



Co-funded by
the European Union

PROtect Integrity Online Erasmus+ Project
Deliverable D2.2
Evaluation Report

Pim Verschuuren, Rennes 2 University



JANUARY 2025



Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Contents

Executive summary	4
1. Introduction	5
2. The importance of evaluating education programmes	6
3. Scope	7
4. Content of the integrity sessions	10
5. Education session observation.....	12
6. Athlete feedback results analysis (quantitative and qualitative feedback).....	13
Dimension 1 - Appraisal if the Code of Conduct is understood following the awareness-raising sessions.....	13
Dimension 2 - The perception of manipulation and betting risks	14
Dimension 3 – Appraisal of the education sessions.....	16
7. Conclusion and recommendations for future antimanipulation educations programmes	17
Bibliography.....	19
Annexe 1: Full results of the questionnaire	20

Executive summary

- The PROtect Integrity awareness-raising sessions consisted of short and interactive in-person physical visits, conducted by player association representatives. The format and modalities were judged by both those representatives and the end-users, as adapted to the agenda and met the needs and constraints of the audience. The feedback has been 93.7% positive.
- The post-session evaluation feedback indicates that the sessions effectively raised awareness on the subject of competition manipulation and betting. 92% of the respondents responded correctly to the post-session question on the betting rule.
- The risk of sport manipulation varied depending on the location and in some areas the risk was measured at very high levels. Betting behaviour however is highly prevalent across all countries and disciplines. 69.5% of the respondents indicated that players from their individual sport bet “occasionally”, “often” or “very often”.
- To continue improving the effectiveness of the sessions, key recommendations were uncovered:
 - Further adapt the sessions by conducting risk and need assessments of the audience and make any and all changes recommended in the evaluation of past sessions.
 - Bolster the interactive parts and consider the sessions as two-way interactions.

1. Introduction

This report represents the D2.2 Deliverable of the PROtect Integrity Online Erasmus+. It aims to “provide the academic evaluation of the online education created and the education delivered, including feedback gathered by athletes who received education. The report will identify strengths, areas that require further work and will include conclusions and recommendations for the future” (PROtect Integrity Online application form, p.48).

The project began with a preliminary research phase, in which good practices and input from both specialised literature and education experts were synthesized (Work package 2). This assisted with the creation of education material (Work package 3), which the project partners (listed below) delivered to a total of 7,533 professional and elite level athletes in five different countries and five main team sports. The education has been implemented via team visits (player associations travelling to each team they represent in the given country/sport to deliver education) and supported by the use of online materials via communicators and social media platforms to amplify and extend its reach.

2. The importance of evaluating education programmes

The Mapping and recommendation report (D2.1) published earlier in the framework of the PIO Project underlined that the evaluation phase is rarely conducted, although it is essential to the strategic management of any education programme. Without it, responsible organisations cannot be held accountable for the implemented activities, nor can they certify they had any influence on the knowledge, attitudes and behaviours of the targeted audience. Evaluating education programmes involves three main actions.

Monitoring

This is the most basic and common action. Most often, organisations record statistics on the resource investment (list of material used, human and financial resources, overall allocated budget), on education activities (e.g. number of sessions, number of social media messages or list of material used) or on the audience (number and demographics of persons in attendance, number of e-learning completions or app downloads, number of social media interactions or website traffic).

Learning process evaluation

To what extent did the programme achieve its immediate learning objectives? For example, was the delivery of the programme successful in terms of raising understanding and knowledge amongst its participants on the programme subject? Organisations involved in antimanipulation programmes often use short feedback questionnaires at the end of sessions to collect such data. For instance, Rugby Players Ireland carried out a survey in 2021, through which they recognised that 91% of their members were aware of applicable betting restrictions. Interviews or focus groups could also be useful in measuring the immediate impact of education interventions and tools.

“For the subsequent training to players, we took a sample of more than 1,500 athletes (out of 14,700 people who were targeted by the education project in its second year) and asked them to complete a confidential questionnaire, variously on paper or online and translated into the local language as appropriate, to assess how much they had learned.” (PROtect Integrity Report, 2017, p. 4).

Programme evaluation

This phase will indicate the effectiveness of the education programme and feed the strategic planning for the following education plan. If the strategic objective was to influence attitudes or behaviours, the collected data on education activities and on the learning process needs to be combined with thorough research investigations. Scientific institutions could be mobilised at this stage (or preferably from the strategic planning phase) to apply one or several of the methods that can be useful in determining education goal achievement such as longitudinal surveys, or qualitative research, through focus groups, interviews, case studies or discourse analysis. Ideally, both qualitative and quantitative methods should be combined and triangulated with documentary research to provide richer insight.

