

PSYCHOSOCIAL CONSEQUENCES AND OTHER RISK BEHAVIORS CAUSED BY GAMBLING OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS IN THE ŽIVINICE TOWN AREA

PSIHOSOCIJALNE POSLJEDICE I DRUGA RIZIČNA PONAŠANJA UVJETOVANI KOCKANJEM KOD SREDNJOŠKOLACA NA PODRUČJU GRADA ŽIVINICE

Adela Jahić¹, Meliha Bijedić¹, Lejla Kuralić-Čišić¹, Almedina Hrnjić²

¹Univerzitet u Tuzli, Edukacijsko-rehabilitacijski fakultet

²JU Dom zdravlja Živinice

Original scientific articles

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to determine the intensity of high school students' involvement in gambling activities, given the level of adverse consequences with gambling and the tendency to engage in other risky behaviors. The survey was conducted in 2016 on a sample of 340 students of both genders (170 male students and 170 female students) in high schools in the City of Živinice. For the purposes of the survey, two measurement instruments were used: the Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI), (Zimbardo and Boyd, 1999) for the male and female gender, and the International Personality Item Pool (IPIP) for the male and female gender (Goldberg, 1999). The survey results show that the largest percentage of respondents suffer psychological consequences of gambling, as well as interpersonal and financial consequences. Regarding other risky and unacceptable behaviors, the following were identified: lenient delinquent behaviors, undesirable normative behaviors, risky gender behaviors, psychoactive substance abuse (PAS), and violent behavior in close relationships. The results of the Z-test and the associated P-value ($P < 0.05$) show that there is a statistically significant difference in the percentage (proportion) of students prone to certain forms of unacceptable behavior between gambling and non-gambling students. For all of these forms of unacceptable behavior, a significantly higher percentage (proportion) of students who gamble is prone to these behaviors compared to students who are not prone to gambling.

Keywords: adverse effects, adolescents, delinquent behavior.

SAŽETAK

Cilj istraživanja je utvrditi intenzitet uključenosti srednjoškolaca u kockarske aktivnosti s obzirom na razinu štetnih posljedica s kockanjem i s obzirom na sklonost uključivanja u druga rizična ponašanja. Istraživanje je provedeno tokom 2016. godine na uzorku od 340 učenika oba spola (170 učenika i 170 učenica) u srednjim školama u Gradu Živinice. Za potrebe istraživanja su korištena dva mjerna instrumenta: Zimbardov upitnik vremenske perspektive (ZTPI), (Zimbardo i Boyd, 1999) za muški i ženski spol, i Međunarodni fond varijabli ličnosti (IPIP) za muški i ženski spol (Goldberg, 1999).

Rezultati istraživanja pokazuju da najveći procenat ispitanika ima psihološke posljedice kockanja, te interpersonalne i finansijske posljedice. Kada su u pitanju druga rizična i neprihvatljiva ponašanja identifikovani su: lakša delinkventna ponašanja, nepoželjna normativna ponašanja, rizična spolna ponašanja, zloupotreba psihoaktivnih supstanci (PAS), nasilno ponašanje u bliskim odnosima. Rezultati testa o razlici proporcija Z-test i njemu pripadajuća P-vrijednost ($P < 0,05$) pokazuju da postoji statistički značajna razlika u procentu (proporciji) učenika sklonih pojedinim oblicima neprihvatljivog ponašanja između učenika koji kockaju i učenika koji ne kockaju. Kod svih navedenih oblika neprihvatljivog ponašanja značajno veći procenat (proporcija) učenika koji kockaju je skloni navedenim oblicima ponašanja u odnosu na učenike koji nisu skloni kockanju.

Ključne riječi: štetne posljedice, adolescenti, delinkventno ponašanje.

INTRODUCTION

Youth gambling and high school students' problems are generally related to the transition period from childhood to adulthood, accompanied by numerous physical, psychological, intellectual, emotional, social and spiritual phenomena (Cian, 1988, according to Ninčević, 2009).

