [prevention paradox] becoming hard to falsify in some cases because the threshold of harm becomes lowered to the extent that it captures even the most minor impacts."
- 3.2.3 Delfabbro and King provide multiple critiques of the methodology used by the authors, which I find valid.<sup>7</sup> I believe it is likely that there is substantial measurement error in the work by the authors to warrant the statement by the authors that "<u>most of the harms produced by gambling are suffered by people who do not have a gambling problem.</u>"<sup>8</sup> I do not find the self-reported approach by the authors to be convincing. Based on my understanding of economic and consumer behavior literature, it is my expert opinion that individuals feel and behave differently than how they respond in these hypothetical questions posed by researchers. The studies by the authors that attempt to quantify harms are useful studies to contribute to the body of academic research, but the empirical findings are inappropriate for policy settings.
- 3.2.4 In other publications, the authors provided responses to the critiques articulated by Delfabbro and King.<sup>9</sup> I am not convinced by the authors arguments, but I do believe these

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> Delfabbro and King, 'Prevention Paradox Logic and Problem Gambling' (n 4).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Delfabbro, Georgiou and King (n 4).

The authors write, "In support of Browne et al. (2016), the findings showed that higher proportions of harm in low risk gamblers is likely to be identified when one uses binary or 'any harm' scoring, but that this effect mostly disappears when more graded scoring or attribution of harm measures are used. Higher risk PGSI groups consistently reported more harms and more serious harms than lower risk groups. It was concluded that the measurement of gambling harm and its estimated distribution over PGSI categories is quite sensitive to how it is measured."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Measurement error is a term of art used to describe numerical bias that occurs in measuring a phenomenon when the tools used (such as a survey Likert scale) cannot accurately capture the true nature of the phenomenon, and therefore produce systematically inaccurate results.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Matthew Browne et al, 'A Framework for Indirect Elicitation of the Public Health Impact of Gambling Problems' (2020) 20(1) BMC Public Health 1717; Matthew Browne and Matthew J Rockloff, 'The Dangers of Conflating Gambling-Related Harm with Disordered Gambling: Commentary on: Prevention Paradox Logic and Problem

are valuable academic conversations. I believe this ongoing debate further underwrites the notion that none of these empirical findings or methodologies are appropriate to be used in a policy setting at this time.

- 3.3 I agree with the authors that gambling opportunities are rarely evaluated for both the positive and negative effects they produce, but I disagree with the authors statement that "<u>Rockloff et al. (2019) described the first study using prevalence data to calculate the net benefit from gambling to consumers from all forms of gambling.</u>"<sup>10</sup>
- 3.3.1 For instance, in this report and their cited source material, the authors do not cite more seminal work beginning in the early 2000s in cost/benefit analysis of casino jurisdictions in the United States and China.<sup>11,12</sup> Although I do not believe that these early works provide accurate empirical estimates either, it is unclear why the methodologies from these prior studies are unused and unaddressed in the recent literature on gambling related harms, as it includes relevant discussion and measurement of social harms from gambling.
- 3.3.2 The authors fail to discuss the challenges of measuring consumer surplus in any industry, which requires understanding the entire demand curve. That is, to truly understand if there's a net benefit or net cost from gambling, the researcher must be able to approximate the value received by every individual. A recent paper coauthored by well-regarded economists, technologists, and industrial data scientists, articulates this problem:<sup>13</sup> "For over 250 years, economists have recognized the importance of consumer surplus when making welfare calculations. Consumer surplus (and the closely related concepts of equivalent variation and compensating variation) is a critical input to many economic policies, such as antitrust analysis, the valuation of non-market goods, and measuring the value of innovation (e.g., Williamson 1968, Willig 1976, Bresnahan 1986). In practice, however, obtaining convincing empirical estimates of consumer surplus has proven to be extremely challenging. We typically observe only the equilibrium point that balances supply and demand. Variations in that equilibrium across time and space are generally the result of a combination of supply-driven and demand-driven shocks and thus are of little use in this regard."

Gambling (Delfabbro & King, 2017)' (2017) 6(3) *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 317 ('The Dangers of Conflating Gambling-Related Harm with Disordered Gambling'); Matthew Browne and Matthew J Rockloff, 'Prevalence of Gambling-Related Harm Provides Evidence for the Prevention Paradox' (2018) 7(2) *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 410.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> Page 9, line 46

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> Earl L Grinols and David B Mustard, 'Business Profitability versus Social Profitability: Evaluating Industries with Externalities, the Case of Casinos' (2001) 22(1–3) *Managerial and Decision Economics* 143 ('Business Profitability versus Social Profitability'); Davis KC Fong, Hoc Nang Fong and Shao Zhi Li, 'The Social Cost of Gambling in Macao: Before and after the Liberalisation of the Gaming Industry' (2011) 11(1) *International Gambling Studies* 43 ('The Social Cost of Gambling in Macao').

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Note: These studies also had many methodological challenges in producing valid and reliable results.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> Peter Cohen et al, *Using Big Data to Estimate Consumer Surplus: The Case of Uber* (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2016).

- 3.3.2.1 Preferences revealed through actual behavior are those typically viewed by academics in the field of economics as reliable and indicative of consumer sentiment, not stated preferences in a survey or other self-report methodology as used by the authors. Although surveys may be appealing since they will infallibly produce a result, that result may be worse than no study at all, since it can lead to false conclusions and bad policy decisions.
- 3.4 The authors state, "<u>it is easier to argue in line with standard economic theory that</u> <u>industries should create greater consumer surpluses than the harms or externalities that</u> <u>they create.</u>"<sup>14</sup> I agree that economic theory suggests that individuals who choose to consume a good or service must value that consumption more than the next best alternative, but it's not clear to me that the authors adequately describe what economic theory suggests about consumer behavior in terms of costs and benefits of gambling.
- 3.4.1 At a subclinical level where individuals would not be characterized as having an addiction and where individuals are therefore presumed to not be behaving irrationally, economic models of consumers suggest that any harms that a consumer may incur must be offset by an even larger benefit, thereby producing a positive consumer surplus. This implies that harms from gambling for those individuals would be less than the benefits.
- 3.5 I disagree with the statement, "<u>Arguments about employment, taxation revenue, or</u> <u>freedom in commerce are hard to quantify. However, it is easier to argue in line with</u> <u>standard economic theory that industries should create greater consumer surpluses than the</u> <u>harms or externalities that they create.</u>"<sup>15</sup>
- 3.5.1 Economic impact studies that examine employment and taxes have been systematically studied for decades in tourism/hospitality and multiple commercial software providers exist to provide these impacts.<sup>16</sup> I have personally led dozens of economic impact studies, including those related to the gambling industry and non-gambling industries. These methodological approaches are similar and frequently relied upon by policy makers. Some of the authors have also been part of an economic impact study of the gambling industry that estimate both taxes and employment.<sup>17</sup>
- 3.6 In Section 5.1, the authors further state, "<u>This narrow focus ignores the now irrefutable</u> evidence that the harm from gambling is not restricted to "problem gamblers," and that many more people than those who meet criteria for problem gambling experience gambling harm (Browne et al., 2016, 2017, 2019)."<sup>18</sup>
- 3.6.1 My opinion is that this misconstrues the evidence. It may be the case that some nonproblem gamblers experience gambling harm, but it is not obvious that they

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Page 9, line 57.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>15</sup> Page 9, lines 56 - 59

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>16</sup> For example, Mark A Bonn and Julie Harrington, 'A Comparison of Three Economic Impact Models for Applied Hospitality and Tourism Research' (2008) 14(4) *Tourism Economics* 769.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>17</sup> Matthew Browne et al, 'Fourth Social and Economic Impact Study of Gambling in Tasmania (2017): Report to Tasmanian Government Department of Treasury and Finance, Volume 1: Industry Trends and Impacts'.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>18</sup> Page 27, line 676

experience "net costs". For the reasons I've explained related to economic theory, my opinion is that non-problem gamblers typically do not experience net costs, and that harms they may experience are offset by the benefits they receive from the consumption experience.

