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A B S T R A C T

The incursion of Information Technologies in the field of education is an undeniable fact that today includes immersion in media education in the classroom. The increase in the use of ICTs in the classroom has raised a concern about the possible impact on the prevalence of problems associated with problematic use of the Internet. This article presents data on an exploratory cross-sectional non-experimental design carried out based on a non-probability prepositive sample through the application of an ad-hoc developed questionnaire. The data in this article correspond to the responses of 832 students of Compulsory Secondary Education in three educational centres in the Autonomous Community of Cantabria, Spain. Two of the educational centres are privately owned, and one of them is public. One of the private centres uses educational methodologies based on the high use of information and communication technologies, as each student uses a personal computer in the classroom. The questionnaire used includes EUPI-A, SOGS-RA, and CERM scales. The questionnaire also includes questions about time spent on internet use and sports betting and gambling or game participation. The data are of interest of researchers in developmental, educational, and behavioural psychology and in statistical scale development.
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1. Data

In 2009, J.L. Rodríguez Zapatero — President of the Spanish Government — announced the ICT Plan with the aim of updating education by the use of portable devices. This ICT Plan includes the use of a device per student for educational use in a model called one-to-one. The implementation of this ICT plan was uneven, mainly due to the political particularities of regional governments, difficulties in the expansion of internet broadband, the complexity of the management of based laptops in schools and the lack of budget aggravated by the economic crisis that the country suffered. For those reasons, the plan was not fully implemented in schools. This movement of educational renewal collided head-on with the costs of acquiring technology -devices, network infrastructure and software, the low preparation of educational content by publishers, and the economic crisis that meant a sharp budget cut in both public and subsidised schools.

In spite of this, in recent years, the process of methodological change based on the adaptation of New Technologies and the Internet in the classroom has undergone a strong revolution in Spain. This revolution takes place, in part, thanks to the proliferation of devices such as Chromebook or iPad devices, with cheaper costs for the end user, simplicity of use by the student, and simple management by the school. In the case of Chromebook devices, in the last two years, there have been many educational experiences that have been carried out jointly by schools, Google - the company responsible for the platform of administration and service G-Suite for Education and the ChromeOS system, the fundamental basis for the operation of Chromebook, and the respective regional Ministries of Education. These experiences are aimed at introducing Chromebook as a digital platform for content managed and provided through G-Suite and complemented by the use of digital licenses of online course books. In the Autonomous Community of Cantabria, where the implementation of the ICT 2.0...
plan was not completed at all, there has been a trend in recent years that advocates methodological change and the introduction of ICT in the classroom. Nowadays (2019), only the reference educational centre of this study presents the use of a Chromebook device in one-to-one mode at all levels of Secondary Education in Cantabria.

Despite the fact that at the time of the study (2016) the implementation of digital contents and Chromebook-managed devices was already taking place in a few schools in other communities of the country, the implementation of the one-to-one model (a device for each student) was a new feature in the community of Cantabria. On this date, only the educational centre of the study had this model of classroom work for all levels of ESO. The choice of this educational centre was justified by the purpose of the study and, therefore, of convenience.

The choice of the other two centres that make up the study is determined by the choice of both public and private centres in the degree of an economic concert by the Ministry of Education. For both cases, the choice of the sample limits the possibilities to those centres that use classroom work methodologies characterised by the use of traditional resources and methodologies: use of physical books, carrying out tasks based on explanation, or group work without focusing their development on the use of the Internet or online tools, except for those subjects and tasks where their use is necessary (subjects such as programming, computing, or the carrying out of certain school tasks).

The data in this article correspond to the responses of 832 students of Compulsory Secondary Education in three educational centres in the Autonomous Community of Cantabria, Spain. Two of the educational centres are privately owned, and one of them is public. One of the private centres uses educational methodologies based on the high use of information and communication technologies, as each student uses a personal computer in the classroom. Descriptive details of the sample are shown in Tables 1–5.