Gambling problems were previously thought to be mainly related to the adult population. However, a growing body of research shows that all children and adolescents have a "mix" of risk and protective factors that determine the likelihood of a problem. Gambling is a risky activity for both the person's finances and psychosocial development. It is important to emphasize that problem gamblers are not the only ones who face problems as a result of gambling. The same problems exist with young people who are not problematic gamblers. Gambling is a common name for a set of diverse games, behaviors and activities, which involve investing money with the risk and hope of expecting a positive outcome, i.e. the player is at risk and has the hope of returning the investment or receiving more than he invested (Koić et al. 2009). Investing something valuable in that event that may (but may not) result in a greater and more favorable outcome (Petry, 2001).

Epidemiological data indicate that youth gambling, like many behaviors in adolescence, occurs on a frequency continuum, ranging from non-participation to experimentation, occasional gambling, regular gambling, and preoccupation with gambling with serious consequences (Stinchfield and Winters, 1998, according to Winters et al. 2002).

Torre and Zoricic (2013) state that gambling seems appealing to young people because it leads to intense excitement while at the same time making it easy to earn money, which leads to the realization of all youthful daydreams.

Research addressing the problems of adult gambling has shown that pathological gambling has strong roots in gambling at a young age (Custer and Milt 1985; Volberg 1994; according to Volberg 2002). Attempts to combat gambling among young people must include addressing peer pressure and eliminating the general positive attitude of young people towards gambling among friends. Also, a large percentage of young people begin to gamble with a family member, indicating the necessary education for the family as a center of prevention efforts.

Today, most people see gambling as socially unacceptable behavior reserved for marginalized groups. In other words, gambling is the investment of something valuable in an event that can result in a greater and more favorable outcome (Petry, 2001, according to Dodig and Ritsiash, 2011).

Given the frequency and consequences, gambling can best be described as a continuum of behavior from complete absence of gambling, through social and risky, to problematic and pathological gambling (National Research Council, 1999).

Over the past few years, we have witnessed an increasing number of people developing problematic level gambling, and the increasing availability of games of chance is cited as possible cause (Dodig and Ricijaš, 2011). Although numerous studies attempt to answer the question of what are the risk factors contributing to gambling and the development of gambling problems, the review of relevant professional and scientific literature gives the impression that there is a lack of research focused on youth, that is, on the question of what personality traits lead to the development of gambling problems.

This is an interesting research question, and an area that is not well researched yet topical in our region. The risk of problematic level gambling is related to certain aspects of gambling activities, drug abuse, crime, as well as socio-demographic characteristics. Research shows that problematic level gambling is also linked to criminal behavior. Blaszczynski and McConaughy (1994; according to Welte, 2004) point out that problem gamblers have a much higher risk of committing crimes than average, a risk of aggressive behavior, and a greater likelihood of being diagnosed with antisocial personality disorder.

The aim of the study is to determine the intensity of high school students' involvement in gambling activities, given the level of adverse consequences with gambling and the tendency to engage in other risky behaviors. The study hypothesized that there was a difference in the propensity to engage in other risky and delinquent behaviors, given the frequency of gambling in such a way that high school gamblers became more involved in other risky and delinquent behaviors.

RESEARCH MATERIAL AND METHODS

Sample of respondents

The study was conducted in April and May 2016 on a sample of 340 students of both genders (170 male students and 170 female students) in high schools in the municipality of Živinice (Medical School, Electrical Engineering School and PI Gymnasium Živinice). Students from grades 1-4 are represented, and the age of respondents ranges from 16 to 19 years from grades 1-4. The choice of respondents enables the self-completion of the inventory/questionnaire, and data were collected during the second semester of 2016.

The method of research conduction

Data were collected in a way that students completed the inventories/questionnaires, through self-expression. All results were presented following the principle of anonymity, and prior written consent was obtained from the parents of the students and also from the management of the schools where the data were collected.

The study was conducted in accordance with the code of ethics for research with children, and the "paper-pencil" method of self-expression was used. Prior to completing the inventory/questionnaire, students were informed that participation in the survey was entirely voluntary and anonymous, and that the data obtained through the survey would be used for research purposes. The research was also beforehand approved by the Ministry of Science, Culture and Sports of the Tuzla Canton. One 45-minute school hour was scheduled to complete the inventory/questionnaire.