- 3.7 My opinion is that the framework for harm measurement put forward by the authors has limitations in its application to policymaking that were not articulated. The public health model focuses on quality of life but generally does not recognize trade-offs that individuals and/or policymakers must make in the allocation time, money, or other resources.
- 3.7.1 Professor Doug Walker discussed the public health model in a 2007 study on gambling-related social outcome models and noted that the approach was helpful but not sufficient for decision making, as there is no cost-benefit trade-off.<sup>19</sup>
- 3.7.1.1 He states, "<u>The public health perspective is perhaps the most general of the three approaches introduced here. It is based on the Ottawa Charter (World Health Organization 1986), and it focuses on prevention, treatment, harm reduction, and quality of life. In terms of gambling, it focuses on how gambling can affect individuals, families, and communities (Korn and Shaffer 1999: 306). The public health approach does not primarily focus on how to measure costs and benefits. Still, economic costs and benefits are an important component of the public health perspective. There are quality-of-life components that defy measurement, and it is important for these to be considered along with components that are easier to quantify. In this sense, the public health framework helps to show how the other approaches fit into the big picture."
  </u>
- 3.8 My opinion is that health impact assessment processes are more effective public health tools for gambling policymakers. Health impact assessments are multi-step methodologies used to assess and improve health-related outcomes from project or policies. Health impact assessments have been used in North America to understand positive and negative impacts to health, but as a methodology, do not constrain themselves to "net" quantification of hard to quantify variables. Health impact assessment models are more effective policy tools since they do not require that all impacts roll-up to a universal figure that is netted out, and instead they can be weighed by stakeholders alongside other material issues.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>19</sup> Douglas M Walker, 'Problems in Quantifying the Social Costs and Benefits of Gambling' (2007) 66(3) *american Journal of economics and sociology* 609.

## 4 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.2

- 4.1 In Section 2.2 of the Rockloff Report, the authors discuss "What are the causes of gambling related harm?"
- 4.2 I do not believe that the authors responded directly to this question. They did not discuss any of the leading models of gambling addiction, which I believe are essential to understanding the causal pathways of gambling-related harm. Although overspending and addiction are not synonymous, addiction necessarily implies overspending by the most harmed individuals.
- 4.2.1 The preeminent model explaining the aggregation of factors contributing to gambling addiction is the biopsychosocial model. The biopsychosocial model recognizes the contributing roles of predispositions (e.g. genetics), psychological vulnerabilities (e.g. life stress), and environment (e.g. access convenience to gambling) to gambling problems.<sup>20</sup> All of these variables interact and contribute to an individual's risk level. Within the model, it is straightforward to understand that an individual with a genetic predisposition to addiction and co-morbid mental issues might be more likely to develop problems with a particular game than someone without those contributing factors. What is important to understand is that no single variable exists as a risk factor without considering its interactions with other contributing factors. Exploring interventions should always be done while considering how they might interact with different people in different environments.
- 4.3 I disagree with the statement, "<u>In gambling research, there is a tendency to revel in</u> <u>complexity in describing the sources of gambling harm.</u>"<sup>21</sup> I have not observed any evidence of researchers reveling in complexity of describing sources of gambling harm. My interpretation is that gambling researchers, as a discipline, can be and should be precise in their definition of gambling related harms and the sources of those harms, and this may require complex thinking.
- 4.4 I disagree with the statement, "<u>This obfuscating complexity suits the interests of the beneficiaries of gambling revenues, including government and industry players, as well as researchers that accrue research income from exploring the many facets of games, advertising practices, responsible gambling codes of conduct, etc."<sup>22</sup> As an individual that has worked for academic institutions, gambling-related non-profits, and government-owned operators, I have not observed any evidence that such complexity suits the interests of these groups or occurs through those proposed paths. The authors do not provide any evidence of this statement, so I am unable to further comment on the statement's validity.</u>
- 4.5 The authors state, "<u>Gambling also has behaviourally addictive properties that hijack our</u> <u>dopaminergic reward systems.</u>"<sup>23</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>20</sup> David C Hodgins, Jonathan N Stea and Jon E Grant, 'Gambling Disorders' (2011) 378(9806) *The Lancet* 1874; Marc N Potenza et al, 'Gambling Disorder' (2019) 5(1) *Nature Reviews Disease Primers* 51.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>21</sup> Page 9, lines 67-68.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>22</sup> Page 9, lines 68-71.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>23</sup> Page 9, line 78-79.

4.5.1 I am not qualified to make precise statements about the neuropathology of gambling addiction, but it is my opinion that the use of the term "hijack" misconstrues the actual relationship. For example, Prof. Marc Potenza is likely the leading authority on this gambling-related neuroscience and stated in a 2018 commentary: "<u>Roles for dopamine in [pathological gambling] have been proposed for years. However, data have largely not supported the hypotheses initially proposed, leading to questions about the centrality of dopamine to [pathological gambling]."<sup>24</sup></u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>24</sup> Potenza, Marc N. "Searching for replicable dopamine-related findings in gambling disorder." *Biological psychiatry* 83.12 (2018): 984-986.

- 5 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 4.1 and to the commentary by the authors regarding what they call the "informed choice" or "Reno model" in section 5.1, excluding comment on Crown's Responsible Gambling framework
- 5.1 In Section 4.1 of the Rockloff Report, the authors discuss "What regulatory or policy approaches are available to legislators and/or regulators to minimise gambling related harm, and what are the benefits and disadvantages of each such perspective or approach?"
- 5.2 It is my opinion that the authors take a narrow view of policy analysis when responding to this question, as they do not discuss: a) the role of societal context when evaluating potential approaches, and b) the opportunity to adopt a hybrid model that adapts the most appropriate policies from the Hing et al. (2020) report for a given society.<sup>25</sup>
- 5.2.1 The authors discuss their views of policymaking outcomes within a domain of gambling, but the authors fail to discuss that gambling policy must be evaluated in the context of broader public policy. It is my opinion that norms, values, and culture at a population level must, on some level, be considered in the context of gambling policy. For instance, most Western societies have adopted legal gambling for adults. Gambling policy must therefore begin with that context: How can legislators and/or regulators minimize gambling related harm, while understanding that adults are free to gamble if they wish? In many societies, the context will be different, but to make gambling policy decisions in isolation is inappropriate. For this same reason, interventions that may work in one culture may not work in another. For example, some Singaporean regulators believe that Singapore's family exclusion programs are helpful, but I expect a similar program would not be well tolerated in Nevada.
- 5.2.2 In most cases, a hybrid model to those described in the Hing et al. (2020) report may be more appropriate.<sup>26</sup> For instance, policymakers may recognize that emphasizing informed choice practices is important for active gamblers, but that a more public health-oriented strategy is appropriate to support prevention programs with young adults and treatment programs for individuals with gambling problems. Similarly, most societies have adopted a consumer protection model for individuals below a certain age (minors) that disallows them from gambling altogether.
- 5.3 The authors refer to the Reno Model as the "informed choice Reno Model" and that within this model, the gambling industry's main responsibility in the responsible service of gambling is to provide minimum core information for informed decision-making.
- 5.3.1 This is false. The Reno Model published in 2004 referred to the industry's duty of care,<sup>27</sup> stating: <u>"personal freedom balances against an institution's 'duty of care' as alluded to, for example, in the Australian Productivity Commission's (1999) report which suggests that government 'specify in statute a duty of care by gambling providers that they take all</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>25</sup> Nerilee Hing, Alexander Russell and Vijay Rawat, 'Responsible Conduct of Gambling Study'.
<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>27</sup> Alex Blaszczynski, Robert Ladouceur and Howard J Shaffer, 'A Science-Based Framework for Responsible Gambling: The Reno Model' (2004) 20(3) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 301 ('A Science-Based Framework for Responsible Gambling').

reasonable and practical steps to protect their customers from gambling problems' (pp. 16–45). The extent and nature of this responsibility is complex and uncertain since the limits and extent of duty of care held by the gambling industry to its patrons are yet to be clearly determined and articulated in law."<sup>28</sup> The Reno Model therefore recognizes that duty of care may extend beyond the provision of information, but is thoughtful, recognizing that the duty of care was not well defined.

