



State of Play: Crime & Problem Gambling

Photo credit: Hirurg

Key points

- Problem gambling leads to crime, as it is an escalating addiction which requires escalating funds
- The Commission for Crime and Problem Gambling has revealed a lack of knowledge or targeted activity within the criminal justice system as regards crime related to problem gambling
- Despite problem gambling being a recognised mental health disorder, the criminal justice system is not responding to related offending in an appropriate way
- The confiscation of assets under the Proceeds of Crime Act needs to be reviewed
- There is a danger that responses to problem gambling and crime can lead to inappropriate up-tariffing, such as replacing fines with more punitive community orders
- and treatment requirements. The emphasis should be on diversion from the criminal justice system wherever possible
- Examples of good practice do exist, particularly at the very front end of the criminal justice system where police first make contact with individuals who may have committed crimes where problem gambling is a factor
- As a first step, the Ministry of Justice should review what improvements can be made including awareness raising and training among practitioners, the assessment of individuals in the criminal justice system, and improving specialist services
- The Sentencing Council should guide improvements to sentencing so as to ensure crime committed linked to problem gambling is appropriately dealt with by the courts.

Introduction

The Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling was launched by the Howard League for Penal Reform in 2019 and is scheduled to run until the end of 2022.

The Chair of the Commission is Lord Peter Goldsmith QC. He leads a team of 16 Commissioners, comprising of academics and professionals with expertise in the criminal justice system and public health, as well as experts with knowledge of the gambling industry and with lived experience of addiction.

The Commission seeks to answer three questions:

- What are the links between problem gambling and crime?
- What impact do these links have on communities and society?
- What should be done?

This briefing summarises the evidence uncovered so far, including the findings from new research with sentencers conducted as part of the Commission's work. The briefing also makes some initial recommendations to government and policymakers.

The evidence so far

The Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling began its investigations with a call for written evidence, receiving submissions from academics, practitioners and policy makers within the criminological, legal and health disciplines; the gambling industry; and people who are expert by experience.

The written evidence submissions were used for internal purposes to inform and guide the work of the Commission. The written evidence covered a broad range of areas including prevalence, the nature of offences, the regulatory context and generic and criminal justice responses to gambling harm and gambling-related crime. They also identified numerous gaps in research and made proposals for future work.

An international literature review (Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling, 2020a) assessed the published research, covering jurisdictions such as Australasia, the United States, Canada, Germany, Scandinavia and the UK. The review found that, while millions of people are affected by gambling, either directly or indirectly, there appear to be fewer than 50 peer-reviewed papers in the last 25 years that address the links between problem gambling and crime specifically.

If the overall quantity of research was not huge, there was nonetheless a consistency in findings across all jurisdictions.

Research analysis suggested that there is a high incidence of people committing crimes to fund their gambling (Williams et al, 2005). A wide variety of crimes are committed as a result of gambling addiction; not just 'white collar' crimes such as theft and fraud, but also offences that occur in public spaces such as street robbery. There is significant evidence of domestic abuse and child neglect linked to problem and pathological gambling.

Studies indicate that the more complex, prolonged and persistent a gambling problem is, the more likely it is that a crime will be committed and, indeed, that many crimes may result.

Although there has been a growing understanding that gambling addiction is a behavioural disorder, little of this has been translated to sentencing; problem gambling is not considered to be a mitigating factor in sentencing in the way mental health problems or drug and alcohol addiction are.

Alongside this assessment of written evidence, the Commission held a series of select committee-style oral evidence hearings with a range of stakeholders, including representatives from organisations such as the Gambling Commission, GambleAware, GamCare, gambling operators, the Gambling Related Harm All Party Parliamentary Group, witnesses with lived experience of problem gambling and crime, and criminal justice professionals (see the Appendix 1 for a full list of oral evidence sessions).

The evidence showed that the understanding of the intersection between problem gambling and crime is at its strongest in the gambling industry. It is, for example, a licensing objective of the Gambling Commission to prevent “gambling from being a source of crime or disorder, being associated with crime or disorder or being used to support crime” (Gambling Commission 2020) and gambling-related crime is recognised within the regulator’s National Strategy to Reduce Gambling Harms (Gambling Commission 2019). In its written submission ahead of providing oral evidence, the Gambling Commission highlighted the seriousness of the issue:

The impact on society of people committing crimes to fund their gambling is far reaching. Stealing to support gambling is a key public concern and is a serious consequence of gambling more than people can afford to lose. The potential of harm to individuals, businesses and society is real. Family members and friends who become victims of gambling associated fraud or theft may experience financial problems as well as mental health issues and damaged relationships including family breakdown. Organisations defrauded of money may suffer financial difficulties, leading in some cases to job losses and bankruptcies impacting on the wider economy.