Students were introduced to the basic purpose of the research, gave their own oral consent to participate in the research, and were able to drop out at any time. The survey used an already proven instrument of very good metric characteristics.

Measuring instrument

For research purposes, the following instruments were used:

- 1) Zimbardo Time Perspective Inventory (ZTPI), (Zimbardo and Boyd, 1999) for males and females.

The instrument (ZTPI) consists of five different sub-scales, each representing one coherent temporal dimension. The instrument consists of five factors of temporal perspective: 1) past-negative, 2) past-positive, 3) present-hedonistic, 4) present-fatalistic, 5) future. These dimensions are orthogonal in theory and it is therefore possible for an individual to have a high score on all five dimensions or a low score on all dimensions. Although this sub-scale independence is not commonly found in practice, it is important that the operationalization of time perspective measurements reflects the complexity of this multidimensional construct. Focusing on one perspective in isolation can lead to an incomplete and potentially distorted image of an individual, but considering the profile by tracking what outcome an individual achieves on each dimension can deepen our understanding of human behavior (Boyd and Zimbardo, 2005).

- 2) Internacional Personality Item Pool-IPIP for males and females (Goldberg, 1999).

Goldberg's IPIP - 100 is a personality questionnaire based on the Big Five personality model. It contains 100 variables, 20 for each of the Big Five dimensions: extraversion, comfort, conscientiousness, neuroticism and intellect. The task of the participant is to evaluate on a five-level scale (completely incorrect, mostly incorrect, neither true nor false, mostly true, completely true) how much the claim in each individual variable corresponds to his or her self-description. An instrument for measuring the distortion of the response was also used. It contains 43 variables, 21 of which were taken from the L-scale of the Eysenck personality inventory/questionnaire and 22 from the Paulhus BIDR, a questionnaire that operationalizes the Paulhus model of distortion of responses to personality inventories/questionnaires.

The inventory/questionnaire is aimed at assessing the behavior of high school students and their involvement in gambling activities. By filling in the inventory/questionnaire, there are no correct and incorrect answers, but an attempt is made to examine the opinion and experience of young people in high school.

The IPIP has 27 questions. The credit for conceptualizing the Big Five model goes to Goldberg (1999), who was equally credited with popularizing it. Factors, traditionally numbered, were named by Goldberg as follows: 1) extraversion or surrogacy, 2) comfort, 3) conscientiousness or reliability, 4) emotional stability, 5) culture or intellect.

The factors of the large personality model represent personality at the most general and abstract level, and each of the five dimensions includes a large number of specific personality characteristics (Mikloušić, 2007).

Method of data processing

The data obtained from this research were processed by the methods of parametric and non-parametric statistics, that is, the methods of descriptive statistics. The methods of collecting, editing, tabular and graphical representation of data, and methods of calculating the parameters of statistical sets are the areas of descriptive statistics.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the samples of the participants in this research, the psychological consequence factor and the preoccupation factor and lack of control were grouped into one factor.

Table 1. Relative frequencies on the ZTPI and IPIP variables of adolescent gambling

	Variables	0	1	2	3
		%	%	%	%
PSYCHOLOGICAL CONSEQUENCES AND LOSS OF CONTROL	14. How often have you felt it would be better for you to stop gambling / betting?	44,98	20,10	22,49	12,44
	17. How often have you hidden your gambling / betting activities from parents, other family members or teachers?	47,85	23,44	17,22	11,48
	15. How often did you come back to try to recover the money lost by gambling / betting?	47,85	23,44	18,18	10,53
	16. How often did you gamble / bet more money than you intended?	47,85	23,44	18,18	10,53
	13. How often did you gamble / bet for a longer period than you intended?	44,98	24,88	20,10	10,05
	20. In the past 3 months, how often have you felt that you may have a problem with gambling / betting?	51,67	22,97	17,22	8,13
	11. How often did you feel stressed about gambling / betting?	43,06	22,97	26,32	7,66
	12. How often have your family members or friends complained about you gambling / betting too much?	44,50	23,92	23,92	7,66
	1. How often have you felt guilty about (the amount of) money lost by gambling / betting?	37,32	44,02	12,44	6,22
	5. How often did gambling / betting make you frustrated?	37,80	45,45	11,00	5,74
	3. How often have you felt sad or depressed about (the amount of) money lost by gambling / betting?	42,11	42,11	11,00	4,78
	10. How often did you gamble / bet your winnings?	38,28	28,23	28,71	4,78
	7. How often have you planned your gambling / betting activities?	44,50	30,62	21,53	3,35
	8. How often did you feel bad about the way you gamble / bet or what happens while you gamble / bet?	42,58	28,23	26,32	2,87
	18. How often have you had difficulty paying down gambling / betting debts?	52,	21,	15,	15,7