- 5.3.2 The Reno Model further states, "<u>From the perspective of the gambling industry, the</u> primary objective of a coordinated responsible gambling strategy is to reduce the incidence of gambling-related harms at the individual, group, community and societal level."<sup>29</sup> The Reno Model recognizes that gamblers exist along a spectrum of risk, and that different stakeholders have varying responsibilities to mitigate gambling-related harms. The Reno Model identifies major stakeholder groups as consumers, gambling industry operators, health service and other welfare providers, interested community groups, and governments and their related agencies.
- 5.3.3 An update to the Reno Model<sup>30</sup> further states, "<u>There is a need to constantly re-</u> evaluate and improve responsible gambling programs as a result of ongoing outcome data monitoring. This is necessary to avoid the potential pitfalls of assuming that current programs are effective, resulting in the stagnation of improvement and, even worse, inadvertently encouraging harms."<sup>31</sup>
- 5.3.4 Based on my training and experience as an operator and researcher, it is my opinion that the best decisions about how much to gamble are made by well-informed individuals. It is self-evident that uninformed gamblers may not make good decisions about how much to gamble. But due to the substantial variation in individuals, environments, and circumstances, it is also clear to me that no centralized authority, including gambling operators, policymakers, or researchers, can make the best decisions for how much each individual should gamble either. The Reno Model therefore provides a useful framework for thinking about how each stakeholder can contribute to better outcomes for individuals and society more broadly, by determining how their policies and tactics can contribute to individuals making better decisions.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>28</sup> Ibid. Page 311, paragraph 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>29</sup> Ibid. Page 308, paragraph 3.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>30</sup> Ladouceur, R., Blaszczynski, A., Shaffer, H. J., & Fong, D. (2016). Extending the Reno model: responsible gambling evaluation guidelines for gambling operators, public policymakers, and regulators. *Gaming Law Review and Economics*, 20(7), 580-586.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>31</sup> Ibid. Page 581, paragraph 4.

- 6 Approaches proposed by Professor Rockloff as having most potential for preventing and reducing gambling harm associated with EGMs and being consistent with the public health approach: Pre-commitment (and the authors' further comments on this topic in answering question 4.2(f))
- 6.1 The authors state that pre-commitment is most effective at reducing harm if it mandatory for all gamblers at all venues with binding limits.
- 6.1.1 My opinion is that there is no evidence to suggest this is true. Much of the relevant insight about these systems does not exist in academic literature. I closely followed this space for many years as I evaluated one of the earliest pre-commitment systems, *MyPlay*, operated by the Nova Scotia Provincial Lotteries and Casino Corporation in Canada, and I led the design of the on-device budgeting system in British Columbia, Canada casinos. There are limited instances of pre-commitment systems being employed and there are no instructive studies of pre-commitment system outcomes.
- 6.1.2 The citations provided by the authors (Livingstone et al., 2019; Rintoul, 2017) do not provide evidence supporting the statements by the authors. For instance, Livingstone et al. (2019) concludes, "<u>A modest body of literature appraising the effectiveness of various aspects of pre-commitment programs now exists. However, this body of evidence is relatively diverse and of low to moderate quality... Overall, this review indicates that there is little evidence for the effectiveness of pre-commitment systems in their current forms, which are primarily voluntary and partial pre-commitment systems."<sup>32</sup> The Productivity Commission concluded that: "pre-commitment is a strong, practicable and ultimately cost-effective option for harm minimisation," but I failed to see evidence in their discussion of the topic that substantiated these claims.<sup>33,34</sup></u>
- 6.1.3 My opinion is that pre-commitment systems may be useful, but they require further innovation by gambling machine manufacturers to improve both the user interface and the user experience. Further, these systems must exist within a service management model that provides value to users, and the benefits may be quite small and concentrated within few users. I do not believe that mandatory pre-commitment systems are broadly effective as harm reduction tools in their current designs, but future designs may be helpful tools for some individuals. Any regulations directing the availability of pre-commitment systems should therefore allow sufficient freedom to management to optimize their design around specific goals. Regulations should also recognize supply chain constraints that exist because operators do not build gaming technology systems.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>32</sup> Charles Livingstone et al, *Identifying Effective Policy Interventions to Prevent Gambling-Related Harm* (Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation, 2019).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>33</sup> Gambling Inquiry Report Volume 1 (No 50, Productivity Commission, 26 February 2010).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>34</sup> Ibid. Chapter 10.

- 7 Approaches proposed by Professor Rockloff as having most potential for preventing and reducing gambling harm associated with EGMs and being consistent with the public health approach: Structural features of EGMs.
- 7.1 The authors state, "those characteristics that have been demonstrated to reduce harm include: the removal of jackpots and bonus games; removing sounds accompanying losses disguised as wins; reducing the maximum bet to \$1; the removal of note-acceptors; reducing the number of lines able to be played; provision of accurate game and price information to players; and adjustments to the distribution of symbols across EGM reels."<sup>35</sup>
- 7.2 I disagree with statement that these characteristics have been demonstrated to reduce harm. The section discussing "Structural features of EGMs" cites only Livingstone et al. (2019), but that report has unclear conclusions.<sup>36</sup>
- 7.2.1 For instance, Livingstone et al. stated the following on reduction of bet size: "<u>A well</u> <u>known study from 2001 (Blaszczynski, Sharpe, & Walker, 2001) reported that</u> <u>reduction of maximum bet size to one dollar on modified EGMs was effective in</u> <u>reducing expenditure by 'problem gamblers' whilst not being noticeable to 'non-</u> <u>problem gamblers'.</u>"
- 7.2.1.1 But the Blaszczynski, Sharpe, & Walker (2001) paper cited by Livingstone et al. (2019) offered more tentative conclusions, stating: "<u>Reducing the maximum bet size did not appear to lead to sessions being prolonged. However, it is possible that this reflected a player's choice to use a different machine where the larger bet sizes were available or to substitute other forms of gambling. While there was no evidence in this study that reducing the maximum bet size would have any effect on persistence in play, only further research that investigated characteristics patterns of play in venue where all machines were modified would resolve this issue. This study provides preliminary evidence to support the effectiveness of reducing the maximum bet size from \$10 to \$1 on electronic gaming machines for at least a small proportion of players."
  </u>
- 7.2.1.2 This is an illustrative example of how relying on non-source material can lead to unreliable insight for policymaking. I also note that assuming that Blaszczynski, Sharpe, & Walker (2001) collected their data in 2000, inflation would place the \$1 per bet at roughly \$1.67 today.
- 7.2.2 Similar to many of these novel interventions, there is only limited evidence that the change will be useful in reducing harm and there is little understanding of potential unintended consequences that create harm. These interventions deserve further consideration and systematic experimentation, but it is not obvious that broad policy mandates would be helpful. In fact, they may be unhelpful if they unnecessarily constrain the scope of potential experimentation.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>35</sup> Page 20, lines 402-405.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>36</sup> Livingstone et al (n 32).