When it comes to antimanipulation programmes, different measurable outcomes are pertinent:

- Integrity behaviour (number of reported/detected cases, number of betting cases, etc.)
- Individual psychosocial aspects (moral disengagement, attitude to manipulation, intentions to accept manipulation offers, etc.)
- Perceived social norms (perceived prevalence of manipulation, ethical climate index, perceived legitimacy of the anti-manipulation system, etc.)

3. Scope

The limited time frame and resources of the PIO Project did not allow us to conduct a full-fledged assessment of the effectiveness of the education programme it delivered. Besides, the differences in styles, content, audience and context between the delivery across the five countries and eight-player associations constrained the capacity to compare the deliveries and generate common results.

Instead, the evaluation relied on a learning process evaluation, which was administered shortly after the completion of the in-club visits. It consisted of two measurements. The first is a questionnaire (accessible here: [LINK](#)), which contains nine questions distributed in three parts:

- **Part 1: If the information provided has been understood** (*The goal is to understand if the session managed to convey the basic messages*).
 - 1) What is inside information? Tick the correct answer(s).
 - Information on injuries (YES)
 - Match tactics (YES)
 - Team line-up that has already been announced publicly (NO)
 - I don't know
 - 2) If you were approached to fix a game, rejected the offer but did not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?
 - Yes (RIGHT)
 - No, because I rejected the offer (WRONG)
 - I don't know
 - 3) Can you bet on your own sport? *If required, edit the response based on the country- and sport-specific regulations
 - Yes (WRONG)
 - Yes, if it's not a game you're playing in (WRONG)
 - No, betting on any game of your own sport is prohibited (RIGHT)
 - No, but I can ask someone else to bet for me (WRONG)
 - I don't know
- **Part 2: The perception of manipulation and betting risk** (*The goal is to understand the relevance of the manipulation/betting subject*).
 - 4) How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?
 - Very high
 - High
 - Medium
 - Low
 - Very low
 - 5) How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?
 - Very often
 - Often
 - Medium
 - Rarely
 - Very rarely
- **Part 3: General feedback** (*The goal is to measure the level of satisfaction with the session delivery and collect potential suggestions*).
 - 6) Do you believe that the session was clear and useful?
 - Definitely yes
 - Yes

- Neutral
 - No
 - Definitely no
- 7) Could you please evaluate the quality of the digital materials presented?
- Very high
 - High
 - Medium
 - Low
 - Very low
- 8) Do you have any suggestions for enhancement of the digital materials?
(open question)
- 9) Please make any suggestion or remark to improve the delivery of such sessions:
(open question)

The questionnaire was administered to a total of 1,049 athletes following the in-club visits. Here is a breakdown of the collected answers per country and association (all answers are presented in Annex):

Association	Number of persons covered by the education sessions	Number of collected answers
AIP (Volleyball, Italy)	225	60
AJFS (Men's Futsal, Spain)	2080	237
AJFSF (Women's Futsal, Spain)	468	81
AJPH (Handball, France)	1856	223
GIBA (Basketball, Italy)	608	90
HSF (Handball, Denmark)	855	108
RPI (Rugby Union, Ireland)	318	154
SNB (Basketball, France)	1122	96
TOTAL	7532	1049

The second evaluation measurement is interviews and focus groups, conducted after the in-person sessions. Each association was asked to conduct an individual or a collective interview following one of their in-person visits to their clubs. The questions covered the same topics as the questionnaires:

- If the information provided has been understood? The goal was to understand if the session managed to convey the basic messages.
- The perception of manipulation and betting risk. The goal is to understand the relevance of the manipulation/betting subject.
- General feedback. The goal is to measure the level of satisfaction with the session delivery and collect potential suggestions.

The main content of the discussion was transcribed and thematically categorised in a codebook by each player association. Here is a breakdown of the participants.

Association	Number of participants (interviews/focus groups)	Context	Division
AIP	9	Male and female volleyball players (two online sessions)	
AJFS	3	Two Spanish professional futsal players and one former Spanish professional futsal player	1 st Division
AJFSF	5	Spanish and Brazilian women's futsal players	1 st & 2 nd Division
HSF	1	Male handball player	2 nd Division
RPI	3	Three rugby union players	1 st Division
AJPH	3	Women handball players	2 nd Division
SNB	1	One French basketball player	1 st Division
GIBA	1	One Italian male player	1 st Division

4. Content of the integrity sessions

The following table contains precise information on the format, content and material used by each association in the delivery of the education sessions. The Code of Conduct rules, messages and posters created by the PIO Project have been disseminated and used by all partners. Beyond the Code of Conduct, the sessions have been adapted to the local context, with varying side-subjects, focuses or materials used.

