

Advertising games of chance in adolescents and young adults in Spain

Abstract

Gambling advertising can influence attitudes and gaming behavior of adolescents and young adults (A&Y). *Objective:* to study the effect of advertising on the attitudes and gaming behavior of a sample of 2887 Spanish A&Y (12-22 years old), by means of a self-report assessment. *Results and discussion:* on average, participants show a weak effect of advertising, however there are great variations, estimating that 11% of A&Y acknowledge being influenced by advertising and 5% recognize being severely affected. Men see themselves more impacted than women, without age differences. Those who play videogames signal a stronger effect of this kind of advertising and although these differences are not substantial in effect size, they reach statistical significance in 12 of the 13 questions assessed. A&Y who showed higher scores indicating problematic use of videogames in the IDGS9-SF, are those who indicate a greater impact of advertising on their attitudes towards gaming, as well as on the way they play or on their intention to play. These results support the idea that videogames can, albeit modestly, predispose engagement in games of chance.

Introduction

Gambling companies invest important sums in advertising games of chance (GoC) and possible wins to encourage gaming. According to the Spanish General Board of Gambling Regulation (Dirección General de Ordenación del Juego, (DGOJ), 2019), 328 million euros were invested in advertising expenses for internet gambling in 2018, 48% more than in 2017. Moreover, the proceeds increased from 134 million euros in 2015, to 328 in 2018 (DGOJ, 2019).

Recently, an increase in the offer of GoC has been observed, with the emergence of new games (e.g. sports betting) or new formats (cards or slot machines on the internet), which intend to attract more A&Y, concurrently producing an increase in advertising, causing public concern.

It seems obvious that advertising improves knowledge of games (Pitt, Thomas, Bestman, Daube & Derevensky, 2017a), although once aware of them, whether a person gambles, depends on availability and on their opinion or attitudes towards gambling (Hanss, Mentzoni, Griffiths & Pallesen, 2015). Advertising increases participation in GoC; however, it is not clear whether it also facilitates the development of problematic gambling.

Bombarded with advertising of GoC, especially on television, on the internet and during sporting events, A&Y consider that an important part of it targets them, including those below the legal age to gamble (Gainsbury, King, Hing & Delfabbro, 2015). Thus, in the work of Derevensky, Sklar, Gupta & Messerlian (2010), 96% of Australian A&Y (12-19 years old) acknowledged having seen advertisements of GoC on television and 71% reported receiving spam emails advertising GoC. Although advertisements of GoC in Spain are restricted, there are significant “deviations”. For example, this type of advertising has restricted hours on television (22 pm to 6 am), which is not applied during sporting events, making it easier for minors to be exposed at almost any hour. Furthermore, gambling companies have restricted credits to play, although they can give vouchers or bonuses to start gambling, something that could push minors to gamble without having “liquidity”.

Advertisements intend to “normalize” GoC as a form of entertainment, presenting the activity as exciting, amusing, a shortcut to make money easily, portraying a life full of glamour, excitement and fantasy (Abarbanel, Gainsbury, King, Hing & Delfabbro, 2017; Derevensky et al., 2010). Although A&Y are aware of the effects of advertising, it is not clear whether they believe them to be negative. In a study by Djohari, Weston, Cassidy, Wemyss & Thomas, (2019), 62% of adolescents in their sample (8-16 years old) considered advertisements during sports events as an influential factor in the bets of A&Y, however, with dissimilar opinions; 31% reported having a negative opinion, 23% a positive vision and 18% were not sure. Nonetheless, in a study of problematic gamblers by Binde (2009), 25% reported that advertising did not have an impact on their problem, almost 50% reported a marginal effect and 20% a tangible impact.