## 8 Professor Rockloff's answers in section 4.2 to whether the following measures are, or are likely to be, effective:

- 8.1 Question 4.2(a) Charging a fee to enter casinos
- 8.1.1 My opinion is that charging a fee to enter casinos is unlikely to be effective in materially reducing harms and is likely to skew the share of revenue from gamblers with problems. By charging a fee, only those individuals most insensitive to demand are likely to enter, which tends to overlap closely with individuals with more gambling problems (i.e. inability to reduce or withdraw).<sup>37</sup> That is, entry fees may be a deterrent to recreational gamblers but not a deterrent to gamblers with problems. Fees also may place gamblers in a perceived "loss state" from the outset of their visit, further increasing risk-taking and potentially increasing the financial harms from gambling.
- 8.2 Question 4.2(e) Low betting limits for individual EGM games (to the extent not already addressed in response to 4(b))
- 8.2.1 My opinion is that the impact of low betting limits for EGM games is unknown. As the authors articulate, the effort to reduce bet sizes is not static effect and must also consider dynamic impacts on the time spent betting. These impacts will further be differentiated among individuals. For example, it may be the case that gamblers at greater risk of harm will disproportionately extend their time spent betting relative to other gamblers. I agree with the authors that any effort to reduce bet sizes or theoretical losses should be evaluated over time.
- 8.3 Question 4.2(g) A low daily maximum spend of around \$40 per session/day
- 8.3.1 The suggestion of a daily maximum spend of \$40 per session/day limit appears to be an entirely arbitrary figure. I see no objective reason to suggest that such an intervention would be helpful. Further, it is my opinion that the systems and infrastructure that would be required to enforce such a limit would be better used in a responsible gambling strategy oriented more towards supporting better spending decisions by gamblers.
- 8.4 Question 4.2(i) Restrictions on the amount that can be won on EGM jackpots (to the extent not already addressed in response to 4(b)).
- 8.4.1 The authors recommended that EGMs could be modified such that gamblers would not be eligible for jackpots if they exceed an arbitrary time limit. Although I am in favor of strategies that incentivize players to gamble responsibly, I do not believe this is an appropriate tactic. This is an entirely novel intervention with only a limited theoretical basis in gambling and consumer theory. Further, the jackpot expiry recommendation is based on a small 130-person academic lab study written by two of the report authors and involving play on a laptop-simulated EGM. <sup>38</sup> I would appreciate seeing future academic studies validating the initial findings, but believe the intervention is inappropriate to suggest at the scale of a policy decision and may lead to unintended consequences.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>37</sup> Kahlil Philander, 'Entry Fees as a Responsible Gambling Tool: An Economic Analysis' (2017) 21(1) UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>38</sup> Matthew J Rockloff, Phillip Donaldson and Matthew Browne, 'Jackpot Expiry: An Experimental Investigation of a New EGM Player-Protection Feature' (2015) 31(4) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 1505.

# 9 Professor Rockloff's criticism of the members of the RGAP on the basis of their receipt of industry funding.

- 9.1 The authors question the legitimacy of the advisory services provided by members of the Crown Responsible Gambling Advisory (RGAP) panel because they received funding from the gambling industry for their research, noting: "Some members of the RGAP panel also have received other direct funding from the gambling industry for their research, and thus cannot be reasonably considered 'independent' providers of advice. This is not to impugn the integrity of these researchers, but only to recognise that people can be subtly and even unconsciously influenced by their financial self-interests."<sup>39</sup> I do not find this criticism credible.
- 9.1.1 It is my opinion that all members of the RGAP are well respected researchers with professional integrity. Each has published high quality research for decades. I find that they are transparent in their work with members of industry and go through great effort to ensure that their research processes and conclusions are unbiased.
- 9.1.2 All academics face a set of conflicts of interest, as career opportunities are related to the extent of an individual's influence, including work involving both industrial and non-industrial special interests. To focus solely on industry funding is deceptive and incomplete.
- 9.1.3 A recent study found that gambling research funded by industry is more likely to include conflict of interest statement and studies with disclosed funding sources were more likely than those with undisclosed funding sources to include a conflict of interest statement.<sup>40</sup>
- 9.1.4 The criticisms of the RGAP researchers are positioned in the context of wider dismissal of the Reno model by the authors. The Reno model is self-described as a position paper and therefore warrants evaluation based on the merit of the content of the ideas. It is not an empirical paper where the design or analysis can be framed to produce a result. To the extent that the ideas in the model may be fallible, they can be critiqued by the authors without ad hominem statements. A criticism of the individuals that designed the Reno model seems unproductive, without merit, and distracts from a focus on the ideas set out in the model. One of the Reno model authors, Howard Shaffer, formerly led the Division on Addiction at Harvard Medical School. The Division on Addiction was and continues to be a leading institution in designing processes and practices to prevent conflicts of interest in grant funded research.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>39</sup> Page 27, lines 701-703.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>40</sup> Paige M Shaffer et al, 'Gambling Research and Funding Biases' (2019) 35(3) Journal of Gambling Studies 875.

### References

Blaszczynski, Alex, Robert Ladouceur and Howard J Shaffer, 'A Science-Based Framework for Responsible Gambling: The Reno Model' (2004) 20(3) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 301

Bonn, Mark A and Julie Harrington, 'A Comparison of Three Economic Impact Models for Applied Hospitality and Tourism Research' (2008) 14(4) *Tourism Economics* 769

Browne, Matthew et al, 'A Framework for Indirect Elicitation of the Public Health Impact of Gambling Problems' (2020) 20(1) *BMC Public Health* 1717

Browne, Matthew et al, 'Assessing Gambling-Related Harm in Victoria: A Public Health Perspective' <a href="https://prism.ucalgary.ca/handle/1880/51519">https://prism.ucalgary.ca/handle/1880/51519</a>

Browne, Matthew et al, 'Fourth Social and Economic Impact Study of Gambling in Tasmania (2017): Report to Tasmanian Government Department of Treasury and Finance, Volume 1: Industry Trends and Impacts'

Browne, Matthew and Matthew J Rockloff, 'Prevalence of Gambling-Related Harm Provides Evidence for the Prevention Paradox' (2018) 7(2) *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 410

Browne, Matthew and Matthew J Rockloff, 'The Dangers of Conflating Gambling-Related Harm with Disordered Gambling: Commentary on: Prevention Paradox Logic and Problem Gambling (Delfabbro & King, 2017)' (2017) 6(3) *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 317

Cohen, Peter et al, *Using Big Data to Estimate Consumer Surplus: The Case of Uber* (National Bureau of Economic Research, 2016)

Delfabbro, Paul, Neophytos Georgiou and Daniel L King, 'Measuring Gambling Harm: The Influence of Response Scaling on Estimates and the Distribution of Harm Across PGSI Categories' (2021) 37(2) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 583

Delfabbro, Paul and Daniel King, 'Prevention Paradox Logic and Problem Gambling: Does Low-Risk Gambling Impose a Greater Burden of Harm than High-Risk Gambling?' (2017) 6(2) *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* 163

Delfabbro, Paul and Daniel L King, 'Challenges in the Conceptualisation and Measurement of Gambling-Related Harm' (2019) 35(3) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 743

Ferris, Jacqueline Ann and Harold James Wynne, *The Canadian Problem Gambling Index* (Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse Ottawa, ON, 2001)

Fong, Davis KC, Hoc Nang Fong and Shao Zhi Li, 'The Social Cost of Gambling in Macao: Before and after the Liberalisation of the Gaming Industry' (2011) 11(1) *International Gambling Studies* 43

Gambling Inquiry Report Volume 1 (No 50, Productivity Commission, 26 February 2010)

Grinols, Earl L and David B Mustard, 'Business Profitability versus Social Profitability: Evaluating Industries with Externalities, the Case of Casinos' (2001) 22(1–3) *Managerial and Decision Economics* 143

Hing, Nerilee, Alexander Russell and Vijay Rawat, 'Responsible Conduct of Gambling Study'

Hodgins, David C, Jonathan N Stea and Jon E Grant, 'Gambling Disorders' (2011) 378(9806) The Lancet 1874

Langham, Erika et al, 'Understanding Gambling Related Harm: A Proposed Definition, Conceptual Framework, and Taxonomy of Harms' (2015) 16(1) *BMC Public Health* 80

Livingstone, Charles et al, *Identifying Effective Policy Interventions to Prevent Gambling-Related Harm* (Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation, 2019)

Philander, Kahlil, 'Entry Fees as a Responsible Gambling Tool: An Economic Analysis' (2017) 21(1) UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal 4

Potenza, Marc N et al, 'Gambling Disorder' (2019) 5(1) Nature Reviews Disease Primers 51

Rockloff, Matthew J, Phillip Donaldson and Matthew Browne, 'Jackpot Expiry: An Experimental Investigation of a New EGM Player-Protection Feature' (2015) 31(4) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 1505

Shaffer, Paige M et al, 'Gambling Research and Funding Biases' (2019) 35(3) *Journal of Gambling Studies* 875

Walker, Douglas M, 'Problems in Quantifying the Social Costs and Benefits of Gambling' (2007) 66(3) *american Journal of economics and sociology* 609

CRW.998.002.1232

Page 21

Addendum A – Letter of Instructions

CRW.998.002.1233

Allens 101 Collins Street Melbourne VIC 3000 Australia

GPO Box 1776 Melbourne VIC 3001 Australia

T +61 3 9614 1011 F +61 3 9614 4661 www.allens.com.au

ABN 47 702 595 758

## Allens > < Linklaters

8 November 2021

Dr Kahlil Philander PhD 8825 34<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, L-466 Tulalip, WA, USA 98271

kahlil.philander@wsu.edu

By email

## Confidential and Subject to Legal Professional Privilege

Dear Dr Philander

## Crown Resorts Limited – Independent Expert Evidence for the Perth Casino Royal Commission – Letter of Instruction

As you know, we act for Crown Resorts Limited (*Crown*) in the Royal Commission into Crown Perth's suitability to hold its Perth casino licence, as well as the suitability of its associates, including Burswood Resort (Management) Limited and Burswood Limited, established by letters patent issued in Western Australian Government Gazette No. 45, Friday 12 March 2021, as amended from time to time (*PCRC*).