	15	53	79	10,53
19. How often has anyone pressured you (in any way) to pay off your debt you lost by gambling / betting?	53, 59	22, 01	14, 35	10,05
22. How often have you spent money for food, clothing, cinema and the like on gambling / betting or repaying gambling / betting debts?	44, 98	28, 71	20, 10	6,22
24. How often have you stolen money or other valuable items to gamble / bet or to repay gambling / betting debts?	53, 59	21, 53	18, 66	6,22
21. How often have you borrowed money from family, friends or other persons for gambling / betting?	49, 76	26, 32	18, 66	5,26
23. How often have you sold your personal property (electronics, clothing, etc.) to have money for gambling / betting or repaying gambling / betting debts?	51, 67	24, 88	19, 14	4,31
4. How often did you miss family gatherings in order to gamble / bet?	48, 33	38, 28	10, 53	2,87
9. How often have you missed hanging out with your friends because of gambling / betting?	46, 41	22, 97	27, 75	2,87
2. How often did you miss or quit some leisure activities (e.g. sports, music school, etc.) because of gambling / betting?	46, 41	39, 23	12, 44	1,91
6. How often have you missed hanging out with your non-gambling / non-betting friends to hang out with your gambling / betting friends?	46, 89	34, 45	16, 75	1,91

Frequency responses to the variables give us even more insight into the areas of psychosocial functions that are more severely impaired for high school students because of gambling, and the interpersonal and financial consequences of gambling. When it comes to psychological consequences and loss of control, the highest percentage of students who profess to feel and suffer these consequences are almost always recorded with the saying that the student felt it would be better for him or her to stop gambling / betting (12.44%), that he/she hid his/her gambling / betting from parents, other family members or teachers (11.48%) and that he/she would often return the other day to try to recover the money lost by gambling / betting (10.53%). When it comes to interpersonal and financial consequences, the highest percentage of students who profess to feel and suffer these consequences are almost always recorded with the the saying that the student had difficulty paying their gambling / betting debts (10.53%). that often someone pressured him/her (in any way) to pay his/her debt after losing by gambling / betting (10.05%) and that often money intended for food, clothing, cinema and the like was used for gambling / betting, or to repay gambling / betting debts (6.22%). According to the above, students who are prone to gambling suffer to a greater extent psychosocial consequences in relation to interpersonal and financial consequences.

Table 2. Descriptive representation of boys and girls response frequencies on gambling belief scale variables