Although the concern around the effect of advertising in facilitating gambling behavior is logical, especially in pathological gambling, it is difficult to establish its influence, perhaps because it is relatively weak (Binde, 2014) or due to the difficulty in identifying its indirect effects. Nonetheless, not all advertisements produced reach the person or impact them, as they could not be attended to or “received”. Research tools such as eye tracking procedure have been implemented to examine the advertisements that are “received”, finding that people only pay attention to approximately 10% of advertisements, or that children show gender differences, with boys attending to commercials three times more than girls (Sandberg, Gidlöf & Holmberg, 2011). However, the most used procedure to assess received advertising is “recall rate”, usually with the use of self-report measures (Deverensky et al., 2010; McMullan, Miller & Perrier, 2012). In general, results show that A&Y are familiar with the content of advertisements of GoC, in other words, they have been impacted. Thus, Djohari et al. (2019) found that 46% of adolescents and 71% of adults remembered at least one gambling brand, men remembered more brands than women and “superfans” remembered more than other adolescents. Nyemcsock et al. (2018) encountered that 73% of A&Y correctly identified betting brands associated with at least one advertisement and remembered more those promotions that helped them earn money.

A&Y are, in general, critical of the content of gambling advertisements, considering them biased and exaggerated, believing they push people to play through the use of psychological tricks, considering them misleading, etc. In a study by Hing, Vitartas, Lamont & Fink (2014), 42% of A&Y acknowledged seeing advertisements of GoC during sports events, although one third of the gambling advertisements were ignored, not understood or dismissed, which could be due to generally negative attitudes towards advertising, or to the disbelief that advertisements could influence their attitude or interests in gambling. However, an important minority (15%) of A&Y does not share this critical sense. Derevensky et al. (2010) encountered that being exposed to gambling advertisements was recalled to a greater extent by those individuals with higher vulnerability to play, with 57% of young people between 17 and 19 years old (79% men) classifying themselves as vulnerable, considering their behavior, attitudes and reactions to advertising.

Exposure to advertisements improves attitudes towards gambling, which consequently increases participation. Pitt, Thomas, Bestman, Daube & Derevensky (2017b) found that advertisements are the primary factor related with a positive attitude towards gambling in A&Y, generating a perception of playing as something easy, fun and with social status. Moreover, Djohari et al. (2019), and also Li et al. (2018), found that the association between sports and sports bets facilitates a positive attitude towards gambling and a greater desire of playing in the future. Hing et al. (2014) showed that, in a sample of adolescents (12-17 years old), more positive attitudes towards gambling commercials and sponsors were associated with greater participation in sports bets as well as in GoC without a specific relation with sports.

The association between exposure to advertising, intention and/or gambling behavior is broad and coincidental (Hayer, Kalke, Meyer & Brosowski, 2018). Pitt et al. (2017a) show advertising of sports betting is one of four factors that are most relevant in predicting intention to participate in those bets. Fried, Teichman & Rahav (2010), showed correlations between exposure to advertising and gambling behavior ($r = 0,28^{**}$), as well as pathological gambling ($r = 0,17^{**}$) in young people (16-19 years old). Clemens, Hanewinkel & Morgenstern (2017), carried out an investigation in a sample of A&Y (13-35 years old) and found a significant association between exposure to advertising and present gambling behavior, as well as after 12 months. Those older than 18 years old were found to have greater probability of developing problematic gambling behavior. McMullan et al., (2012) found A&Y (13-18 years old) with high exposure to advertising of GoC started taking part in these games as they grew older, even before reaching the legal age to be able to gamble. The memory of being exposed to advertising appears to be a significant predictive factor of attitude towards gambling, of gambling behavior and possibly of pathological gambling in A&Y.

Traditionally, a certain association has been found between videogame gaming (VGG) and taking part in GoC, for which it is assumed that both types of players share certain characteristics, such as mental health issues and substance abuse, or executive function deficits (Sanders & Williams, 2019). This has brought to the consideration that VGG might facilitate the step towards GoC and

also pathological gambling. However, research findings have been contradictory. Some point to a scarce or null relation between VGG and increased probability of gambling or pathological gambling (Forrest, King & Delfabbro, 2016), other point that people addicted to VGG have higher probability of gambling than those who are not addicted (McBride & Derevensky, 2016; Sanders & Williams, 2019), concluding that VGG predisposes, although moderately, to the implication in GoC. Consequently, it is foreseeable that advertising of GoC would affect more specifically those A&Y with greater participation in VGG, although with a moderate difference. Furthermore, Derevensky et al. (2010) found that exposure to advertising in A&Y (12-19 years old) was the main predictor of progressing to GoC. In addition, a high proportion of A&Y, especially those who had gaming issues, pointed out that messages in advertisements pushed them to play.