The purpose of this letter is to instruct you to prepare a written report that addresses certain aspects of the report prepared by Professor Matthew Rockloff and others entitled '*Gambling Harm and Harm Minimisation in Western Australia*' dated October 2021 (the **Rockloff Report**). Your report is required to be produced to the PCRC on 10 November 2021.

## A. Your report

Your report should contain your observations on the following parts of the Rockloff Report:

- 1 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.1 and to the commentary by the authors on the same topic on page 27 in section 5.1;
- 2 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 2.2;
- 3 Professor Rockloff's answer to question 4.1 and to the commentary by the authors regarding what they call the "informed choice" or "Reno model" in section 5.1 (you will not be required to comment on Crown's RG framework);
- 4 The following of the approaches proposed by Professor Rockloff as having most potential for preventing and reducing gambling harm associated with EGMs and being consistent with the public health approach:
  - (a) Pre-commitment (and the authors' further comments on this topic in answering question 4.2(f)); and
  - (b) Structural features of EGMs.

Our Ref CTKS:VUES:120998061 LBCM 517212770v2 120998061 8.11.2021

Allens is an independent partnership operating in alliance with Linklaters LLP.

## Dr Kahlil Philander PhD

## Allens > < Linklaters

- 5 Professor Rockloff's answers in section 4.2 to whether the following measures are, or are likely to be, effective:
  - (a) Question 4.2(a) Charging a fee to enter casinos
  - (b) Question 4.2(e) Low betting limits for individual EGM games (to the extent not already addressed in response to 4(b))
  - (c) Question 4.2(g) A low daily maximum spend of around \$40 per session/day
  - (d) Question 4.2(i) Restrictions on the amount that can be won on EGM jackpots (to the extent not already addressed in response to 4(b)).
- 6 Professor Rockloff's criticism of the members of the RGAP on the basis of their receipt of industry funding.

### B. Guidelines for the preparation of your report

**Annexed** to this letter is a copy of the Federal Court of Australia Practice Note GPN-EXPT – Expert Witnesses in Proceedings in the Federal Court of Australia (the *Practice Note*).

Although the Practice Note is directed towards proceedings before the Federal Court of Australia, the Practice Note contains guidelines regarding the standard and form of expert evidence generally required in Australian proceedings, including Royal Commissions. Relevantly, the Guidelines prescribe that (amended in the context of the PCRC):

- (a) as an independent expert, you have an overriding duty to assist the PCRC on matters relevant to your area of expertise. This means that your paramount duty is to the PCRC not to our client even though our client is retaining you; and
- (b) an independent expert is not an advocate for a party. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the evidence you provide is honest, impartial, objective and independent.

Your report should also contain:

- (a) an acknowledgement at the beginning of the report that you had read, understood and complied with the Practice Note;
- (b) details of your qualifications and practical experience in your area of expertise (e.g. by annexing a copy of your CV);
- (c) a statement of the questions that you have been asked to address;
- (d) the factual premises upon which your report proceeds;
- (e) any assumptions you have made for the purposes of your report; and
- (f) a list of the documents and other materials that you have been asked to consider.

You must inform us if any particular question or issue you are asked to address in your report falls outside your relevant field of expertise.

If your opinion is not fully researched because you consider that insufficient data is available or for any other reason, this should be stated with an indication that the opinion is no more than a provisional one. Further, if you believe that your report may be incomplete or inaccurate without some qualification, that qualification should be stated in your report.

The Practice Note also requires, and we request that you include, the following declaration at the end of your report, which we have modified to the context of the PCRC:

'I have made all the inquiries that I believe are desirable and appropriate and that no matters of significance that I regard as relevant have, to my knowledge, been withheld from the PCRC.'

Dr Kahlil Philander PhD

## Allens > < Linklaters

We look forward to working with you.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Maher

Partner Allens Andrew.Maher@allens.com.au T +61 3 9613 8022

CRW.998.002.1236

Addendum B – Curriculum Vitae

KAHLIL S. PHILANDER

915 N. Broadway Everett, WA, USA 98201 Mobile: (702) 722-7342 Office: (425) 405-1659 E-mail: kahlil.philander@wsu.edu

EDUCATION

Ph.D.	University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 2012 Hospitality Administration <i>Dissertation title</i> : The Impact of Casino Tax Policy on Short- Run Gaming Development <i>Committee</i> : Bo J. Bernhard (Chair), William R. Eadington, Ashok K. Singh, and Bradley S. Wimmer.
M.A.	University of Toronto, 2007 Economics
B.Com (Honors)	<b>University of British Columbia</b> , 2005 Double Specialization: Finance   Commerce & Economics

## ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

<ul> <li>Washington State University, Everett/Pullman, WA</li> <li>Assistant Professor (tenure-track), Carson College of Business</li> <li>Faculty in the School of Hospitality Business Administration.</li> </ul>	2017-
<ul> <li>University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW, Australia</li> <li>Honorary Lecturer, School of Psychology</li> <li>Honorary position in the Gambling Treatment and Research Clinic at the Bra Centre.</li> </ul>	2018- ain and Mind
<ul> <li>University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV</li> <li>Assistant Professor (tenure-track), College of Hotel Administration</li> <li>Director of Research, International Gaming Institute <ul> <li>Faculty in the William F. Harrah College of Hotel Administration.</li> <li>Responsible for sponsored research programs and development in the International Gaming Institute.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2014-2015 2013-2015 ational
Visiting Assistant Professor, College of Hotel Administration Graduate Assistant & Adjunct Faculty	2013-2014 2009-2012
<ul> <li>Responsible Gambling Council of Canada, Toronto, ON 2012-2013</li> <li>Senior Policy Researcher</li> <li>Policy/education research related to problem gambling prevention and awareness.</li> <li>Research included program evaluation/development, experimental design, knowledge translation, data mining, conjoint analysis, and econometric analysis.</li> </ul>	
<ul> <li>University of Toronto, Toronto, ON</li> <li>Graduate Assistant <ul> <li>Teaching assistant for faculty in the Department of Economics, including indorganization and macroeconomics.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	2006-2007 lustrial

## INDUSTRY EXPERIENCE

## Conscious Gaming (Non-Profit), Vancouver, BC

Advisory Board Member

2020-

2015-2017

 Advised on product design and go-to-market strategy for the PlayPause self-exclusion system.

## BCLC, Vancouver, BC

Director of Social Responsibility

- Led a team of ~50 full-time equivalent employees and contractors responsible for executing and evaluating social responsibility strategies at the crown corporation responsible for conducting and managing casino, lottery, and online gambling in British Columbia.
- Senior leader responsible for stakeholder engagement with academic community, public health officials, and various industry groups. Oversaw multi-jurisdictional GameSense responsible gambling program.
- Host of annual New Horizons in Responsible Gambling conference for ~300 researchers, regulators, and business operators from seven countries.
- Received the National Council on Problem Gambling Corporate Social Responsibility . Award.