Ordinal	CLAIMS	Prone to gambling	1	2	3	4	5	M	SD	P
			%	%	%	%	%			
1.	Gambling outcomes can be predicted.	No	80,15	3,82	9,92	4,58	1,53	1,44	0,95	0,000
		Yes	22,01	30,62	29,19	14,83	3,35	2,47	1,09	
2.	Some activities (e.g. rituals, etc.) increase the likelihood of gambling winnings.	No	78,63	8,40	8,40	3,05	1,53	1,40	0,88	0,000
		Yes	36,36	26,32	26,32	8,61	2,39	2,14	1,08	
3.	In the long run, gambling attributes more winning than losing.	No	80,15	6,87	8,40	2,29	2,29	1,40	0,91	0,000
		Yes	29,19	21,53	27,27	13,40	8,61	2,51	1,28	
4.	If one is successful at gambling, it is proof that he or she possesses the knowledge and skills required to gamble.	No	77,10	5,34	6,11	6,11	5,34	1,57	1,18	0,000
		Yes	22,49	21,53	34,45	14,35	7,18	2,62	1,19	
5.	Whoever has no luck in love, will have luck in gambling.	No	83,97	5,34	8,40	1,53	0,76	1,30	0,75	0,000
		Yes	31,10	27,75	27,27	7,18	6,70	2,31	1,18	
6.	If a person in gambling has a series of winnings, it is very likely that the winnings will continue.	No	77,10	9,16	9,16	1,53	3,05	1,44	0,95	0,000
		Yes	26,79	32,06	30,62	8,61	1,91	2,27	1,01	
7.	A person can sense when they will be lucky in gambling.	No	74,05	14,50	7,63	2,29	1,53	1,43	0,85	0,000
		Yes	24,40	31,10	33,01	8,61	2,87	2,34	1,03	
8.	Lucky items (e.g. wearing a certain piece of clothing, pendant, etc.) increase the likelihood of gambling winnings.	No	75,57	16,03	7,63	0,76	0,00	1,34	0,65	0,000
		Yes	32,06	30,62	28,71	8,13	0,48	2,14	0,98	
9.	The chances of winning a large amount of money by gambling are quite high.	No	74,05	16,79	7,63	0,76	0,76	1,37	0,73	0,000
		Yes	26,79	26,79	33,01	11,48	1,91	2,35	1,05	
10.	One cannot become addicted to gambling.	No	70,99	20,61	5,34	1,53	1,53	1,42	0,79	0,000
		Yes	35,41	21,05	28,23	11,96	3,35	2,27	1,16	
11.	Skills determine how successful a gambler will be.	No	67,94	19,85	8,40	3,82	0,00	1,48	0,81	0,000
		Yes	22,01	28,71	36,36	11,48	1,44	2,42	1,00	
12.	If a person loses by gambling for a longer period, they are more likely to start winning soon.	No	72,52	16,03	9,92	1,53	0,00	1,40	0,73	0,000
		Yes	27,27	21,05	37,32	14,35	0,00	2,39	1,04	
13.	A person is more likely to win a gamble if they use their lucky numbers.	No	69,47	17,56	6,87	5,34	0,76	1,50	0,90	0,000
		Yes	22,01	24,40	37,80	12,92	2,87	2,50	1,06	
14.	Focusing thoughts on winning increases its likelihood.	No	73,28	16,03	7,63	3,05	0,00	1,40	0,76	0,000
		Yes	24,40	26,32	37,80	10,53	0,96	2,37	1,00	
15.	Gambling simultaneously in different games increases the likelihood that a person will win at least in one of them.	No	68,70	19,08	9,92	1,53	0,76	1,47	0,80	0,000
		Yes	18,18	27,75	36,84	15,79	1,44	2,55	1,01	
16.	To make money by gambling you need to have a good gaming system.	No	70,23	14,50	9,16	3,82	2,29	1,53	0,97	0,000
		Yes	15,79	30,14	32,54	19,62	1,91	2,62	1,03	
17.	Gambling winnings are not just about luck.	No	70,99	13,74	9,16	4,58	1,53	1,52	0,95	0,000
		Yes	14,83	22,97	36,84	19,14	6,22	2,79	1,11	
18.	Although a gambler has a series of losses, they will win back their money if they play long enough.	No	75,57	13,74	8,40	1,53	0,76	1,38	0,77	0,000
		Yes	31,58	27,27	30,14	9,09	1,91	2,22	1,05	

A survey of high school students' gambling and betting opinions found that there was a statistically significant difference between high school students who were prone to gambling and those who were not prone to gambling, given that all 18 variables were $P < 0.05$ (5% significance level on which the hypothesis that there was a difference between groups was tested).

Higher average scores on each of the 18 variables listed in Table 2, which relate to students' gambling opinion, were recorded in gambling-prone students. In order to answer the research problem, the response frequencies of the variables are presented.

Gambling conviction scales.