Exposure to advertising has been indicated as the main predictor of gambling with real money, in addition to its importance as trigger of problematic behavior in GoC and/or obstacle in inhibiting such behavior (Hayer et al., 2018). Monaghan, Derevensky & Sklar (2008) found 42% of young people inform that advertising of GoC makes them want to try the game and 61% imagine or dream of what they could buy with the winnings. In fact, despite the legal restrictions, many minors admit to having gambled, and even, having had gambling problems. In Spain, where gambling is illegal for underage youngsters, in 2018, 10.3% of A&Y (14-18 years old) acknowledged having gambled online, and 22.7% in person (between 18.6% and 25.6%, according to age group) (ESTUDES, 2019).

In summary, it appears that a positive association exists between attitudes towards GoC and intention to gamble or gambling behavior. Furthermore, advertising could have the power to modify these attitudes in A&Y, although there is a lack of investigations in this respect in Spain. Thus, the aim of the current study is to research the effect of advertising of GoC in A&Y in Madrid (Spain), drawing from their opinions and recall of being exposed to it. It is expected that advertisements of GoC will show an association with; a) improvements in attitude towards GoC; b) increase in intention to gamble or gambling behavior in A&Y; c) this will be found to a greater extent in men and minors; d) more in the case of problematic gaming or greater implication in VGG.

Methods

Participants

The sample was selected using stratified random sampling in schools in the city of Madrid. Data on the student population for the city's 21 districts – age, school year and type of schooling (public school, private school and state subsidized school) – was retrieved from the website of the regional government's statistics service. Subsequently, a stratified representative sample was derived, matching the distribution of students by districts, type of school, and school year. The final sample analyzed in this study comprised 2887 students from 38 schools in the city of Madrid, with an average age of 15.35 years (SD = 2.69), ranging between 12 and 22 years, of which, just over half were males.

Design

Transversal epidemiological study with a representative sample of Madrid.

Variables and Instruments

This study is part of a larger project with the objective of identifying problematic VGG behavior in A&Y adults (Labrador et al., 2019). The data was collected by means of an online instrument, which was used to assess the variables of interest in the current study, described as follows;

Sociodemographic variables: evaluated through a survey. In this study, gender, age, and videogame usage were considered.

Problematic video game use: assessed using the IGDS9-SF. This is a brief, nine-item instrument that covers the nine diagnostic criteria of Internet Gaming Disorder (IGD), according to the DSM-5, developed by Pontes and Griffiths (2015). This instrument, originally found in English, has been translated and validated in more than ten languages, including Spanish (Sánchez-Iglesias et al., 2020). The purpose of the instrument is to assess the severity of Internet Gaming Disorder (IGD) and its harmful effects, evaluating online and offline gaming activities carried out during the last 12 months. Responses for each item are given on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Never; 2 = Hardly

ever; 3 = Sometimes; 4 = Often; 5 = Very Often). The instrument's scores range between 9 and 45; higher scores indicate the presence of more problematic gaming behavior. Cronbach's alpha for this instrument was .80.

Attitudes and Opinions about gambling advertising. The evaluation was carried out with 11 questions as part of the survey, in which participants rated their agreement with each statement on a 5-point Likert type scale: 1 (*strongly disagree*); 2 (*disagree*); 3 (*neither agree nor disagree*); 4 (*agree*); 5 (*strongly agree*) (See Table 1).

Memory of Gambling Advertising. Two questions were asked, surveying the number of celebrities, or advertising messages that participants remembered from gambling advertisements.