(Gambling Commission 2020)

The Gambling Commission has, as is its statutory remit, largely focused on reduction of crime through the regulation of gambling operators and encouraging industry bodies to raise standards to ensure protections and controls are in place to properly manage and minimise the impacts of gambling-related crime. This regulatory action has seen the industry take more steps over time to limit opportunities for people to use resources gained illicitly to gamble, through such methods as source of funds and affordability checks.

The Commission’s oral evidence from people with lived experience, who had (or their family members had) all committed offences against their employers, shed important light on the nature of gambling-related crime and on how the criminal justice system responds

to it – albeit the profile of those committing crime were all white adult males and as discussed below, the knowledge base with diversity in mind is problematic. Witnesses all felt that problem gambling leads to crime, as it is an escalating addiction which requires escalating funds. Witnesses described how the strength of the addiction can frustrate/mask one’s usual decision-making pathways and moral compass.

The depth of this link was illustrated by one witness’s stark observation that, for people with gambling addictions, their ‘rock bottom’ can involve either committing a crime or committing suicide. One witness explained that in his poor mental state, he had not been aware of the full amount he had stolen.

Our witnesses reported that gambling-related crime often took the form of the theft of large amounts, stolen over a period of time. All the individuals concerned handed themselves in to the police and disclosed their behaviour. Witnesses noted that the offence was the first that they (or their family member) had ever committed. They noted that they felt they (or their family member) would never reoffend. Witnesses stated that gambling alone had made them/their family member commit a crime.

Oral evidence on criminal justice

By contrast, the Commission’s inquiries as to criminal justice stakeholders have revealed a lack of knowledge or targeted activity within the criminal justice system as regards crime related to problem gambling. Prisons, for example, do not screen for signs of problem gambling upon entry to prison, while it would be up to individual probation practitioners to pick up on problem gambling from their caseload – with limited (if any) guidance available in probation areas to support the assessment of individuals, or to advise on what services might be available locally.

Where data on problem gambling is collected, as part of the self-assessment questionnaire informing OASys – the offender assessment tool used by HM Prison and Probation Service staff – no analysis has been undertaken by the evidence-based practice team.

In a telling indication, requests for the four criminal justice inspectorates (HM Inspectorate of Prisons, HM Inspectorate of Probation, HM Inspectorate of Constabulary and Fire & Rescue Services, HM Crown Prosecution Service Inspectorate) to give evidence to the Commission were all politely declined due to a lack of inspection activity looking at the impact of gambling-related crime across the system.

It is clear, however, that despite problem gambling being a recognised mental health disorder, the criminal justice system is not always responding to related offending in an appropriate way.

Witnesses from the lived experience evidence session provided concerning evidence about each stage of the criminal justice system:

Policing

Witnesses with lived experience highlighted the limited role the police played, due to the fact they handed themselves in. Witnesses noted that mental health and addiction support available in police settings was limited. A lack of understanding of gambling addiction was apparent, both among police and mental health practitioners. Two witnesses explained that their initial engagement and interviews were a cathartic experience for them, as the police interview allowed them to open up about their behaviour and suffering. Witnesses noted a general lack of signposting in terms of process and support.

The Commission is currently undertaking research to understand whether each police force in England and Wales routinely screens for problem gambling when a person is brought into police custody suites and if so, what happens. The Commission is also working to understand the strategy of Police and Crime Commissioners to identify people coming into police custody with gambling problems and how they seek to support them once identified.

Court process

Witnesses highlighted the limited understanding of problem gambling among their legal teams. Witnesses in fact ended

up conducting research themselves and educating their legal teams. One witness was represented by a family member of a fellow Gamblers Anonymous (hereafter GA) member (their experience as an affected other gave them greater understanding). Witnesses noted that, whilst custodial sentences were inevitable (due to amounts stolen), the judge's attitude toward and understanding of problem gambling played a central role in sentencing. All witnesses highlighted the judiciary's lack of knowledge about problem gambling. One witness explained that his hearing was adjourned whilst the judge researched the matter.

