

Opening Pandora's loot box: Weak links with gambling and player opinions on probability disclosures in China

Leon Y. Xiao

The Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn,
Lincoln's Inn, London WC2A 3TL, United Kingdom

Department of Law, School of Law,
Queen Mary University of London,
Mile End Road, London E1 4NS, United Kingdom

Centre for Commercial Law Studies, School of Law,
Queen Mary University of London,
67-69 Lincoln's Inn Fields, London WC2A 3JB, United Kingdom

The City Law School,
City, University of London
Northampton Square, Clerkenwell, London EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom
leon.xiao.y@gmail.com

Tullia C. Fraser

Independent Researcher

Philip W. S. Newall

Experimental Gambling Research Laboratory,
School of Health, Medical and Applied Sciences,
CQUniversity,
400 Kent St, Sydney, NSW 2000, Australia

Keywords

Gambling, Video gaming, Loot boxes, Video game law, Video gaming regulations, Consumer protection, Exposure to gambling, Gambling in video games

INTRODUCTION

Paid loot boxes are quasi-gambling monetisation methods in video games that provide the player with randomised rewards of varying in-game and, potentially, real-world value (1,2). Loot boxes are prevalent in video games internationally (3,4), and are more

Extended Abstract Presented at Chinese DiGRA 2021

© 2021 Authors & Digital Games Research Association DiGRA. Personal and educational classroom use of this paper is allowed, commercial use requires specific permission from the author.

prevalent in the People's Republic of China (the PRC)¹ than in the UK (5). Loot box purchasing has been found to be positively correlated with problem gambling in 15 previous studies in Western countries, including the US (6,7), Canada (8), the UK (9,10), Germany (11), Denmark (12), and Australasia (6,13), and internationally in general (14–20). However, it is not known whether the same positive correlation can be found in non-Western countries, as cultural differences have been identified as a factor which affects gambling behaviours (21,22). Many countries are grappling with how best to regulate loot boxes, including non-Western countries, *e.g.*, Brazil (23). As the existing literature is based on 'Western Educated Industrialized Rich and Democratic (WEIRD)' samples (24), it is desirable to attempt to replicate this correlation in non-Western countries to broaden the literature and inform forthcoming regulation.

The PRC is the largest video game market in the world (25). Unlike in many Western countries, gambling is strictly prohibited by law in the PRC except for state-sponsored lotteries (26–28), and casual wagering between family and friends on entertainment activities such as card games or Mahjong (29,30). Access to and engagement with multiple forms of gambling represent a risk factor for problem gambling in Western countries (31). The correlation between loot box purchasing and problem gambling may not appear in the PRC because the lower availability of commercial gambling products may reduce gambling participation, and hence the distribution of problem gambling symptomology.

Further, the PRC is the only jurisdiction to uniquely regulate loot boxes by legally requiring video game companies to disclose the probabilities of obtaining loot box rewards as a consumer protection measure (32–34). Our previous study found that only 5.5% of games with loot boxes surveyed disclosed probabilities using the most prominent format (5). However, it is not known whether players have in fact seen these probability disclosures, and whether they believe that these disclosures have influenced their loot box purchasing behaviour. Obtaining data on these issues can inform the international debate on probability disclosures as a loot box consumer protection measure.

The following hypotheses were preregistered at <<https://osf.io/gan6k>>.

Hypothesis 1: Loot box expenditure and problem gambling will be positively correlated amongst people who have gambled in the previous 12 months.

Hypothesis 2: Loot box expenditure will be positively correlated with engagement with gambling in the previous 12 months.

Hypothesis 3: Loot box expenditure will be positively correlated with impulsiveness.

METHOD

Cross-sectional data were collected in an online survey ($N = 879$), including by being circulated through the mailing list of CDiGRA. Participants were predominantly male

¹ In this paper, the PRC refers to Mainland China and excludes the Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong and Macau, and Taiwan, as the applicable laws in these areas are different.