Association	Overall session length	Average length of the integrity presentation	Content of the integrity presentation	Education support documents used
AIP	30min	20min	Explanation of the European project, role of the Association, code of conduct rules	Poster, Leaflet & CoC Video sent to the team Whatsapp group. We presented the subject using a Powerpoint presentation. Posters and leaflets were distributed to each club.
AJFS	30min	10min	Review of the Code of Conduct with posters and leaflets (1 per player), and CoC Video share via Whatsapp group (players & staff)	Poster, Leaflet & CoC Video delivered to the team Whatsapp Group
AJFSF	40min	25min	Start asking who has received educational information from us in the past. Depending on the age of the group and their level of information I decide how to provide the information to them. Presented the 5 points code of conduct and a more dynamic interaction was encouraged through questions and active participation. If there are many new players that don't know the rules, we first focus on them	Posters, leaflets, and post-presentation quiz
AJPH	1h10min	15min	General introduction on the vital importance of integrity in sport. Overview of doping and sports betting. This included a presentation of the 5 main rules, which were put into perspective with general sports news and how sports betting controls work in France. Overview of what penalties apply to players. Focus on the importance of talking and not isolating oneself. Presentation of platforms to enable players to speak out anonymously. Platforms: Pharos and Signalsport.fr	Power point presentation including two videos. One was 50 seconds long, to introduce the general subject of integrity in sport and supplement what may have been said orally The second was about 1 minute long, to explain the importance of not remaining isolated, of paying attention to the people around the players and potential interaction with them. A mini-quiz has been added for young academy players. Posters were distributed to each club.

GIBA	30min	20min	Risks of match-fixing; risk of betting; rules and regulations; value of integrity. Presentation questions Quiz for feedback	Posters and quiz
HSF	60min	10min	Rules explained for the whole team (specific focuses for each visit)	Leaflets handed out and picture with poster
RPI	40min	10min	Highlighted the restrictions on betting in Rugby - went through the main points of World Rugby Regulation 6 and focussed on the potential sanctions. Several articles were provided on individuals who have been caught on the wrong side of Regulation 6 and the impact on them and those around them. A confidential e-mail was provided to use to report approaches.	Posters, Articles and Powerpoint
SNB	1h45	30mn	Introductory question/answer quiz (via kahoot): "Can you bet on ASVEL vs JL Bourg?". Overview of sports betting rules and the penalties incurred. Examples from the basketball business in France (file cross-referencing).	Kahoot (quiz), Powerpoint presentation, Press articles, Poster and Leaflets



Figure 1. The Code of Conduct for athletes as presented during the awareness-raising sessions.

5. Education session observation

Two meetings were attended by the lead researcher:

- AJPH intervention at the Cesson-Sevigné men handball team (1st national division), on the 1st of September, 2023
- AJPH intervention at the Nantes women handball team (2nd national division), on the 27th of November, 2024

Both sessions lasted slightly over one hour. Following a general introduction which presented the player association, its structure, its objectives and the membership modalities, the session on antimanipulation lasted about 10-15 minutes, including an awareness-raising video on the international threat of manipulation, and more concrete information on the betting prohibition and the potential consequences of getting caught betting on its sport.

Main feedback:

The observation of both sessions led to similar lessons concerning the effectiveness of sessions. Several constraints were apparent:

- Both sessions happened just after training sessions, and before lunch, which implies that some players may not be able to fully concentrate during the whole session, as it exceeded 1 hour of time length.
- In both sessions, some players had already attended such sessions, while others were discovering the subject of integrity. There was some difficulty finding common ground and keeping the attention of all attendees.
- The integrity part of the sessions was included as part of a wider presentation which included information on player associations, the new applicable rules, antidoping, and other subjects. This also reduces the propensity to catch players' attention onto the specific issues.

In terms of player attention and participation, and in line with the constraints listed above, it was clear that the attention of players slightly dropped during the second half of the session. Eye contact and body language showed the athletes had become less focused and engaged. In both sessions, no player has been seen taking notes.

6. Athlete feedback results analysis (quantitative and qualitative feedback)

Full results on the questionnaires are available in the Annex. Analysis of the results, including with focus groups, is presented here under through each feedback dimension.