Prosecution

Witnesses noted that there appeared to be a lack of understanding of problem gambling in the Crown Prosecution Service (CPS). The focus on severity and financial benefit belied the fact that problem gamblers who commit crime rarely profit financially, given their escalating spiral of debt.

Prison

Witnesses described a near total lack of support available for gambling addiction in prison, and a lack of understanding amongst staff and other prisoners. In addition to a lack of support, there were barriers to accessing it (seeking support meant admitting to gambling, something which is not permitted in prison). Witnesses agreed that gambling was a significant part of prison culture, making recovery more challenging. One witness explained how prison could in fact cause, exacerbate, or lead to relapse of a gambling addiction, citing an occasion where her family member was threatened for not participating in a bet. Despite the lack of support available, witnesses highlighted the prevalence of the problem, noting that they encountered others in prison (including cellmates) with similar problems.

Probation

Witnesses again highlighted a lack of understanding/knowledge about problem gambling in the probation service. Witnesses explained that whilst there was no tailored support on probation, they were helpful

in accommodating needs (for example, allowing changes to conditions around electronic monitoring, in order to attend GA meetings). Witnesses would have engaged with probation-led support if available and noted that the onus was placed on them/ family members to support, seek treatment, and rehabilitate.

Proceeds of Crime Act 2002

Witnesses described how people with a gambling addiction rarely benefit materially from their behaviour (any wins were placed again as bets) and highlighted inconsistencies in the use of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002, including the proportionality of confiscation orders in such cases and its impact on rehabilitation.

The primary purpose of the confiscation regime is depriving defendants of the benefit they have gained from their relevant criminal conduct, within the limit of their means. The model of proceeds of crime confiscation typically assumes that there are realisable assets that can be retrieved to deprive them of the benefit gained. In cases in which problem gambling or a gambling disorder is instrumental in the offence, the gambler typically turns to crime to maintain their addiction once all other assets have been exhausted. The realisable assets of gamblers themselves are therefore frequently nil or limited as the stolen finances have all been consumed through gambling.

A further consideration is that offending of this nature is typically hidden from the family and often the only realisable assets are contained within the family unit. The family therefore suffer a greater penalty from the confiscation order than the perpetrator. In addition, for the perpetrator with a gambling addiction, there is a risk that the level of debt to repay would incite further offending.

Finally, stolen money can be recouped in other ways with victims of the crime receiving compensation from gambling companies following investigations by the Gambling Commission for social responsibility and money laundering failures. There have also been instances where banks have provided compensation. Banks and gambling

companies are therefore deemed to have been implicated in the offending, for example, because they failed to scrutinise the source of funds, yet this multiple culpability is not reflected in the confiscation process.

The Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling has submitted more detailed evidence on this matter to a recent Law Commission consultation on the relevant legislation (Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling, 2020b).

New research findings

The Commission's literature review supports the oral evidence received, indicating a growing understanding of gambling addiction as a behavioural disorder which had not yet translated into criminal justice system thinking and practice. The review highlighted a deficit in knowledge among sentencers. To understand this issue new research was commissioned, in partnership with the Magistrates Association, to explore sentencers' understanding and treatment of problem gambling (Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling, 2021). It focussed on magistrates' awareness of people who are problem gamblers coming before them in court; their practice when problem gambling was apparent in a case; and magistrates' views on how courts may account for problem gambling.

A representative sample of more than 650 magistrates took part in an online survey. This was followed by focus groups where a subset of the original sample explored the ideas and issues raised in the survey. The final phase of the research was a roundtable-style event with criminal justice and therapeutic stakeholders to stress test and discuss the emerging findings.

The research findings mirror contributions heard in the Commission's oral evidence sessions, that there is a general awareness of gambling, if not problem gambling, among criminal justice practitioners and professionals but there is little or no focussed understanding of the relationship between problem gambling and crime. Sentencers revealed their awareness was often derived from the increasing visibility, and normalisation, of

gambling particularly through advertising. Sentencers were concerned about this dynamic, its wider implications and by extension its potential impact on those who ended up in criminal justice system because of problem gambling.