Intervistas Consulting (Subsidiary of Royal HaskoningDHV), Vancouver, BC Senior Analyst, Economics and Policy 2007-2009 2005-2006

Research Analyst, Economics and Policy

- Economic, operational, and policy analysis related to the tourism and transportation fields.
- Projects included price regulation analysis, econometric analysis, economic forecasting, expert witness support, cost/benefit analysis, and strategic planning.

## **AWARDS & HONORS**

Research of the Year Award (2021) – National Council on Problem Gambling: "An examination of the validity and reliability of the Positive Play Scale: findings from a Canadian national study" with Nassim Tabri, Richard Wood, and Michael Wohl.

Non-Resident Research Fellowship (2018) – International Center for Gaming Regulation

- Academic Council Member (2017-) International Center for Gaming Regulation
- Advisory Board Member (2016-2017) National Low-Risk Gambling Guidelines Advisory Committee, Canadian Centre for Substance Abuse.
- Advisory Board Member (2015-2017) Centre for Gambling Research, University of British Columbia.
- Research of the Year Award (2015) National Council on Problem Gambling: "Online Gambling Participation and Problem Gambling Severity: Is there a Causal Relationship?" with Terri-Lynn MacKay.

**40 Under 40** (2015) – Global Gaming Business Magazine. Available at: http://ggbmagazine.com/issue/vol-14-no-11-november-2015/article/40-under-40standing-up-for-gaming

## PUBLICATIONS (PEER REVIEWED)

- Tabri, N., **Philander, K.S.**, Wood, R. T., Wohl, M. J. (in-press). Temporal measurement invariance of the financially focused self-concept construct. *Journal of Gambling Issues*.
- Edson, T., Tom, **Philander, K. S.,** Louderback, E., LaPlante, D. (2021). A large-scale prospective study of big wins and their relationship with future financial and time involvement in actual Daily Fantasy Sports contests. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*.
- Gainsbury, S. M., Philander, K.S., Grattan, G. (2020). Predicting Intention to Play Random and Skill-based Electronic Gambling Machines Using the Theory of Reasoned Action. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 36(4), 1267-1282. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10899-019-09915-3
- Philander, K.S, Gainsbury, S. M. (2020). Overconfidence in understanding of how electronic gaming machines work is related to positive attitudes. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 3820. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.609731.
- Gainsbury, S. M., Philander, K.S., Blaszczynski, A. (2020). A qualitative study of participant experience with skill gaming machines in comparison to electronic gaming machines. *International Gambling Studies*, 20(3), 452-465. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2020.1789890.
- Gainsbury, S. M., Philander, K.S., Grattan, G. (2020). Skill gambling machines and electronic gaming machines: participation, erroneous beliefs, and understanding of outcomes. *International Gambling Studies*, 20(3), 500-514. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2020.1828991.
- Pickering, D., Philander, K.S., Gainsbury, S. M. (2020). Skill-Based Electronic Gaming Machines: a Review of Product Structures, Risks of Harm, and Policy Issues. *Current Addiction Reports*, 7(2), 229-236. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s40429-020-00309-9.
- Tabri, N., Wood, R. T., Philander, K.S., Wohl, M. J. (2020). An examination of the validity and reliability of the Positive Play Scale: findings from a Canadian national study. *International Gambling Studies*, 20(2), 282-295. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2020.1732442.
- Gainsbury, S. M., **Philander**, **K.S.**, & Grattan, G. (2019). Predicting intention to play random and skill-based electronic gambling machines using the Theory of Reasoned Action. *Journal of Gambling Studies*.
- Philander, K.S., Gainsbury, S. M., & Grattan, G. (2019). An Assessment of the Validity of the Gamblers Belief Questionnaire. *Addictive Behaviors*, 97, 104-110
- **Philander, K.S.** (2019) Regional impacts of casino availability on gambling problems: Evidence from the Canadian Community Health Survey. *Tourism Management*, *71*, 173-178.

- Gainsbury, S. M., Abarbanel, B. L., **Philander**, **K.S.**, & Butler, J. V. (2018). Strategies to customize responsible gambling messages: a review and focus group study. *BMC public health*, *18*(1), 1381.
- Abarbanel, B., Cain, L., **Philander, K.S.** (2018). Influence of perceptual factors of a responsible gambling program on customer satisfaction with a gambling firm. *Economics and Business Letters*, 7(4), 144-155.
- Tabri, N., Wohl, M., Wood, R., Philander, K.S. (2018) Financially Focused Self-Concept is Associated with Etiological and Maintenance Factors of Disordered Gambling Among Non-Problem Gamblers. *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 39, 308-313.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2017). Entry Fees as a Responsible Gambling Tool: An Economic Analysis. *Gaming Research and Review Journal, 21*(1), 43-48.
- Wood, R. T. A., Wohl, M. J. A., Tabri, N., & Philander, K.P. (2017). Measuring Responsible Gambling amongst Players: Development of the Positive Play Scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 227. http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00227
- Philander, K.S., Zhong, Y.Y. (2016). Twitter sentiment analysis: Capturing sentiment from integrated resort tweets. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 55, 16-24.
- Philander, K.S., Bernhard, B., Wimmer, B., Singh, A.K., Eadington, W.R. (2015). U.S. Casino Revenue Taxes and Short-Run Labor Outcomes. *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 37(1), 35-46.
- Philander, K.S., Abarbanel, B. L., & Repetti, T. (2015). Consumer spending in the gaming industry: evidence of complementary demand in casino and online venues. *International Gambling Studies*, 15(2), 256-272.
- Philander, K.S., Raab, C., Berezan, O. (2015). Understanding Discount Program Risk in Hospitality: A Monte Carlo Approach. *Journal of Hospitality Marketing & Management*, 25(2), 218-237.
- Philander, K.S. and Abarbanel, B.L.L. (2014). Determinants of Internet Poker Adoption. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 30(3), 609-623.
- Philander, K.S. and MacKay, T.L. (2014). Online Gambling Participation and Problem Gambling Severity: Is there a Causal Relationship?. *International Gambling Studies*, 14(2), 214-227.
  \*Winner of the 'Research of the Year' award from the National Council on Problem Gambling.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2014). Identifying High Risk Online Gamblers: A Data Mining Approach. *International Gambling Studies, 14*(1), 53-63.
- Philander, K.S. (2014). Specific or Ad Valorem? A Theory of Casino Taxation. *Tourism Economics*, 20(1), 107-122.
- Philander, K.S., and Roe, S. J. (2013). The impact of wage rate growth on tourism competitiveness. *Tourism Economics*, 19(4), 823-834.

- **Philander, K. S.** (2013). A Normative Analysis of Gambling Tax Policy. UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal, 17(2), 17-26.
- **Philander, K.S.** and Walker, D.M. (2012). William R. Eadington and the Economics of Gambling. *UNLV Gaming Research and Review Journal*, 16(2). 9-18.
- Philander, K.S. and Fiedler I. (2012). Online Poker in North America: Empirical Evidence on its Complementary Effect on the Offline Gambling Market. *Gaming Law Review and Economics*, 16(7/8).
- Philander, K.S. (2011). The Effect of Online Gaming on Commercial Casino Revenue. UNLV Gaming Research and Review Journal, 15(2), 23-34.

### BOOKS AND CHAPTERS

- Philander, K.S. (2014). A normative analysis of gambling tax policy. In A.Cabot & N. Pindell (Eds.), Regulating Land-Based Casinos. Las Vegas: UNLV Gaming Press (ISBN 978-1-939546-07-4).
- Fiedler, I. & **Philander, K.S.** (2013). US Online Poker Report: An Academicon Market Analysis and Forecast. Hamburg: Germany (ISBN 978-3-00-042514-1).