Dimension 1 - Appraisal if the Code of Conduct is understood following the awareness-raising sessions

Several questions were asked regarding the rules related to antimanipulation education. On the questions related to the report of manipulation approaches, and the allowance of bets, it is possible to compare the results of six associations which asked the same questions. The results indicate that the information provided at the presentations appears to have been understood by a majority of the respondents. However, the relatively high number of wrong answers on some specific subjects indicates that sessions did not cover all principles of the Code of Conduct with the same intensity. As an example, the fact that a majority of AIP, GIBA and AJPH respondents fail to respond correctly to the reporting question (*2.If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?*), while respondents from both AJFS and AJFSF provide correct answers may indicate that the duty of reporting was not addressed in France and Italy (an absence which was observed in the attended AJPH session), but well insisted upon in Spain.

The answers received for the question on inside information cannot be properly compared as several answers could be selected at the same time and they cannot be separated. However, they indicate that for AJFS and AJFSF several respondents (around one quarter) have selected wrong answers, which means that inside information was perhaps not a priority for the sessions for those two associations, or that the sessions failed to deliver the messages.

Association	<i>2.If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?</i>	<i>3.Can you bet on your own sport?</i>
	Wrong answer or "I don't know"	Wrong answer or "I don't know"
AIP	62.5%	41%
AJPH	55.6%	1.8%
HSF	25.2%	16.9%
GIBA	55.5%	16.6%
AJFS	27.4%	0.8%
AJFSF	7.4%	1.2%
TOTAL	39%	8%

Via their focus groups, AJPH, AIP, AJFSF confirmed the need for players to have a better access to information as many of their athletes do not know or understand the betting rules. Some ambiguities were also raised, these included;

"Why is it forbidden for a third league women player to bet on the men's first national league?"

"I don't understand why we can't bet in our sport. I think if we do it with awareness when we aren't in that match, then there shouldn't be a problem."

"Incidentally, I still find it hard to understand why clubs communicate on social networks about our injuries, for example, when we're not supposed to..."

Some representatives are also aware of possibilities to bet anonymously or on illegal websites, which undermines the credibility of the rule (AJFSF, HSF). The issue of reporting also seems unclear for players, since some may not know where to report confidentially or may not fully trust the available reporting options (AJFSF, AJSF, RPI):

“To be honest, I don't know if players would really take the step on the platform if it happened to them. I think they might tell the club or the union, but even that I'm not sure. As it's never happened to me and I've never heard of this kind of thing happening in basketball, it's hard to know, but I have my doubts about reporting on the platform.”

“I wouldn't know how the reporting process works.”

“I think that it's difficult to report this for us as players. The mechanism is not enough.”

Several players indicated their awareness and readiness to report issues related to manipulation nonetheless (AJSF, RPI).

Dimension 2 - The perception of manipulation and betting risks

The players' perceptions of manipulation and betting risks in their sport vary across the samples, but two major trends can be identified. The first is the relative uniformity between results from different associations in the same countries and disciplines. This coherence strengthens the validity of the results. The second important result is the fact that Italian associations (AIP and GIBA) score high levels of perceived risks, with approximately two-thirds of the respondents considering that manipulation risks in their sports are either high or very high. This number should mobilise regulating authorities as it suggests a degraded integrity situation in Italian volleyball. Scores in Spain (AJFS and AJFSF) and France (SNB and AJPH) are lower but remain noteworthy. Danish handball has the lowest perceived risks.

Regarding betting, the picture is different in the sense that no major disparity can be felt between countries and disciplines. Betting behaviour instead seems to be widespread across the global sample. Although betting behaviour by athletes as such is not forbidden (except for bets on his or her disciplines), the results should alarm the authorities and player associations, given the dangers that betting behaviour can represent for players, whether in terms of addiction risks, financial precarity risks or manipulation vulnerabilities.