Magistrates and stakeholders who participated in the research depicted problem gambling as a hidden issue in the courtroom. This is derived from lack of awareness, a training deficit, but also a lack of clarity about how problem gambling should, or could, be dealt with in the courtroom. These issues are compounded when attention is turned to how sentencers might account for and effectively sentence a person in court, particularly as they were clear that problem gambling should be regarded as an addiction. An overarching concern for sentencers was to serve the needs of justice. It was felt that more appropriate treatment of problem gambling would lead to better outcomes for all, including victims of crime.

The research findings clearly pointed to the need for greater awareness of the relationship between crime and problem gambling in wider support services and through early stages of criminal justice system. Diversion away from the criminal justice system at the earliest possible junction is desirable. This signals a desire to reduce the role of the criminal justice system. This led the research conclusions to focus on crime prevention, community safety and public health issues as well as those that focus on courtroom and sentencing practice.

Reflections on the research

The research clearly identified a systemic problem in need of attention by the public health and criminal justice systems. Evidence from the Gambling Commission (2020:36) suggests that 43% of the public believed that gambling is associated with acquisitive crime to fund a gambling addiction. However, there is no clarity about the prevalence of problem gambling and its relationship to crime. This evidence gap clearly hampers both the public health and the criminal justice system to effectively work on this issue.

Most magistrates surveyed had not knowingly dealt with a person in court where problem gambling was an identified issue.

Respondents had a dominant view of a white adult man being most likely to come before them in court with problem gambling issues. This largely reflects the dominant narrative often portrayed in the media and elsewhere. The combined effect is problematic. Criminal justice practice needs to be alive to issues of diversity and how this may impact on practice and outcomes.

Research regularly identifies problem gambling as an addiction; a behavioural addiction (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Blaszczynski et al, 2008; Leeman and Potenza, 2012; Pettorruso et al, 2019; Zhang and Clark, 2020; Goudriaan, 2020; Lee et al, 2020). The relationship between public health and criminal justice agendas and approaches is particularly pertinent in this regard. Public health treatment of problem gambling, akin to other addictive but legal actions like smoking or alcohol consumption, were favoured. Magistrates as well as other criminal justice and therapeutic stakeholders in our research clearly indicated they wanted to treat problem gambling as an addiction. The public and professional education and training that flows from such an approach would inevitably impact on the workings of the criminal justice system. The Commission's research indicates the necessity of this step.

The research raises a number of questions that need to be considered in the treatment of problem gambling in the courtroom:

- What is the scale of the issue? How many cases involve problem gambling?
- Is there greater awareness, understanding and training on this issue among people working in criminal justice, including sentencers? There is little evidence to support this.
- What else needs to be explored? There is no system-wide screening in police custody suites for problem gambling. Issues related to problem gambling are rarely brought to court by probation staff or legal professionals. Evidence from stakeholders, and those directly affected, indicates that people are unlikely to disclose a gambling addiction for reasons such as shame or denial.

- Is problem gambling a mitigating factor or an aggravating factor in court? Magistrates in the research sample expressed uncertainty about how to deal with information about gambling addictions if presented in court. This stemmed from having neither training nor sentencing guidance.

Sentencers viewed the crimes often associated with problem gambling as acquisitive – particularly theft and unauthorised use of a credit card (Turner et al, 2009) - and domestic abuse (Roberts et al, 2020). This mirrors wider research findings (Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling, 2020a).

Sentencers identified a range of concerns that affect their treatment of people found guilty of crimes where a gambling addiction is identified as a significant, perhaps causal, factor. Again, the lack of guidance about treating a gambling addiction as an aggravating or mitigating factor was foremost in the discussion. Other issues raised included:

- *Consideration of the financial threshold to retain a case in the magistrates' court. The sums of money often involved in cases where problem gambling is an identified issue were such that they were referred up to crown court where prison sentences were more likely*

Sentencers in our sample postulated about this when considering evidence that people coming before the court with a gambling addiction often had no previous engagement with the criminal justice system, but the amounts involved in the crime were also large. There was acknowledgment that this potentially arose out of the addiction and the ease with which it is possible to gamble large sums of money, particularly with the advent of online gambling.