Procedure

Five independent evaluators with clinical psychology degrees were trained to administer the assessment instrument. Data on the student population for the 21 districts of the city of Madrid, including their ages, school year and type of schooling (public school, private school and state subsidized school), was retrieved from the website of the city hall statistics service (Ayuntamiento de Madrid, 2017). Schools were divided into groups by district and type of school, and randomly ordered. Subsequently, for each district and type of school, the first school on the list was contacted and asked to provide access to the set of classes required by the district. If the school refused, the next school on the list was contacted. Once a school agreed to participate in the study, the evaluators delivered informed consent forms for the children's parents/guardians and a date was set for the evaluator to visit the school to perform the assessment in the classroom chosen using stratified random sampling. After collecting informed consent forms from parents/guardians, the assessments were administered in groups, using computers in each school's computer room, allowing approximately 30-40 minutes for the students to complete them. Participants' responses were anonymously collected and coded directly in a computerized database.

Ethical issues for this study have been audited by the ethics committee of the Universidad Complutense de Madrid, Faculty of Psychology.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics (means and standard deviations) were calculated to identify the main characteristics of the participants and to evaluate the variables of interest in the study.

Differences on favorable attitudes towards advertising of games of chance and remembrance of famous people or messages announcing such games were analyzed through Student's *t*, using Cohen's *d* to estimate effect size.

The relationship between scores on favorable attitudes towards advertising of GoC and recollection of famous people, or messages promoting such games, age, and scores on IGDS9-SF, were analyzed through Pearson's correlation. SPSS 25 was used to analyze the data.

Results

Table 1 shows means and SD divided by gender for each question surveyed. Dividing the sample by gender shows systematic differences; men show significantly higher scores in 10 out of 13 criteria, whereas this was not the case for women in any of the questions assessed.

Insert Table 1 here.

Due to the possible relation between GoC and VGG, the sample was divided based on A&Y videogames usage. The results are shown in Table 2. Those who recognized gaming videogames also acknowledged greater influence of advertising.

Insert Table 2 here.

A correlation analysis was carried out between participants' scores on the 13 questions, age and scores on the IGDS9-SF. The correlations with age were found to be of less relevance, however, IGDS9-SF scores were found to have a strongly significant association (see Table 3)

Insert Table 3 here.

Discussion

General remarks will be made for the first 11 questions (Q) surveying participants' opinions and attitudes towards gambling (Q1-Q11). It will be indicated explicitly when references are made to the recall of famous people or GoC advertising (Q12-Q13). Q2 and Q5 were asked in a negative form, however, with the purpose of facilitating the reader in this discussion section, these will be referred to with inverse value.

In general, results average around 2 (1-5 scale), indicating disagreement (although moderate) with the questions. In other words, A&Y, on average, show that advertising of GoC does not influence them, or change their attitude or behavior towards it. However, there are important differences, as it can be observed from the fact that in the 11 questions there are cases in all possible answers (1-5), ranging the SDs between 1-1.7, and there are important variations in the percentage of participants providing answers to each of the 5 alternatives. Thus, the majority indicate that advertising does not influence them, nonetheless, a minority of the sample reports being affected, even reaching high agreement with the statement (high disagreement in Q2 and Q5).

It should be noted that a percentage of A&Y achieved a score of 5, although there are variations according to the question answered (1.8% in Q9 and 32.6% in Q2), which can be estimated to be, on average, around 5%. If scores 4 and 5 are considered, the range would be between 42% (Q2) and 4.4% (Q11) estimating an average of 11%. These are considerable values of 11% or 5%, representing those who admit being affected by advertising; in addition, the scores in some of the questions greatly exceed these averages.