(709; 80.7%), students (561; 63.8%), and young ($M_{age} = 23.0, SD = 5.9$). This is similar to previous studies, which recruited predominantly (~90%) males (15,18,19).

RESULTS

The hypotheses were tested via Spearman's rank correlation tests.

Hypothesis 1 was rejected: loot box expenditure and problem gambling were unrelated ($r_s(85) = .07, p = .259$).

Hypothesis 2 was accepted: a statistically significant correlation between loot box expenditure and engagement with gambling in the previous 12 months ($r_s(877) = .06, p = .030$) was found, although it was very weak.

Hypothesis 3 was accepted: a statistically significant correlation between loot box expenditure and impulsiveness ($r_s(877) = .06, p = .038$) was found, although it was very weak.

Overall, 362 of 428 loot box purchasers reported seeing loot box probability disclosures (84.6%). As to the perceived effects of seeing probability disclosures, of these 362 participants, only 70 (19.3%) reported buying fewer loot boxes and spending less.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The previous literature has shown a positive correlation between loot box purchasing and problem gambling across numerous Western countries (35). In contrast, the present study found either insignificant or muted positive correlations between loot box purchasing and preregistered gambling-related constructs in the PRC. These results suggest that caution should be exercised when extrapolating Western findings on new digital markets to other jurisdictions due to cultural and other potential differences.

One possible explanation for the observed muted correlations between loot box expenditure and gambling is that the relatively traditional gambling products available in the PRC have little appeal to video game players. Lotteries are the only legal commercial gambling products and may be seen by younger video game players as outdated, unexciting, and unattractive, as the experience involves purchasing physical tickets and waiting for results. In contrast, other gambling products legally unavailable in the PRC, such as electronic gambling machines (36), or equivalent mobile phone casino games (37), are more gamified and have structural characteristics similar to loot boxes, such as ease of use, electronic delivery, and opportunities for rapid play and instant gratification. In support of this explanation, a UK study found that loot box purchasing was more strongly positively correlated with online casino games than with playing bingo or sports betting, and, importantly, was *not* correlated with lottery purchasing (38). Although the present results appear unresponsive of the loot box purchasing and problem gambling literature (cf. 35), they could perhaps motivate deeper investigation of this correlation towards the refinement of a more nuanced psychological explanation, *i.e.*, that loot box purchasing is correlated with engagement with and problematic use of specific types of gambling that are gamified and electronic, rather than all types of gambling.

As to probability disclosures, importantly, only 19.3% of loot box purchasers who saw disclosures reported buying fewer loot boxes as a consequence. Stronger interventions, such as maximum spending limits and increasing the probabilities of winning rare rewards and reducing the total number of potential rewards (39), may be needed to