In order to carry out the study, and in the absence of a consensual or firm bibliographic definition, the operational definition of the “high use of information and communication technologies at classroom” has been estimated for this study as:

“the use of ICT technologies in a one-to-one approach in which each student has his or her own device for the course of the classes, the online educational contents, and the necessary software to carry out the academic tasks with the use of these devices in practically the totality of the classroom subjects, reaching an average use superior than 4 h a day on average.”

The centres that show a “low technology use in the classroom” show a use inferior to the 2 h a day on average.

The data were collected by the use of a questionnaire that includes EUPI-A [1,2], SOGS-RA [3–6] and CERM scales [7–12]. The questionnaire also includes questions about age, gender, internet use on classroom and out of classroom, as well as sports betting and gambling prevalence. Reliability of scales are shown on Table 6.

2. Experimental design, materials, and methods

The main objective of the work was to research the possible explanatory interrelation between the high use of technology in the classroom and potentially problematic behaviours in adolescents through a study not carried out under experimental conditions –without manipulation of dependent variables – in a subset of the population in the age range included in compulsory secondary education. In order to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Hi Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2
Age (Mean) by educational level of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Hi Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3
Gender of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Hi Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>832</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4
Age of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Hi Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5
Crosstabulation educational level and gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Hi Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ℓ</td>
<td>ℓ</td>
<td>ℓ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO2</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cARRY OUT THIS STUDY, AN EXPLORATORY CROSS-SECTIONAL NON-EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN WAS CARRIED OUT. THIS STUDY WAS BASED ON A NON-PROBABILITY PURPOSIVE SAMPLE, SINCE THIS IS A SAMPLE IN WHICH THE CENTRES WERE CLASSIFIED BY TYPE FOR THE PURPOSE OF THE STUDY AND THE STUDENTS WERE NOT RANDOMLY SAMPLED WHEN ALL THE STUDENTS PARTICIPATED, FOCUSED ON THE POPULATION OF SECONDARY EDUCATION STUDENTS IN THE AUTONOMOUS COMMUNITY OF CANTABRIA THROUGH THE APPLICATION OF AN AD-HOC DEVELOPED QUESTIONNAIRE, BUILT SPECIFICALLY FOR THIS STUDY.
The study included a sample of 832 students of Compulsory Secondary Education between the ages of 12 and 17 (M = 13.72, SD = 1.21), of which 370 were girls (44.47%) and 462 boys (55.53%), from different public and private (subsidised) educational centres in the Autonomous Community of Cantabria (a population of 22,003 pupils). One of the private centres is immersed in an Educational Innovation Programme (PIIE programme) of the Government of Cantabria and is characterised by the intensive use of technology in the classroom: students use a Chromebook device as a working tool, use digital books and have constant access to the Internet - albeit limited and secure. All the centres considered in the sampling present several lines and do not show segregation of the students.

Educative Centre A, (Private, educational methodologies include High Technology use in the classroom, n = 287). Religiously-owned centre subsidised by the Department of Education of the Government of Cantabria for the teaching of the levels of Compulsory Secondary Education, which also teaches the levels corresponding to the Baccalaureate. All the answers were obtained through the online questionnaire posed by the researchers. The centre, located in an area of the city with a population of average socioeconomic characteristics, represents one of the most advanced bets of the Regional Ministry of Education as one of the participants in the PIIE Programme - Integrated Programme of Educational Innovation - [13], which aims at the evolution of education through methodological reform in the classroom. The commitment to technology in the centre is strong, along with the reform of the programming of subjects, its staff follows an intense training program in new teaching methodologies and use of ICTs in the classroom as a teaching medium and, since its implementation, has provided students with a device (a Chromebook) in possession. The participation of ESO students was very high, participating in all the courses of the four educational levels, reaching a participation of 287 students. In this case, the centre studies chose a Chromebook device, which includes content and tasks distributed through several tools such as Moodle or Google Classroom, digital textbooks and software (office suites and mail systems, such as Google Drive or Gmail in the case of G-Suite).