Q2 is to note, as 32,2% strongly disagree (“advertisements of GoC do not influence my decision to gamble”). Other statements, although with lower scores, are also highlighted, such as Q10 (“gambling GoC is useful to earn money”), in which the average (2.11) shows partial disagreement, nonetheless 117 participants (4.1%) indicate *strong agreement*. These answers suggest cognitive bias, representative of pathological players, compared to people without gambling problems (Labrador, Labrador, Crespo, Echeburúa & Becoña, 2020). Furthermore, the results achieved are

consistent with those of adolescents from other countries. Hing et al. (2014) show that, although adolescents in Australia are critical of this type of advertising, a minority (between 10-15%) does not share such critical thinking.

The content of the statements can be grouped as follows:

- 1) *Advertising does not affect me*: including questions 2 (“it does not affect me”) and 5 (“I do not pay attention to it”) (asked negatively). The average scores of both statements, greater than 3, indicate a medium, intermediate position, neither in agreement or disagreement. However, if we consider those who scored 1 or 2 (disagree or strongly disagree), 41.9% disagree with Q2 and 20.4% with Q5. Additionally, 32.2% strongly disagree with the statement indicating not being affected by advertising (Q2). It appears that a relevant percentage of A&Y acknowledges being influenced by advertising.
- 2) *Advertising affects my gambling behavior or my intention to gamble*: includes Q1 (it is more likely that I will play afterwards); Q3 (it increases my interest in gambling); Q4 (I think about playing in the future); Q8 (I risk more when gambling). The means, with similar values (approximately 1.78), indicate that on average advertising has a low effect on gambling or intention to gamble. However, there are minorities who acknowledged being affected, scoring “*strongly agree*” between 2.45% (Q4) and 6% (Q8). If we consider those who answered 4 or 5, this would increase to 12% in Q8. Recognizing that advertising influences intention or gambling behavior is common (Hayer et al., 2018; Pitt et al., 2017a), although in this study the percentage of A&Y affected by advertising is lower than the reported in other studies. In Djohari et al. (2019), 62% of A&Y acknowledged that advertising influenced their gambling behavior. In a study by Monaghan et al. (2008), 42% of A&Y reported that advertisements make them want to try GoC (Clemens et al., 2017). Additionally, McMullan et al. (2012) point out that advertising is associated with changes in the current gambling behavior, as well as in the following 12 months, even before adolescents reach the legal age to play. In Binde (2009), 20% of problematic gamblers reported that advertising had a tangible impact on their gambling behavior.

- 3) *Advertising influences my attitude towards GoC*: including Q9 and Q11. Participants agree on average around 1.80, however, once again the percentage for those A&Y who score 4 or 5 (8.5% in Q9 and 4.4% in Q11) is relevant. The fact that advertising modifies attitudes towards GoC was expected, being associated with multiple positive aspects (amusement, social prestige, glamour, becoming rich easily) (Abarbanel et al., 2017), as was the fact that such positive attitudes are associated with greater intent or desire to gamble in the future (Djohari et al., 2019; Li, Langham, Browne, Rockloff & Thorne, 2018).
- 4) *Advertising increases my knowledge of GoC*: includes Q6 and Q7, presenting means around 2.3. It should be noted that around 5% of participants report strong agreement (*strongly agree*) and almost 20% answered “*agree*”. Logically, a basic objective of advertising is to provide information on games or brands, and its effect has been repeatedly documented (Pitt et al., 2017a).
- 5) *Memory of celebrities or messages in advertisements*. Around 50% report not recalling famous people (46.1%) or messages (54.4%). Famous people are generally recalled more ($M = 1.86$) than the messages found in advertisements ($M = 1.68$). These results approach those of Djohari et al (2019), who found 46% of adolescents recalled at least one gambling brand. Nonetheless, these figures are somewhat lower than those reported by Nyemcsock et al. (2018), showing that 73% of young people recognized gambling brands associated with a special offer. The results from the present study show around half of the sample surveyed recalling these aspects of advertising, which goes against the self-reports of not attending to, or not being affected by advertising, especially in those participants recalling more than 5 famous people (4.8%) or messages (3.6%) from advertisements. In agreement with the findings of Hayer et al. (2018), the memory of an advertisement is found to be a significant predictor of future gambling behavior and of shifting from simulated games to gambling with money. It is possible that a considerable number of A&Y do not identify the effects of advertising correctly.