- *Inadequacy of the sentencing options available should problem gambling be acknowledged*

Concerns related to the efficacy and appropriateness of imposing a fine. There was equal awareness that to impose

anything else when the analysis of the case led to the sentence of a fine would not be serving the needs of justice. There was an awareness of the potential for imposing the desire to deal with a gambling addiction.

- The inability to attach treatment/support to an order

The sentencers in our research found it hard to reconcile imposing voluntary requirements for treatment or support to low tariff sentences. Magistrates wanted the ability to hold someone to account to make sure they were getting support or treatment for their gambling addiction, with a view to reducing their likelihood of reoffending.

Should a court feel that treatment is needed there is the potential danger for a more significant (higher tariff) sentence being imposed. Gambling addiction is accepted as distinct from other addictions. Existing courses aimed at other needs, such as drug addiction or thinking skills, were regarded as inadequate and not appropriate. The inability of the criminal justice system to assess the scale of the problem means that demand for services cannot be assessed and developed accordingly. Sentencers voiced a preference for services either provided by the probation service directly or endorsed by it. This is another barrier to adequate supply.

Prison was regarded as a problematic sentence to impose as there was a sense that it was likely to exacerbate gambling addiction problems. There was no knowledge of, or confidence, that treatment or support would be systematically available in prison even if a person was identified as having a gambling addiction.

The research clearly identifies the systemic deficits in the criminal justice system to address problem gambling even when it is an identified issue. This again chimes with the evidence heard by the Commission, particularly from criminal justice stakeholders and those with first-hand experience.

Examples of good practice

Despite the lack of knowledge or targeted activity within the criminal justice system as regards problem gambling and crime, there are examples of good practice which point to ways forward in raising awareness, better understanding prevalence, identifying need in individual cases, and developing options for effective remedies.

Hertfordshire Problem Gambling Project

The Hertfordshire Problem Gambling Project was run by GamCare and funded by the local Police and Crime Commissioner's Innovation Fund. It ran for two years from October 2018 to the end of September 2020, although the impact of Covid-19 disrupted the project's operations in its final six months. The project took a 'whole system' approach to understand where best to intervene within the criminal justice system, so as to identify and support individuals experiencing gambling-related harms.

Activities included the formation of a network of supporting criminal justice organisations, the training of practitioners to raise awareness of problem gambling and crime, the introduction of a screening questions (eventually streamlined to a single question) at key stages within the system (including during induction to probation services, and at both induction and resettlement stages within The Mount prison), and the creation of referral pathways into GamCare's existing support and treatment services.

Learning from the project chimes with the Commission's own findings. As GamCare has noted, the criminal justice system is:

...generally behind in terms of awareness around gambling and its impacts. The system is in a 'pre-contemplation' stage such that gambling is not usually a priority and therefore is not given parity with other addictions. It is generally seen as an afterthought and one that can be dealt with 'once everything else is sorted'

(GamCare 2021)

GamCare won 'Organisation of the Year' for its work in Hertfordshire at the Howard League for Penal Reform annual Community Awards in 2020. The charity has since been awarded further funding to scale up delivery of its programme to raise awareness and develop pathways to support for people experiencing gambling harms across the criminal justice system.

Cheshire pilot – Screening for problem gambling at point of arrest

Beacon Counselling Trust, in partnership with GamCare, Cheshire Constabulary and Mitie Care in Custody, ran a pilot project primarily based in police custody suites, which screened arrested individuals for signs of problem gambling and referred them into treatment. This pilot project received a Community Award from the Howard League for Penal Reform in 2017.

Over 250 individuals from a variety of organisations involved with the wider criminal justice system in Cheshire received training to raise awareness and use a screening tool. This included police custody suite staff, medical and nursing staff, and prison officers from several prisons in the county.

760 individual screenings took place, with 99 positive results recorded against one or more of the screening questions – suggesting a prevalence of problem gambling among those arrested in Cheshire of 13 per cent. 29 individuals who positively screened during the pilot elected to receive an intervention from the National Problem Gambling Treatment Service.

Beacon Counselling Trust and its partners are now working with Cheshire Police and five other forces in England – Merseyside, Lancashire, Cumbria, Greater Manchester and West Midlands – plus those in Scotland and Wales, to develop screening and referral pathways to gambling treatment providers across each force area. Collaborative work is now being

undertaken with NHS England Liaison and Diversion services, with the ultimate aim to make training and awareness available for all police staff in custody suites, as well as to introduce specialist trained key workers into custody suites who can provide referral into treatment services.