It may be noted from the above that high school students who tend to gamble answer the illusion claims with "No". Thus, 83.97% for the claim "Whoever has no luck in love, will have luck in gambling.", 80.15% for "Gambling outcomes can be predicted" agree that they are not prone to gambling, 80.15% "In the long run, gambling attributes more winning than losing", 75.57% "Although a gambler has a series of losses, they will win back their money if they play long enough", 75.57% "Lucky items (e.g. wearing a certain piece of clothing, pendant, etc.) increase the likelihood of gambling winnings", 74.05% "The chances of winning a large amount of money by gambling are quite high". Thus, in gambling students, the largest percentage of those who fully agreed with one of the proposed claims is thus noted in the claim that "In the long run, gambling attributes more winning than losing", 35.41% for "One cannot become addicted to gambling", 32.06% for "Lucky items (e.g. wearing a certain piece of clothing, pendant, etc.) increase the likelihood of gambling winnings", 31.58% for "Although a gambler has a series of losses, they will win back their money if they play long enough", 27.27% for "If a person loses by gambling for a longer period, they are more likely to start winning soon", 26.79% for "The chances of winning a large amount of money by gambling are quite high". The above claims are stated as superstitious. Of these 18 variables, it is necessary to indicate how many times during the course of a student's life he or she behaved in a specific manner described in this way:

- 0- has never e.g. destroyed school property,
- 1-2 times e.g. ran away from home,
- 3-4 times e.g. took from a car something that didn't belong to him/her,
- 5 and more times e.g. cheated on a test at school.

Variables are saturated with seven factors:

- 1) lenient delinquent behavior,
- 2) undesirable normative behaviors,
- 3) risky gender behaviors,
- 4) psychoactive substance abuse (PAS),
- 5) violent behavior in close relationships,
- 6) severe delinquent behaviors (such as theft, burglary, etc.),
- 7) suicidal behaviors.

We will single out some of the claims and consider as a percentage such claims:

„ Gambling outcomes can be predicted “ yes 22,01%, no 80,15%, 0-times 3,82%, 1-2 times 9,92%, 3-4 times 4,58%, 5 and more times 1,53%.

„ In the long run, gambling attributes more winning than losing “ yes 29,19%, no 80,15%, 0-times 6,87%, 1-2 times 8,40%, 3-4 times 2,29%, 5 and more times 2,29%.

„ Whoever has no luck in love, will have luck in gambling “ no 83,97%, yes 31,10%, 0-times 5,34%, 1-2 times 8,40%, 3-4 times 1,53%, 5 and more times 0,76%.

„ If a person in gambling has a series of winnings, it is very likely that the winnings will continue “ no 77,10%, yes 26,79%, 0-times 9,16%, 1-2 times 9,16%, 3-4 times 1,53%, 5 and more times 3,05%.

Table 3 presents data on the number and structure of students according to their propensity to other forms of delinquent behavior, depending on whether or not they are prone to gambling.

Table 3. Descriptive representation of the number and structure of boys and girls in relation to the propensity to various forms of delinquent behavior

Ordinal	OTHER FORMS OF DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR	Prone to gambling		Not prone to gambling		Z	P
		f	%	f	%		
1.	Deliberately teared, damaged or destroyed school property.	44	21,05	3	2,29	4,88	0,000
2.	Stole or tried to steal a bike or skateboard.	38	18,18	1	0,76	4,91	0,000
3.	Took something from the store without paying for it.	55	26,32	3	2,29	5,73	0,000
4.	Took money at home that did not belong to us (e.g. from mom's wallet).	73	34,93	10	7,63	5,70	0,000
5.	Took something from the school that did not belong to us (e.g. from a teacher or student).	69	33,01	4	3,05	6,55	0,000
6.	Took something from a random car that did not belong to us.	80	38,28	7	5,34	6,77	0,000
7.	Cheated on a test at school.	149	71,29	27	20,61	9,10	0,000
8.	Hit or pushed a teacher or other adult at school.	82	39,23	9	6,87	6,56	0,000
9.	Hit or pushed one of the parents.	84	40,19	7	5,34	7,06	0,000
10.	Hit or push peers or physically clash with them.	104	49,76	9	6,87	8,17	0,000
11.	Entered someone's house, garage or yard without permission.	88	42,11	7	5,34	7,35	0,000
12.	Ran away from home.	68	32,54	5	3,82	6,28	0,000
13.	Ran away from school.	91	43,54	10	7,63	7,05	0,000
14.	Had a dialogue with the principal due to misbehavior at school.	50	23,92	3	2,29	5,35	0,000
15.	Wrote / paint graffiti on walls or cars without permission.	45	21,53	1	0,76	5,45	0,000
16.	Behaved inappropriately in public, which is why we had problems.	36	17,22	0	0,00	5,02	0,000