To summarize, on average participants report that advertising has little impact on them, however these averages conceal important variations, estimating that 11% of A&Y acknowledge being affected by advertisements and 5 % report being very affected.

Differences according to gender. By dividing the sample according to gender, men were found to reach significantly higher scores in all the statements surveyed, although the average differences are reduced (only one exceeds the value of 0.2 out of 5). A greater difference was observed in Q12 and Q13, (famous people and messages) with differences exceeding 1 point. As it has been shown in other studies, not only men play more videogames, but it appears that they are also more influenced by advertising (Sandberg et al., 2011; Djohari et al., 2019). The effect size (Cohen's d) reaches low values, as only one of the statements exceeds 0.18, suggesting a small effect size. The correlational analysis shows similar results as the majority of the correlations between the statements and gender are negative, indicating higher agreement values in men (1) than in women (2) in recognizing the influence of advertising in gambling and intention to gamble, as well as a positive opinion towards it. Although the correlation values obtained are low (around 0.1) in 9 of 13 questions, they reach significance. Thus, a greater effect of gambling advertising on men is confirmed.

Differences according to age and use of videogames. Almost no correlations were found between age and any of the statements surveyed: most are not significant (7), the values never exceed $r = 0.065$, obtaining almost as many negatives as positives. This study does not show differences in the impact of advertising on different age groups. It should be noted that, although GoC advertising is more directed towards an older group of A&Y (16 years old or older), it is nevertheless received by minors and similarly affects them, at least from the age of 12.

Regarding the differences depending on whether they admit to VGG, it is striking that those who acknowledge gaming videogames present means with significantly higher values in 12 of 13 questions, although the mean differences are small, (in general they do not reach values of 0.4 out of 5). The effect size values, although reduced, are somewhat higher than those obtained with the variable "sex", ranging between .10 and .30 (Q6 and Q7, increased in knowledge of games or

companies). Thus, in general A&Y players of videogames recognize a greater effect of advertising and, although these differences are not large, they are significant in all cases. It is noteworthy that, despite the low value of effect size, d , this is greater than that of the variable *gender*, usually considered a relevant discriminating factor. It is possible that VGG is associated with greater impact of advertising, consistent with the results of Derevensky et al. (2010) that exposure to gambling advertising was best remembered by people with greater vulnerability to gambling.

Correlation with problematic use of videogames. Considering the possible relationship between VGG and gambling, or intent to gamble in GoC, a correlation analysis was carried out between IGDS9-SF scores, as assessment instrument of problematic VGG, and the 13 statements surveyed. The results are believed to be relevant, as important correlations were observed. Firstly, the correlations found are always positive, the higher the score on the IGDS9-SF, the greater the acknowledgment of the influence of advertising: 9 of the 11 statements show significant correlations greater than 0.15. It should also be noted that the highest correlations were attained in those statements indicating that advertising affects the way of gambling or the intention to gamble: Q4 ($r = .213$): Q1($r = .175$) and Q9 ($r = .174$). In summary, A&Y who achieved higher scores on the IGDS9-SF, are those who report a greater impact of advertising in the form or intention of gambling, as well as in their attitudes towards gambling. These results support the idea that experiencing problems with VGG can facilitate the transition to GoC, approaching the conclusions of McBride and Derevensky (2016), or Sanders and Williams, (2019), that people with greater implication, or problems with VG, are more likely to gamble. It appears that, although modestly, playing VG might predispose to engagement in gambling.

The association between the questions and the amount of gaming reported by participants (how many days per week and how many hours per day) is almost nonexistent (below $r = .05$), suggesting that the time spent playing is not very relevant, rather more specific aspects of the participation in VGG might be of interest.

Some limitations of this investigation should be noted. The results were collected through self-report measures of A&Y, thus, it is not possible to know to what extent they give an accurate representation.