Recommendations going forward

As the examples of good practice show, there is now work being done to roll out lessons and improve linkages between various stages of the criminal justice system and treatment providers in the community. The impetus for this is largely coming from those working to prevent gambling-related harms and funding is being provided as part of the Gambling Commission's National Strategy to Reduce Gambling Harms. It is also notable that the primary partners for both the Hertfordshire and Beacon projects came from the world of policing.

It is now time for other parts of the criminal justice system to take a lead on this developing area. There is an opportunity, with the probation service currently being reunified within the public sector, to extend good practice into the new probation model being currently developed (HMPPS 2021). The Ministry of Justice can take important steps which will not only improve practice but help to build a picture on the prevalence of crime related to problem gambling.

As a first step, the Ministry of Justice should review what improvements can be made to a number of areas, including:

- a) awareness raising and training among practitioners,
- b) the assessment of individuals in the criminal justice system,
- c) identifying the availability of specialist services locally, and
- d) signposting individuals to those services.

There may be further opportunities to encourage Police and Crime Commissioners to help fund this work locally.

In addition, the Commission's research with sentencers points to the important role played by the Sentencing Council. The Sentencing Council should consider what improvements can be made to sentencing guidelines to ensure problem gambling is appropriately dealt with by the courts.

References

American Psychiatric Association (2013) *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, fifth edition (DSM-5)*, Arlington: American Psychiatric Publishing

Blaszczynski, A., Walker, M., Sharpe, L. and Nower, L. (2008) 'Withdrawal and tolerance phenomenon in problem gambling', *International Gambling Studies*. 8(2):179–192

Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling (2020a) *Crime and Problem Gambling: A Research Landscape*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform

Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling (2020b) *Submission to Law Commission consultation on Confiscation under Part 2 of the Proceeds of Crime Act (POCA) 2002*. Available at: <https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/POCA-submission.pdf>

Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling (2021) *Sentencers' understanding and treatment of problem gamblers*, London: Howard League for Penal Reform.

Gambling Commission (2020) *Commission on Crime and Problem Gambling briefing January 2020*. Available at: <https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/02/Gambling-Commission-Response.pdf>

Gambling Commission (2019) *National Strategy to Reduce Gambling Harms*. Available at: <https://beta.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/about-us/reducing-gambling-harms>

GamCare (2021) *Hertfordshire Problem Gambling Project: Year Two Final Report*, London: GamCare

Goudriaan, A. (2020) 'Integrating neurocognition from bench to bedside in gambling disorder: from neurocognitive to translational studies', *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 31:83–88

HM Prison & Probation Service (2021) *The Target Operating Model for probation services in England and Wales*, London: HM Prison & Probation Service

Lee, L., Tse, S., Blaszczynski, A. and Tsang, S. (2020) 'Concepts and controversies regarding tolerance and withdrawal in gambling disorder', *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 31:54–59

Leeman, R.F., Potenza, M.N. (2012) 'Similarities and differences between pathological gambling and substance use disorders: A focus on impulsivity and compulsivity', *Psychopharmacology*, 219: 469–490

Pettoruso, M., Martinotti, G., Cocciolillo, F., De Risio, L., Cinquino, A., Di Nicola, M., Camardese, G., Migliara, G., Moccia, L., Conte, E., Janiri, L. and Di Giuda, D. (2019) 'Striatal presynaptic dopaminergic dysfunction in gambling disorder: A 123I-FP-CIT SPECT study', *Addiction Biology*, 4(5):1077–1086

Roberts, A., Sharman, S., Landon, J., Cowlshaw, S., Murphy, R., Meleck, S. and Bowden-Jones, H. (2020) 'Intimate partner violence in treatment seeking problem gamblers', *Journal of Family Violence*, 35:65–72

Turner, N.E., Preston, D.L., Saunders, C., McAvoy, S., Jain, U. (2009) 'The relationship of problem gambling to criminal behaviour in a sample of Canadian male federal offenders', *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 25(2):153–169

Williams, R., Royston, J. and Hagen, B. (2005) 'Gambling and problem gambling within forensic populations: A review of the literature', *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 32(6), 665–689