17.	Deliberately set fire to or attempt to set fire to a building, car or something else.	34	16,27	0	0,00	4,87	0,000
18.	Carried weapons in public (close combat weapon or firearm).	32	15,31	1	0,76	4,41	0,000
19.	Avoided paying for cinema, food or the like.	37	17,70	0	0,00	5,10	0,000
20.	Stole someone's purse or wallet, or stole something from someone's pocket.	23	11,00	0	0,00	3,93	0,000
21.	Targeted people with stones, bottles or similar objects.	36	17,22	6	4,58	3,45	0,001
22.	Consumed alcoholic beverages.	54	25,84	11	8,40	3,98	0,000
23.	Smoked cigarettes or chewed tobacco.	34	16,27	8	6,11	2,77	0,006
24.	Smoked marijuana.	28	13,40	4	3,05	3,18	0,001
25.	Sniffed glue.	31	14,83	5	3,82	3,21	0,001

Reviewing the results in Table 19, it can be said that the following forms of unacceptable behaviors are prevalent in gambling students:

- 1) Cheated on a test at school 71,29%,
- 2) Hit or pushed one of the parents 40,19%,
- 3) Hit or push peers or physically clash with them 49,76%,
- 4) Ran away from school 43,54%,
- 5) Entered someone's house, garage or yard without permission 42,11%.

Furthermore, students who are not prone to gambling have mostly the following forms of unacceptable behavior:

- 1) Cheated on a test at school 20,61%,
- 2) Consumed alcoholic beverages 8,40%,
- 3) Ran away from school 7,63%,
- 4) Hit or push peers or physically clash with them 6,87%.

The results of the Z-test and the associated P-value ($P < 0.05$) show that there is a statistically significant difference in the percentage (proportion) of students prone to certain forms of unacceptable behavior between gambling and non-gambling students. For all of these forms of unacceptable behavior, a significantly higher percentage (proportion) of students who gamble is prone to these behaviors compared to students who are not prone to gambling.

Students in the US and Canada alike cite fun, excitement, socializing and winning money as the main motives for gambling (Derevensky et al., 2010; Volberg et al., 2008; Wickwire, Whelan, & Meyers, 2010; Zhang, Dong and Stormann, 2008, according to Bell and Boldero, 2011). A study conducted in the Republic of Croatia confirmed the results of a study conducted for the purposes of this paper and found that the most pronounced reasons for gambling were fun / excitement (49.6% of adolescents gamble mostly or always because of it) and winnings/earnings (44.2% of adolescents cited this as a reason mostly or always).

Concerning risky and delinquent behavior, the results are consistent with foreign studies, that is, the hypothesis has been confirmed that engaging in risky and delinquent behaviors regarding gambling risk in such a way that students with more pronounced gambling problems engage in more risky and delinquent behaviors compared to those students who exhibit less gambling-related problems.

Given the results obtained, we can accept the hypothesis and conclude that there are no differences in the severity of adverse effects with regard to the type of school, but differences in the intensity, participation in different games of chance exist in some activities, but also that the effects of these differences are relatively small, given that high school students with already serious gambling problems participate in a number of different games and do so to a much greater extent. Gambling and gambling problems are most often the result of poor handling of a difficult life situation such as retirement, the death of a spouse and the like. It is a worrying phenomenon in for the society where gambling is accepted as a fun family activity and a very acceptable way of spending free time for parents and their child. As gambling is an activity on the market that has a wide range of modalities tailored to players and their needs, so it can be assumed that more intense involvement in one gambling activity is characterized by more intense gambling through other games, as confirmed by research (Ricijaš et al., 2013).

The results are surprising since problematic level gambling often occurs as part of certain behaviors that involve taking risks, seeking excitement, impulsiveness and usually low self-control. Engaging in risky behaviors leads to engaging in other risky behaviors, so youthful involvement in risky behaviors, through certain boundary testing, is not at all harmless.