effectively reduce potential harms from loot box purchasing. A greater number of customisable and flexible ‘ethical game design’ interventions exist given that loot boxes are purely digital products, in comparison to what is possible in gambling (32,39,40).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Drummond A, Sauer JD, Hall LC, Zendle D, Loudon MR. Why loot boxes could be regulated as gambling. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2020 Jun 29;4:986.
2. Nielsen RKL, Grabarczyk P. Are Loot Boxes Gambling? *Random Reward Mechanisms in Video Games*. *ToDIGRA*. 2019 Oct 11;4(3):171–207.
3. Rockloff M, Russell AM, Greer NM, Lole LR, Hing N, Browne M. Loot Boxes: Are they grooming youth for gambling? [Internet]. Central Queensland University; 2020 Jun [cited 2020 Aug 21]. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.25946/5ef151ac1ce6f>
4. Zendle D, Meyer R, Cairns P, Waters S, Ballou N. The prevalence of loot boxes in mobile and desktop games. *Addiction*. 2020 Feb 6;115(9):1768–72.
5. Xiao LY, Henderson LL, Yang Y, Newall PWS. Gaming the system: suboptimal compliance with loot box probability disclosure regulations in China. *Behavioural Public Policy*. 2021;Advance Online Publication:1–27.
6. Drummond A, Sauer JD, Ferguson CJ, Hall LC. The relationship between problem gambling, excessive gaming, psychological distress and spending on loot boxes in Aotearoa New Zealand, Australia, and the United States—A cross-national survey. *PLOS ONE*. 2020 Mar 23;15(3):e0230378.
7. Zendle D, Cairns P. Loot boxes are again linked to problem gambling: Results of a replication study. *PLoS One* 14(3): e0213194 [Internet]. 2019 Mar 7 [cited 2020 Apr 13];14(3). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0213194>
8. Brooks GA, Clark L. Associations between loot box use, problematic gaming and gambling, and gambling-related cognitions. *Addict Behav*. 2019 Sep 1;96:26–34.
9. Zendle D. Gambling-like video game practices: A cross-sectional study of links with problem gambling and disordered gaming [Internet]. *PsyArXiv*; 2019 [cited 2021 Jan 23]. Available from: <https://psyarxiv.com/fh3vx/>
10. Wardle H, Zendle D. Loot Boxes, Gambling, and Problem Gambling Among Young People: Results from a Cross-Sectional Online Survey. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*. 2021;24(4):267–74.
11. von Meduna M, Steinmetz F, Ante L, Reynolds J, Fiedler I. Loot boxes are gambling-like elements in video games with harmful potential: Results from a large-scale population survey. *Technology in Society*. 2020 Nov 1;63:101395.
12. Kristiansen S, Severin MC. Loot box engagement and problem gambling among adolescent gamers: Findings from a national survey. *Addict Behav*. 2019;103:106254.

13. Rockloff M, Russell AMT, Greer N, Lole L, Hing N, Browne M. Young people who purchase loot boxes are more likely to have gambling problems: An online survey of adolescents and young adults living in NSW Australia. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions* [Internet]. 2021 Feb 24 [cited 2021 Apr 6]; Advance Online Publication. Available from: <https://akjournals.com/view/journals/2006/aop/article-10.1556-2006.2021.00007/article-10.1556-2006.2021.00007.xml>
14. Hall LC, Drummond A, Sauer JD, Ferguson CJ. Effects of self-isolation and quarantine on loot box spending and excessive gaming—results of a natural experiment. *PeerJ*. 2021 Feb 3;9:e10705.
15. Macey J, Hamari J. eSports, Skins and Loot Boxes: Participants, Practices and Problematic Behaviour Associated With Emergent Forms of Gambling. *New Media Soc*. 2019 Jan 1;21(1):20–41.
16. Zendle D. Problem gamblers spend less money when loot boxes are removed from a game: a before and after study of *Heroes of the Storm*. *PeerJ*. 2019 Oct 29;7:e7700.
17. Zendle D, Cairns P, Barnett H, McCall C. Paying for loot boxes is linked to problem gambling, regardless of specific features like cash-out and pay-to-win. *Comput Hum Behav*. 2019 Jul 9;102:181–91.
18. Zendle D, Meyer R, Over H. Adolescents and loot boxes: links with problem gambling and motivations for purchase. *R Soc open sci* 6: 190049. 2019 Jun 19;6:190049.
19. Zendle D, Cairns P. Video game loot boxes are linked to problem gambling: Results of a large-scale survey. *PLoS One* 13(11): e0206767 [Internet]. 2018 Nov 21 [cited 2020 Apr 13];13(11). Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0206767>
20. Li W, Mills D, Nower L. The Relationship of Loot Box Purchases to Problem Video Gaming and Problem Gambling. *Addict Behav*. 2019;97:27–34.
21. Ellenbogen S, Gupta R, Derevensky JL. A Cross-Cultural Study of Gambling Behaviour Among Adolescents. *J Gambl Stud*. 2007 Mar 1;23(1):25–39.
22. Raylu N, Oei TP. Role of culture in gambling and problem gambling. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2004 Jan 1;23(8):1087–114.
23. Dealessandri M. Brazil launches inquiry to ban loot boxes [Internet]. *GamesIndustry.biz*. 2021 [cited 2021 May 5]. Available from: <https://www.gamesindustry.biz/articles/2021-04-06-brazil-launches-inquiry-to-ban-loot-boxes>
24. Henrich J, Heine SJ, Norenzayan A. The weirdest people in the world? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*. 2010 Jun;33(2–3):61–83.
25. Statista. Leading gaming markets worldwide in 2020, by gaming revenue [Internet]. Statista. 2020 [cited 2021 Apr 15]. Available from: <https://www.statista.com/statistics/308454/gaming-revenue-countries/>