Zhang K and Clark L. (2020) 'Loss-chasing in gambling behaviour: Neurocognitive and behavioural economic perspectives', *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, 31:1–7

Appendix 1: List of oral evidence sessions

First evidence session, December 2019: Mark Etches, (CEO, GambleAware), Anna Hemmings (CEO, GamCare) and Jenny Brace (Head of Programmes, GamCare)

Second evidence session, February 2020: Tim Miller (Executive Director, Gambling Commission)

Third evidence session, September 2020: Lord Chadlington

Fourth evidence session, December 2020: Paul Buck (Chief Executive, EPIC Risk Management), Rebecca Jones (lived experience family member) and Stephen Ramsey (expert by experience)

Fifth evidence session, December 2020: Carolyn Harris MP and Sir Iain Duncan Smith MP, (Chair and Vice Chair of the Gambling Related Harm All Party Parliamentary Group)

Sixth evidence session, February 2021: Andrea Albutt (President of the Prison Governors Association) and Lisa Ustok (Probation Officer, South West Probation)

Seventh evidence session, March 2021: Maris Catania and Tim Cook (Kindred Group plc) and Robert Parkes (Betway)

Eighth evidence session, May 2021: Neil Platt (Clinical Lead of Beacon Counselling Trust)

More detail on the evidence sessions can be found at: <https://howardleague.org/commission-on-crime-and-problem-gambling/oral-evidence-sessions/>

Appendix 2: Sentencers' understanding and treatment of problem gamblers research

This research focussed on magistrates. It sought to understand the extent that sentencers are aware of problem gamblers coming before them in court; their practice when problem gambling is apparent within a case; and to elicit magistrates' views on the potential for courts to account for problem gambling.

It was undertaken in partnership with the Magistrates Association.

The research was undertaken by a team led by Sarah Page from Staffordshire University. The team comprised Dr Jo Turner, Sarah Plimley, Simon Bratt, Kathryn McFarlyn and Laura Bailey.

The full report is available at <https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Sentencers-understanding-and-treatment-of-proble-gamblers-full-report.pdf>

The summary is available at <https://howardleague.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/09/Sentencers-understanding-and-treatment-of-problem-gamblers-summary.pdf>

Appendix 3: List of commissioners

Lord Peter Goldsmith QC (Chair)

Dr Jamie Bennett, Deputy Director, HM Prison and Probation Service

Andrew Black, co-founder of Betfair

Professor Henrietta Bowden-Jones OBE, FRCPsych, BA (Hons), DOccMed, MD (Imperial), Founder and Director of the National Problem Gambling Clinic

Assistant Chief Constable Matt Burton, Cheshire Police

Dr John Chisholm CBE, Medical Ethics Committee, British Medical Association

Jon Collins, Chief Executive, Prisoners' Education Trust

Frances Crook OBE, Chief Executive, Howard League for Penal Reform

Elizabeth Morony, Partner, Clifford Chance LLP

Andrew Neilson, Director of Campaigns, Howard League for Penal Reform

Neil Platt, Clinical Director, Beacon Counselling Trust

Sarah Ramanauskas, Senior Partner, Gambling Integrity

Gerda Reith, Professor of Social Science, University of Glasgow

Norma Stephenson OBE, Councillor, Stockton on Tees Borough Council

Sue Wade OBE

About the Howard League for Penal Reform

The Howard League for Penal Reform is a national charity working for less crime, safer communities and fewer people in prison. We campaign on a wide range of issues including short term prison sentences, real work in prison, community sentences and youth justice. We work with parliament and the media, with criminal justice professionals, students and members of the public, influencing debate and forcing through meaningful change to create safer communities.

Our legal team provides free, independent and confidential advice, assistance and representation on a wide range of issues to young people under 21 who are in prisons or secure children's homes and centres. By becoming a member, you will give us a bigger voice and give vital financial support to our work. We cannot achieve real and lasting change without your help.

Please visit www.howardleague.org and join today.

Howard League for Penal Reform

1 Ardleigh Road t 020 7249 7373
London e info@howardleague.org
N1 4HS w www.howardleague.org
@TheHowardLeague

2021

Company limited by guarantee
No. 898514
Registered charity
No. 251926

ISBN 978-1-911114-58-1



9 781911 114581 >
ISBN 978-1-911114-58-1