For the choice of the other two educational centres, the characteristics of the main centre were taken into consideration due to the similarity, focusing on the existence of three or more courses per level. Thus, in the case of subsidised or private centres, it was limited to 9 of the 42 possible samples to be considered. In the case of the public centre, this limited the possibilities to 40 of the 47 possible centres. The choice of the representative centre of each category was made randomly.

Educative Centre B, (Private, classic educational methodologies with Low Technology use in the classroom, n = 265). A religiously-owned centre subsidised by the Department of Education of the Government of Cantabria for the teaching of the levels of Compulsory Secondary Education. The centre is located in an area of the city with a medium-high purchasing power, has the technological means in accordance with the commitment made by the Ministry of Education of the Government of Cantabria for the use of ICT in the classroom, without being integrated as a PIIE centre. This commitment includes the use of pedagogical means, such as digital blackboards, but not the integration of a specific device for students or the use of specific digital didactic means. The participation of ESO students was high, reaching a participation of 265 students. All student responses were collected through the printed questionnaire and were manually transcribed for analysis.

Educative Centre C, (Public, classic educational methodologies with Low Technology use in the classroom, n = 280). A Public Centre belonging to the Department of Education of the Government of Cantabria located in an urban municipality near the capital of the Autonomous Community. This centre offers ESO studies and develops different educational plans, including the ICT plan, which provides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Theoretical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Hi Tech</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUPI-A</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>0.783</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOGS-RA</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.853</td>
<td>0.616</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CERN</td>
<td>0.760</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>0.761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
specific computer rooms and computers with a projector in the classrooms. The use of new technologies and Internet at the centre is, therefore, quite limited, counting the aforementioned rooms with 16 and 18 connected computers for the more than 500 students that represent the total number of enrolled. The participation of the students of this centre covers the stages of ESO, with a participation close to 75% of the Secondary Education students. All the answers were obtained through the paper questionnaire and were transcribed individually for analysis. The questionnaire was a designed ad-hoc and included EUPI-A, SOGS-RA, and CERM scales.

EUPI-A scale. Developed with the aim of becoming a screening scale of problematic Internet use among adolescents, developed according to the diagnostic criteria collected in the DSM-V for gambling and gambling disorder based on the Internet, as well as the instruments and studies previous to the date of its construction. It includes 11 first-person statements, relating to a single dimension, with a Likert type response format of 5 options in a range of values from 0 -Nothing agree-to 5 -Totally agree-. The scale allows discrimination in its application between Moderate Internet Use and Problematic Internet Use. Originally, in its validation, the questionnaire yielded a Cronbach alpha reliability (0.820), establishing its cut-off point at 16 points [1]. Descriptive details of the sample on EUPI-A scale are shown in Fig. 1 and Tables 7–10.

CERM Scale, Mobile-Related Experience Questionnaire. CERM is, together with CERI -Internet-Related Experience Questionnaire-, an adaptation of the PRI [8,9] questionnaire that comprises 10 Likert type items with four possible answers in increasing order according to intensity and that contemplates two factors: the existence of conflicts and the communicational (sic) and emotional use. This questionnaire shows good overall reliability, reaching a Cronbach alpha of .805 in its development and allows to estimate, continuously, the degree of problems present in the participants. Occasionally, the use of non-hierarchical cluster analysis can be used to obtain cut-off scores in order to determine the

Fig. 1. EUPI-A scores histogram.
Table 7
EUPI-A Scores summary statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>12.084</td>
<td>10.754</td>
<td>12.483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>7.5878</td>
<td>7.1652</td>
<td>7.9981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>57.547</td>
<td>51.340</td>
<td>63.970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>1.183</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.887</td>
<td>1.984</td>
<td>0.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile 25</td>
<td>10,054.0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8
EUPI-A Scores summary statistics by educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESO1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>6.7474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>45.528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile 25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9
Summary statistics of the EUPI-A scores by educational centre and educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESO1</td>
<td>ESO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>51.164</td>
<td>59.880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.349</td>
<td>1.298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>2.007</td>
<td>2.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile 25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
existence of homogeneous groups of responses. Descriptive details of the sample on the CERM scale are shown in Fig. 2 and Tables 11–14.