26. Zeng Z, Zhang D. A Profile of Lottery Players in Guangzhou, China. *International Gambling Studies*. 2007 Dec 1;7(3):265–80.
27. Li H, Mao LL, Zhang JJ, Wu Y, Li A, Chen J. Dimensions of Problem Gambling Behavior Associated with Purchasing Sports Lottery. *J Gambl Stud*. 2012 Mar 1;28(1):47–68.
28. Ye Y, Gao W, Wang Y, Luo J. Comparison of the addiction levels, sociodemographics and buying behaviours of three main types of lottery buyers in China. *Addiction Research & Theory*. 2012 Aug 1;20(4):307–16.
29. Wu AMS, Lau JTF. Gambling in China: socio-historical evolution and current challenges. *Addiction*. 2015;110(2):210–6.
30. Steinmüller H. The moving boundaries of social heat: gambling in rural China. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*. 2011;17(2):263–80.
31. Russell AMT, Hing N, Browne M. Risk Factors for Gambling Problems Specifically Associated with Sports Betting. *J Gambl Stud*. 2019 Dec 1;35(4):1211–28.
32. King DL, Delfabbro PH. Video Game Monetization (e.g., ‘Loot Boxes’): a Blueprint for Practical Social Responsibility Measures. *Int J Ment Health Addiction*. 2019 Feb 1;17(1):166–79.
33. McCaffrey M. The macro problem of microtransactions: The self-regulatory challenges of video game loot boxes. *Business Horizons*. 2019 Jul 1;62(4):483–95.
34. Xiao LY. Regulating Loot Boxes as Gambling? Towards a Combined Legal and Self-Regulatory Consumer Protection Approach. *Interactive Entertainment Law Rev*. 2021 Jun;4(1):27–47.
35. Garea SS, Drummond A, Sauer JD, Hall LC, Williams MN. Meta-analysis of the relationship between problem gambling, excessive gaming and loot box spending. *International Gambling Studies*. 2021 Apr 26; Advance Online Publication:1–20.
36. Schüll ND. *Addiction by Design* [Internet]. Princeton University Press; 2012 [cited 2021 May 17]. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400834655>
37. James RJE, O’Malley C, Tunney RJ. Understanding the psychology of mobile gambling: A behavioural synthesis. *British Journal of Psychology*. 2017;108(3):608–25.
38. Zendle D. Beyond loot boxes: a variety of gambling-like practices in video games are linked to both problem gambling and disordered gaming. *PeerJ*. 2020 Jul 14;8:e9466.
39. Xiao LY, Newall PWS. Probability disclosures are not enough: Reducing loot box reward complexity as a part of ethical video game design [Internet]. *PsyArXiv*; 2021 [cited 2021 May 3]. Available from: <https://psyarxiv.com/nuksd/>

40. Xiao LY, Henderson LL. Towards an Ethical Game Design Solution to Loot Boxes: a Commentary on King and Delfabbro. *Int J Ment Health Addiction* [Internet]. 2019 Dec 18 [cited 2020 Aug 3]; Advance online publication. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-019-00164-4>