Furthermore, a set of 13 questions was used, which was not a validated instrument, nevertheless, it can represent a first approach to the problem. Ultimately, the sample was collected by means of stratified random sampling, albeit widespread it is only representative of Madrid, therefore the generalization of results should be applied with caution.

Conclusion

Broadly, the results of the study show that a large minority of A&Y, greater than 40%, admits being affected by GoC advertising. Such influence appears to impact all aspects considered: attitude towards gaming, gambling modality, intention to gamble and knowledge of GoC. Additionally, advertising appears to especially affect a reduced percentage of A&Y, which can be estimated around 11% (answers “agree” and “strongly agree”), or around 5% (answer “strongly agree”).

Considering the different variables that can contribute to the observed influence of advertising, this appears to affect more men than women, without important differences in regard to age factors. However, it appears to influence A&Y who are also VG gamers more than non-gamers, given that A&Y with higher scores on the IGDS9-SF are most impacted.

Table 1

Descriptivos y Diferencias en Actitudes Favorables hacia la Publicidad de JdA en Función del Género

Question	Total	Sexo		<i>t(df)</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	(<i>N</i> = 2887) <i>M (SD)</i>	Male (<i>n</i> =1659) <i>M (SD)</i>	Female (<i>n</i> = 1228) <i>M (SD)</i>			
Q1. Es más probable que juegue después de ver publicidad sobre juegos de azar	1.85 (1.13)	1.89 (1.17)	1.78 (1.07)	2.74 (2754.445)	0.006	0.10
Q2. Los anuncios de juegos de azar no influyen en mi decisión de jugar	3.02 (1.67)	2.99 (1.68)	3.06 (1.66)	-0.98 (2663.579)	0.327	0.04
Q3. Los anuncios de juegos de azar aumentan mi interés en el juego	1.76 (1.10)	1.75 (1.09)	1.76 (1.12)	-0.11 (2603.579)	0.911	0.00
Q4. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que piense en jugar en el futuro	1.79 (1.11)	1.86 (1.14)	1.70 (1.05)	3.72 (2751.035)	<0.001	0.14
Q5. No presto atención a los anuncios de juegos de azar	3.82 (1.44)	3.78 (1.43)	3.87 (1.45)	-1.63 (2626.434)	0.103	0.06
Q6. Los anuncios de juegos de azar han aumentado mis conocimientos sobre los distintos juegos que existen	2.34 (1.29)	2.41 (1.31)	2.23 (1.27)	3.67 (2686.320)	<0.001	0.14
Q7. Los anuncios de juegos de azar han aumentado mis conocimientos sobre las empresas de juego	2.23 (1.26)	2.37 (1.31)	2.03 (1.16)	7.30 (2791.887)	<0.001	0.27
Q8. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que arriesgue más al apostar dinero	1.75 (1.22)	1.81 (1.25)	1.67 (1.18)	3.11 (2721.607)	0.002	0.11
Q9. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que tenga mejor opinión sobre el juego	1.82 (1.07)	1.90 (1.11)	1.71 (1.02)	4.79 (2757.337)	<0.001	0.18
Q10. Creo que jugar a juegos de azar sirve para ganar dinero	2.11 (1.18)	2.19 (1.21)	1.99 (1.14)	4.39 (2723.297)	<0.001	0.16
Q11. Me gusta que haya anuncios sobre juegos de azar	1.79 (1.03)	1.83 (1.06)	1.73 (0.98)	2.62 (2748.183)	0.009	0.10
Q12. Cuántos famosos recuerdas que anuncien juegos de azar	1.86 (5.83)	2.38 (7.24)	1.16 (2.89)	6.25 (2303.496)	<0.001	0.21
Q13. Cuántos mensajes/músicas/slogans de anuncios de juegos de azar recuerdas	1.68 (6.71)	2.16 (8.58)	1.02 (2.41)	5.14 (1999.949)	<0.001	0.17

Table 2

Descriptivos y Diferencias en Actitudes Favorables hacia la Publicidad de JdA en Función del Uso de Videojuegos