## EDITORIAL ACTIVITY

Editorial board: International Gambling Studies (2013-present)

**Editorial board:** The Brief Addiction Science Information Source (BASIS), Division on Addiction, Cambridge Health Alliance, a Harvard Medical School teaching hospital (2016-2022)

Editorial board: UNLV Gaming Research & Review Journal (2016-present)

Referee: Current Issues in Tourism (2019-)

Referee: Journal of Gambling Studies (2013-2019)

Referee: Journal of Behavioral Addictions (2019)

**Referee:** Tourism Management (2019)

Referee: Annals of Tourism Research (2018)

Referee: International Journal of Hospitality Management (2017)

Referee: International Center for Gaming Regulation Grant Program (2016)

Referee: Social Problems (2016)

**Referee:** Addictive Behaviors (2015)

Referee: Policy & Internet (2015)

Referee: Sage Open (2015)

**Referee:** Manitoba Gambling Research Program (2013, 2014)

## TEACHING

Washington State University; Everett, WA; Pullman, WA; Tri-Cities, WA

**Primary Instructor**: Special Topics: Quantitative Decision Making in Gaming (HBM 497)

Focusing on business problems in gaming management and application of quantitative methods to deliver organizational insight.

**Primary Instructor**: Special Topics: Introduction to Casinos (HBM 496)

Introduction to casino management, including gaming operations, contributing departments in a large casino resort, community issues, and demographic issues.

**Primary Instructor**: Hospitality Leadership and Organizational Behavior (HBM 381) Focusing on interpersonal skills and group dynamics; covers key hospitality leadership and management issues.

Primary Instructor: Hospitality Systems (HBM 280)

Management functions relating to the planning and operation of various lodging, food, and beverage businesses.

University of Nevada, Las Vegas; Las Vegas, NV

Primary Instructor: Strategic Management in Hospitality (HMD 454)

Students acquire in-depth knowledge of strategic management concepts and techniques and develop strategies that enable companies to build and maintain a competitive advantage in a rapidly changing business environment.

Primary Instructor: Hospitality Financial Management (TCA 420)

Introduces students to the financial management function in the hospitality organization. Focuses on the process of value creation. Other topics include financial markets, valuation criteria and feasibility and appraisal.

**Primary Instructor (Ph.D. student instructor)**: Management of Service Delivery Systems (HMD 453)

Evaluation, design, and management of service delivery systems through operations management topics from a service perspective. Included are other related topics such as customer satisfaction and managing organizational change.

**Executive Education**: The Economics of the Modern Integrated Resort: Maximizing Economic Benefits

A series of economic case studies of jurisdictions that have introduced integrated resorts. In particular, this included case studies in both North America and Asia, with a focus on recently-legalized jurisdictions that have explored issues similar to those currently debated in the Cambodian context. Conclusions outlined "best practices" and lessons learned from these illustrations, focusing on how these lessons apply to Cambodia.

**Executive Education**: Corporate Social Responsibility and Community Relations in the Canadian Gaming Industry

Research on the unique socio-cultural and economic environment associated with the Canadian gaming industry. Issues such as problem gambling are of paramount importance in Canadian and First Nations environments, and Dr. Philander draws upon his experience being asked to testify and opine upon these matters in Canadian settings.

**Graduate Student Independent Studies**: Daniel Michalski (Online Affiliate Marketing in Gaming)

University of Toronto; Toronto, ON

Teaching Assistant: Industrial Organization (ECO 310)

A study of how firms compete and structure of markets. Emphasize oligopoly markets and use of game theory. In addition to theory, study empirical industrial organization including estimation of demand. Applications to competition policy with a focus on evaluating antitrust implications of horizontal mergers.

Teaching Assistant: Introductory Economics (ECO 100)

An introduction to economic analysis and its applications: price determination; the role of competition; international trade and finance; the theory of production and employment; the role of money and the banking system; monetary and fiscal policy.

#### INVITED PRESENTATIONS

- **Philander, K. S.** (2020). *The Rise of Online Gaming and the Future*. Japan IR Forum Online. Oral Presentation.
- Philander, K. S. (2020). Future-Proofing the Industry: Organizational Culture and Responsible Gambling. BCLC New Horizons in Responsible Gambling Conference. Oral Presentation.
- Philander, K. S. (2020). Future-Proofing the Industry: Organizational Culture and Responsible Gambling. BCLC New Horizons in Responsible Gambling Conference. Oral Presentation.
- Philander, K., Feldman, A, Jones, C., Whelan, J., Doura, B., Sanna, R. (2020). Special Presentation Unifying Stakeholders to Drive Responsible Gambling Effectiveness. *National Council of Legislators from Gaming States*. San Diego, CA, (2020).
- **Philander, K.S.** (2019). Why should you care about integrated resorts? *Northeast Asia Association Economic Form*. Incheon, Korea. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. & Gainsbury, S.M. (2019). Cognitive Distortions in Gambling Consumption: Implications for Policy and Practice. University of British Columbia Center for Gambling Research. Vancouver, BC, Canada. Seminar presentation.
- Philander, K.S. (2019). Adaptation and Exposure: Exploring Paradoxical Findings in General Population Studies. *International Conference on Gambling and Risk Taking*. Las Vegas, NV. Oral presentation.

- Philander, K.S., Cox, L.M., Duffy, J., Jones, C. (2019). Leading the Way: The Next Generation of Responsible Gambling Measures. *International Association of Gaming Advisors Summit.* San Francisco, CA. Panel.
- Krafcik, C., Gouker, D., Philander, K.S., Davis, E., Jones, M. (2019). Taxation, Consumer Protection, & Sports Integrity: Why States Should Legislate. *Betting on Sports America*. Meadowlands, NJ. Panel.
- Black, R., Dean, S. **Philander, K.S.** (2019). Sports Betting Media is Changing Society: Are We Ready? *Discovery 2019*. Toronto, ON, Canada. Panel.
- Philander, K.S. (2019). Buy, Sell, Hold: Where to Invest Your Research Dollars. *New Horizons in Responsible Gambling Conference*. Vancouver, BC, Canada. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. & Gainsbury, S.M. (2018). Cognitive Distortions in Gambling Consumption: Implications for Policy and Practice. *Division on Addictions, Cambridge Health Alliance a Harvard Medical School Teaching Hospital*. Cambridge, MA. Seminar presentation.
- Philander, K.S. (2018). Educational Needs of Responsible Gambling Specialists. Four Directions Problem Gambling and Health Awareness Conference. Shelton, WA. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. (2018). Living Las Vegas: Lessons for Other States from the Capital of Sports Betting. National Council for Problem Gambling. Cleveland, OH. Oral presentation.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2018). Self-Exclusion: Building a Better System. *National Council for Problem Gambling*. Cleveland, OH. Oral presentation.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2018). Adaptation/Exposure: Will Legalization Increase Gambling Problems? Cleveland, OH. Panel.
- Philander, K.S. (2018). The Economics of Taxation in Sports Betting. National Conference of State Legislators. Alpine Village, NV. Panel.
- **Philander, K.S.**, Roberts, J. (2018). Regulatory Impacts from Gambling Tax Rates. *Global Gaming Expo (G2E) Asia*. Macau, SAR, China. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S., Cantwell, R., Madureira, O. (2018). Responsible Gaming Casino Entry Levies: A Deeper Analysis. *Global Gaming Expo (G2E) Asia*. Macau, SAR, China. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S., Antunes, I., Madureira, O., Bufalino, J. (2018). Gambling Controls on Local Residents – What's the Best Approach?. *International Association of Gaming Advisors Summit*. Macau, SAR, China. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. (2017). Economic Impacts of Integrated Resorts in Japan. U.S. Japan Business Council Integrated Resorts. Roppongi, Tokyo, Japan.