The SOGS-RA questionnaire in its Spanish version [5] is a 12-item dichotomous (Yes/No) questionnaire to assess the presence of problem gambling and risk gambling, derived from the SOGS questionnaire [6] and adapted to the adolescent population. It is capable of achieving reliability, evidenced by the Cronbach alpha coefficient of 0.800. This scale allows the classification of the

### Table 10
Mean, median and standard deviation of all EUPI-A scale questions obtained from the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
<th>Low Tech</th>
<th>Hi Tech</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.476</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.301</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.135</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.267</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.397</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.366</td>
<td>1.196</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.419</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.268</td>
<td>0.921</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.918</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.288</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.924</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.953</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>0.807</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.898</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Histogram](image)

**Fig. 2.** CERM scores histogram.
### Table 11
CERM Scores summary statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low Tech</td>
<td>Hi Tech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>16.269</td>
<td>15.714</td>
<td>16.687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.1751</td>
<td>3.9026</td>
<td>4.4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>17.432</td>
<td>15.230</td>
<td>19.360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.454</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile 25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12
CERM Scores summary statistics by educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESO1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>14.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>4.0726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>16.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>1.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile 25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13
Summary statistics of the CERM scores by educational centre and educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESO1</td>
<td>ESO2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>1.049</td>
<td>0.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.725</td>
<td>−0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile 25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
participants in non-player or without gambling problems, risk player or problematic player according to the cut points, usually those proposed by and used in different studies; 0–1 without gambling problems, 2–3 player at risk, 4 or more problem players. Descriptive details of the sample on the SOGS-RA scale are shown in Tables 15–17.

The questionnaire also included some questions about time spent on internet use and sports betting and gambling or game participation. Data obtained from all respondents are shown in Tables 18–20.

### Table 14
Mean, median and standard deviation of all CERM scale questions obtained from the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.888</td>
<td>1.746</td>
<td>1.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.406</td>
<td>1.296</td>
<td>1.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.407</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>1.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>1.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.905</td>
<td>2.757</td>
<td>2.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.624</td>
<td>1.657</td>
<td>1.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td>1.693</td>
<td>1.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.704</td>
<td>1.636</td>
<td>1.741</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 15
SOGS-RA Scores summary statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.160</td>
<td>0.8363</td>
<td>0.9317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>7.003</td>
<td>6.244</td>
<td>7.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>63.454</td>
<td>45.703</td>
<td>77.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16
OGS-RA Scores summary statistics by educational level.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ESO1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.4084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>2.406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>5.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent.25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 17
Data of SOGS-RA scale questions obtained from the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Public (Low Tech)</th>
<th>Private</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18 814</td>
<td>7 273</td>
<td>5 260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11 821</td>
<td>4 276</td>
<td>7 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 825</td>
<td>3 277</td>
<td>4 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>51 781</td>
<td>16 264</td>
<td>10 254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21 811</td>
<td>8 272</td>
<td>6 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>18 814</td>
<td>8 272</td>
<td>2 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13 819</td>
<td>4 276</td>
<td>4 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5 827</td>
<td>3 277</td>
<td>2 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>11 821</td>
<td>3 277</td>
<td>4 261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3 829</td>
<td>0 280</td>
<td>1 264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5 827</td>
<td>2 278</td>
<td>2 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>7 825</td>
<td>2 278</td>
<td>4 261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 18
Internet use in the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESO</th>
<th>Public (LT)</th>
<th>Private (LT)</th>
<th>Private (HT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
<td>1–2h</td>
<td>2–3h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 19
Internet use outside the classroom.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESO</th>
<th>Public (LT)</th>
<th>Private (LT)</th>
<th>Private (HT)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;1h</td>
<td>1–2h</td>
<td>2–3h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20
Respondents who claim to have participated in gambling/sport bets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gambling</th>
<th>Sport Bets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\varnothing$</td>
<td>$d$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (LT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (LT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (HT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (LT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (LT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (HT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (LT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (LT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (HT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public (LT)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (LT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (HT)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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