Adolescence is a complex period that presents an abundance of risks to the healthy development of the individual. Therefore, one should always be on the lookout for the development of risky behaviors among young people so that, through certain treatments, the necessary assistance can be provided in an effective and timely manner.

Adolescent gambling is a growing and significant public health problem today, as young people are precisely the group most at risk for developing gambling problems (Heung et al., 2007).

Gambling is reaching daily proportions at all ages. The mass media are increasingly promoting risky behaviors leading to severe and delinquent behaviors.

CONCLUSION

This paper provides insights into the characteristics of high school students sports-betting activities, as well as some specific characteristics that through certain experiences contribute to the more frequent and intense involvement in gambling activities. As mentioned above, adolescence is a particularly vulnerable period and is also conducive to engaging in risky behaviors as well as developing various addictions (Chambers, Taylor, & Potenza, 2003). There are differences in the types of psychosocial consequences in a way that the youth is more likely to experience the detrimental psychosocial consequences associated with gambling, which are divided into two factors: Psychological consequences and loss and Interpersonal and financial consequences.

Regarding differences in the severity of adverse psychosocial consequences associated with gambling, the Hi-square test of high school gamblers found the following: Four-year vocational school 68%, PI Gymnasium in Živinice 60% ($X^2 = 0.942$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.332$) i.e. students of all types of schools are equally represented in different risk categories. The implications of this research are numerous. The data could be used in two ways: to monitor changes in certain behaviors in adolescents, to scientifically analyze all childhood stressful events resulting in delinquent behavior and thus in various gambling activities.

REFERENCES

1. Bell, R. i Boldero, J. (2011). *Factors affecting youth gambling, A comprehensive model of the antecedents and consequences of gambling in younger people*. University of Melbourne.
2. Dodig, D. i Ricijaš, N. (2011). Kockanje zagrebačkih adolescenata-uloga psihopatskih osobina, rizičnog i delinkventnog ponašanja. *Kriminologija i socijalna integracija*, 19, 2, 45-55.
3. Goldberg, L. R. (1999). A Broad-Bandwidth, Public Domain *Personality Inventory* Measuring the Lower- Level Facets of Several Five-Factor Models.
4. Koić. E., Medved, B. (2009). Stavovi mladih o kockanju. *Hrvatski časopis za javno zdravlje*, 5, 17, [http://www.hejz.hr/ old/ članak. Php?id=13992](http://www.hejz.hr/old/članak.Php?id=13992) posjećeno 2015.
5. National Research Council (1999). *Pathological Gambling: a critical review*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
6. Mikloušić, I. (2007). Neke poveznice ličnosti i društvenih stavova. Analiza odnosa Velepetornih dimenzija ličnosti i temeljnih društvenih stavova. Diplomski rad. Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji sveučilišta u Zagrebu.
7. Ninčević, M. (2009): Izgradnja adolescentskog identiteta u današnje vrijeme. *Odgojne znanosti*, 11, 1, 119-141.
8. Petry, N. M (2001). Substance Abuse, Pathological Gambling and Impulsiveness. *Drug and Alcohol Dependence*, 63, 29-38.
9. Ricijaš, N., Dodig., Kranželić, V. i Huić, A. (2013). Adolescent slot machines players: experiences, motivation and cognitive distortions. Prezentacija s konferencije The 15th International Conference on Gambling i Risk Taking, Las Vegas, Nevada, Američke Države.
10. Torre, R., Zorčić, Z. (2013). *Kockanje i kladenje od zabave do ovisnosti*. Hrvatski savez klubova lijčenih alkoholičara. Zagreb.
11. Volberg, R. A. (2002). *Gambling and problem gambling among adolescents in Nevada*. Report to the Nevada Department of Human Resources.
12. Welte J. (2004). Risk factors for pathological gambling. *Addictive Behaviors*, 29, 323-335.
13. Winters, K. C., i sar. (2002). A prospective Study of Youth Gambling Behaviors *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 16, 1, 3-9.
14. Zimbardo PG and Boyd JN (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 77(6): 1271–128.