Question	Do you play videogames?		<i>t(df)</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
	Yes (<i>n</i> = 2173)	No (<i>n</i> = 714)			
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>			
Q1. Es más probable que juegue después de ver publicidad sobre juegos de azar	1.88 (1.13)	1.75 (1.12)	2.55 (1225.423)	0.011	0.11
Q2. Los anuncios de juegos de azar no influyen en mi decisión de jugar	3.09 (1.76)	2.82 (1.71)	3.66 (1186.420)	<0.001	0.16
Q3. Los anuncios de juegos de azar aumentan mi interés en el juego	1.77 (1.08)	1.70 (1.15)	1.49 (1154.410)	0.135	0.07
Q4. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que piense en jugar en el futuro	1.83 (1.12)	1.68 (1.06)	3.32 (1272.658)	0.001	0.14
Q5. No presto atención a los anuncios de juegos de azar	3.86 (1.39)	3.72 (1.55)	2.08 (1116.200)	0.037	0.09
Q6. Los anuncios de juegos de azar han aumentado mis conocimientos sobre los distintos juegos que existen	2.43 (1.29)	2.06 (1.24)	6.89 (1264.804)	<0.001	0.29
Q7. Los anuncios de juegos de azar han aumentado mis conocimientos sobre las empresas de juego	2.32 (1.26)	1.95 (1.18)	7.11 (1288.575)	<0.001	0.30
Q8. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que arriesgue más al apostar dinero	1.78 (1.23)	1.65 (1.18)	2.43 (1268.701)	0.015	0.10
Q9. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que tenga mejor opinión sobre el juego	1.88 (1.09)	1.66 (1.00)	4.89 (1316.748)	<0001	0.20
Q10. Creo que jugar a juegos de azar sirve para ganar dinero	2.14 (1.19)	2.01 (1.17)	2.48 (1233.886)	0.013	0.11
Q11. Me gusta que haya anuncios sobre juegos de azar	1.82 (1.04)	1.71 (1.00)	2.40 (1251.711)	0.016	0.10
Q12. Cuántos famosos recuerdas que anuncien juegos de azar	2.07 (6.55)	1.22 (2.57)	4.99 (2807.521)	<0.001	0.15
Q13. Cuántos mensajes/músicas/slogans de anuncios de juegos de azar recuerdas	1.84 (7.54)	1.18 (2.95)	3.37 (2811.769)	0.001	0.10

Table 3

Correlaciones entre actitudes favorables hacia la publicidad de JdA y la edad y el uso problemático de videojuegos

Question	Age	IGDS-9-SF
	<i>r</i>	<i>r</i>
Q1. Es más probable que juegue después de ver publicidad sobre juegos de azar	-.016	.175**
Q2. Los anuncios de juegos de azar no influyen en mi decisión de jugar	.050**	.051**
Q3. Los anuncios de juegos de azar aumentan mi interés en el juego	-.007	.134**
Q4. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que piense en jugar en el futuro	.025	.213**
Q5. No presto atención a los anuncios de juegos de azar	.017	-.051**
Q6. Los anuncios de juegos de azar han aumentado mis conocimientos sobre los distintos juegos que existen	.021	.150**
Q7. Los anuncios de juegos de azar han aumentado mis conocimientos sobre las empresas de juego	.065**	.161**
Q8. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que arriesgue más al apostar dinero	-.045*	.151**
Q9. Los anuncios de juegos de azar hacen que tenga mejor opinión sobre el juego	-.049**	.174**
Q10. Creo que jugar a juegos de azar sirve para ganar dinero	.041*	.162**
Q11. Me gusta que haya anuncios sobre juegos de azar	-.027	.154**
Q12. Cuántos famosos recuerdas que anuncien juegos de azar	.043*	.096**
Q13. Cuántos mensajes/músicas/slogans de anuncios de juegos de azar recuerdas	.03	.086**

*Note: * $p < .010$; ** $p < .001$; all other p non significant.*