- Philander, K.S., Briggs, D. (2017). Leagues and Legalized Sports Betting: What's Next?. National Council on Problem Gambling 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Sports Betting Summit. Portland, OR, USA.
- **Philander, K.S.**, Grinbalt, N., Miller, T., Martino, S., Stuhrenberg, H. (2017). Responsible Gaming Initiatives and Issues Around the World. *International Association of Gaming Advisors Summit*. New York, NY, USA.
- **Philander, K.S.** Sanna, R. (2017). The Latest in Responsible Gambling Research and the Debate Surrounding Research Funding: Part 1, Research Roundtable. *International Association of Gaming Advisors Summit*. New York, NY, USA.
- Philander, K.S. (2016). Economic Impacts of Regulation. *Gaming Law Conference: Regulating Land-Based Casinos*. Las Vegas, NV, USA.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2016). Keynote: What Really Matters for Players: Incentives, Designs & Sources. *30th National Conference on Problem Gambling*. Tarrytown, NY, USA.
- Feeney, D., Whyte, K., Bernhard, B., Philander, K.S., Potenza, M., Hynes, J. (2016). Closing Plenary Panel: Future of the Field. 30th National Conference on Problem Gambling. Tarrytown, NY, USA.
- Mlambo, B., Fong, D., Gainsbury, S., Waugh, D., Philander, K.S., Chueca Santa Maria, J.M. (2016). Lunch Keynote Panel: The Integrated Resort Today: Research, Government, and Policy Observations from Six Continents. 16th International Conference on Gambling & Risk Taking. Las Vegas, NV, USA.
- Wilsenach, A., Bernhard, B., LaPlante, D., Philander, K.S. (2016). Gaming Regulation: How Research and Academe Can Help. 16th International Conference on Gambling & Risk Taking. Las Vegas, NV, USA.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2016). Measures of Gambling Harm: Transparency and Accountability for Industry. *Alberta Gambling Research Institute Conference*. Banff, AB, Canada.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2015). Internet Gambling and Responsible Gambling. *NASPL/WLA Responsible Gambling Seminar*. Dallas, TX, USA.
- Philander, K.S. (2015). Measuring Impact. British Columbia Association for Charitable Gambling Symposium 2015. Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Philander, K.S. (2015). Targeting Special Populations for Responsible Gaming: Approaches and Outcomes. 16th Annual NCRG Conference on Gambling and Addiction. Las Vegas, NV, USA.
- Williams, J., Brear, P., Potts, L., **Philander, K.S.** (2015). Panel: What's the point of consumption? *IAGA International Gaming Summit*. Vancouver, BC, Canada.

- Bernhard, B., Pindell, N., **Philander, K.S.** (2015). Panel: UNLV and the International Gaming Institute. *IAGA International Gaming Summit*. Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2015). Responsible Gambling Research. *NASPL Professional Development Seminar*. Seattle, WA, USA.
- Becker, M. & **Philander, K.S.** (2015). The Importance of Responsible Gambling in Achieving a (Social) License to Operate. *NCRG @ IAGA*. Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Bernhard, B. & Philander, K.S. (2015). From Untegrated to Integrated to Outegrated: Gaming's Social Impacts in a Changing Business Model. *New Horizons Conference in Responsible Gambling*. Vancouver, BC, Canada. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. (2014). A Policy Perspective on Responsible Gambling. *Edgewater Casino Responsible Gambling Speaker Series*. Vancouver, BC, Canada.
- Philander, K.S. and MacKay, T.L.. (2013). Responsible iGaming: Signals and Noises. C5's 3rd Annual Forum on US Online Gaming Law. Las Vegas, NV, USA.
- Philander, K.S. and MacKay, T.L. (2013). iGaming Effects on Problem Gambling: When Correlation Does Not Imply Causation. *Canadian Gaming Summit*. Montreal, QC, Canada.
- Bernhard, B., Abarbanel B.L.L., and **Philander, K.S.** (2011). Global Problem Gambling Scan. *The 25<sup>th</sup> National Conference on Problem Gambling*, Boston, MA, USA.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2009). The Recession: How Deep? How Long? *HAC 13th Annual Convention and Trade Show*, Vancouver, BC, Canada.

#### **REFEREED CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS**

- Robinson, J., Philander, K.S., Stark, S. (2019) Recommendations for Responsible Gambling Manager Education. *International Conference on Gambling and Risk Taking*. Las Vegas, NV. Oral presentation.
- Gainsbury, S., **Philander, K.S.**, Grattan, G. (2019). Skill-based Gambling Machines: Consumer Attitudes and Capacity for Informed Choice. *International Conference on Gambling and Risk Taking*. Las Vegas, NV. Oral presentation.
- Wimmer, B., **Philander, K.S.** (2019). The Value of Regulation to Platform-based Businesses: Evidence from Online Poker Markets. *International Conference on Gambling and Risk Taking*. Las Vegas, NV. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. (2018). A needs assessment of responsible gambling professional training and education. 12th European Conference on Gambling Studies and Policy Issues. Valletta, Malta. Oral presentation.

- **Philander, K.S.** (2018). Measuring Responsible Gambling by Players: Development of the Positive Play Scale. *ICE Totally Gaming Research Exchange*. London, England. Oral presentation.
- Gainsbury, S., Abarbanel, B., Butler, J., Philander, K.S., Mkrtchyan, N. (2017). Customized Responsible Gambling Messaging as a Tool to Encourage Help-Seeking. 18<sup>th</sup> Annual National Centre for Responsible Gambling Conference on Gambling and Addiction. Las Vegas, NV. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S., Briggs, D., Asher, J., (2017). Sports Betting: Issues and Solutions. *Canadian Gaming Summit*. Vancouver, BC, Canada. Oral presentation.
- Dolinski, S., Harris, P., **Philander, K.S.** (2017). Gambling with GameSense. *Canadian Gaming Summit*. Vancouver, BC, Canada. Oral presentation.
- Bouchard, R., **Philander, K.S.** (2016) Supporting Gaming Workers: Programs and Outcomes. *30th National Conference on Problem Gambling*. Tarrytown, NY, USA. Oral presentation. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. & Gainbury, S. (2015). Customized Responsible Gambling Messaging: Design and Outcomes. *New Horizons Conference in Responsible Gambling*. Vancouver, BC, Canada. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S., Abarbanel, B.L.L., & Repetti, T. (2014). Online and Offline Gambling: Substitutionary, Complementary, or Unrelated Goods?. 10th European Conference on Gambling Studies and Policy Issues. Helsinki, Finland. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S., Repetti, T., & Abarbanel, B.L.L. (2014). The Relationship Between Online and Offline Gambling: Is the New Medium Cannibalizing the Old?. 2014 Annual ICHRIE Conference. San Diego, CA, USA. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S., Zhong, Y.Y. (2014). Social Media Sentiment Analysis as a Customer Satisfaction Measurement Tool. 2014 Annual ICHRIE Conference. San Diego, CA, USA. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. and MacKay, T.L. (2013). A Consistent Estimate of Online Gambling Participation Effects on Problem Gambling. *International Conference on Gambling and Risk-Taking*. Las Vegas, NV, USA. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. and Roe, S.J. (2011). The Impact of Wage Rate Growth on Tourism Competitiveness in Transitional Countries. 29th EuroCHRIE Annual Conference. Dubrovnik, Croatia. Oral presentation.
- MacKay, T.L., Hodgins, D., and **Philander, K.S.** (2011). Computer Game Involvement and Problem Gambling. *12<sup>th</sup> Annual NCRG Conference on Gambling and Addiction*. Las Vegas, NV, USA. Poster presentation.

- **Philander, K.S.** and Abarbanel, B.L.L. (2011). Determinants of Internet Gambling Policy Adoption. 2011 Annual ICHRIE Summer Conference. Denver, CO, USA. Oral presentation.
- **Philander, K.S.** (2011). The Effect of Online Gambling on Commercial Casino Revenue. 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Caesars Hospitality Research Summit. Las Vegas, NV, USA. Oral presentation.
- **Philander, K.S.** and Abarbanel, B.L.L. (2011). Determinants of Internet Gambling Policy. *Alberta Gaming Research Institute's 10<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference*. Banff, AB, Canada. Oral presentation.
- Philander, K.S. and Abarbanel, B.L.L. (2011). Identifying Online Professional Poker Players: A Revealed and Stated Analysis Approach. 16<sup>th</sup> Annual Graduate Student Research Conference in Hospitality and Tourism. Houston, TX, USA. Poster presentation.
- Repetti, T.A., Roe, S.J., and Philander, K.S. (2010). Impact of Complimentary Food and Beverage on Gratuity Percentages. 2011 Annual ICHRIE Summer Conference. San Juan, PR. Poster presentation.

## CONSULTING

- Economic modeling: Large (Fortune 500) and mid-sized gaming companies. National, state, and provincial governments.
- Responsible gambling: Large (Fortune 500 gaming companies. State and provincial governments.