Interestingly, out of the 60 players from the AIP association who were asked if they bet on volleyball, almost 50% (28/60) answered that they do so either “occasionally”, “sometimes” or “always”, which is explicitly against the applicable rules of not being allowed to bet on your own discipline. In comparison, for the same question asked in Irish rugby (RPI), only one out of 154 respondents answered positively; still, and in coherence with information from other European associations, a majority of them (83/155) still declare to place bets (but outside of rugby). The Italian Volleyball Players Association (AIP) also asked directly, in the written questionnaire to the players, if they place bets (outside of volleyball). Seven out of 60 responded “sometimes”, 10 “always”, 17 “occasionally” and 26 “never”. French basketball players were also asked “did you already place bets outside of basketball before this presentation” and 28 out of 96 respondents declared “yes”. From discussions during the focus groups and the questionnaire results, betting behaviour indeed seems to be widespread among athlete populations. To avoid desirability biases linked to responses related to personal experiences, the written questionnaires in all associations asked “5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?”. In total, 620 out of 891 (69.5%) answered

either “very often”, “often” or “sometimes”. This confirms the extent of betting habits throughout athlete population. A breakdown of the answers (see table below) indicates some similarities in proportion among disciplines (basketball in France and Italy around 80%; handball in France and Denmark around 69%). Differences between AJFS and AJFSF answers show that men and women have different betting habits. These trends and hypotheses need to be confirmed in a more robust scientific assessment. However, they tend to confirm the high prevalence of betting among athletes, compared to the larger population, as described by recent research (Nelson et al., 2024; Turk et al., 2023).

Association	4. How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?	5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?
	Very high or high	Very often, often or sometimes
AIP	71.6%	31%
AJPH	17.9%	73%
HSF	7.4%	65%
GIBA	92.2%	81.1%
SNB	28,1%	80.2%
AJFS	15,1%	75.9%
AJFSF	12,3%	49.3%
TOTAL	27,6%	69.5%

Except for the GIBA and RPI interviews, all athletes' qualitative feedback confirmed the betting habits within European sports. Female players are also concerned (AJPH, AJFSF).

“In recent years, you do see that there are players betting on futsal more regularly and in all divisions. Not only in futsal, but in all sports in general. And that it is very easy to gamble through mobile applications and the danger it generates in terms of causing gambling addiction in young people.”

Some questioned the relevance of the strict betting prohibition for players, while sponsorship deals across sports promote betting:

“Today, there are a lot of games that encourage sports betting. Even our first division championship is called “Betclit” Elite, so it's easy to wonder whether that means it's okay to bet. [...] Another thing I don't understand. Why do you tell players not to bet and then name your division “Betclit”???? It seems to me that naming alcohol or cigarettes is forbidden, so why not betting if it's so dangerous?”

Manipulation risks are not uniformly addressed in the conversations. AIP respondents confirm the level of risks expressed in the questionnaires and pinpoint the roles of club managers in the schemes. Most (AJPH, HSF, GIBA, SNB, RPI) are less familiar with the problem. Some still note that end-of-season games are more likely to showcase “strange” occurrences (AJPH, AJFSF):

“I experienced in season 22/23 the possibility of match-fixing the last game of the season so another team would go to a lower division but we didn't answer back and won our game. We never told anybody.”

Dimension 3 – Appraisal of the education sessions

As outlined in the table below, a majority of the respondents praise the quality of the sessions and the used materials. RPI respondents (150/154) also underlined its usefulness. A few suggestions have been recommended by the players. Some of them proposed to have more interactions, such as through quizzes, and use more alternative tools to gain attendance attention, via videos, former player testimonies or more concrete examples. Some of the lowest scores (but still highly positive) concerned the AIP association, which was conducting its first ever awareness-raising campaign.

Association	6. Do you think the information was clear and useful?	7. Could you evaluate the quality of the digital materials presented (video, posters, etc.)
	Very clear or clear	Very high or high
AIP	80%	81.6%
AJPH	96.8%	94.6%
HSF	89.6%	83.9%
GIBA	94.4%	
SNB	100%	
AJFS	94%	85.2%
AJFSF	91.3%	79%
TOTAL	93.7%	86.9%

Compared to questionnaires results, potential desirability biases need to be taken even more seriously in responses from interviews or focus groups. Not surprisingly, the qualitative feedback on the sessions is very positive:

“It’s also great that you as a players’ association have a campaign that spells out the rules and kind of educates us about the rules.”

“I like that AJFSF provides information to us about this topic, it’s true that we most know everything but it’s good to have access to the information.”

“Through club visits, you can have discussions on more sensitive subjects, such as salaries”

“Very happy with the closeness that we get from the AJFS, and to inform and update on everything related to the Code of Conduct”

The level of betting and manipulation risks or the fact that many players are not familiar with the applicable regulation explains the need for repetition of such sessions. This is a demand from the players themselves (GIBA, AJPH, AIP, HSF), especially for young players who are deemed more vulnerable (AJPH, SNB). They suggest using more concrete numbers and examples (AJPH), testimonies from players who have been caught up in betting or manipulation (SNB), interactive tools (HSF), social media (GIBA) and leaflets or PDFs (HSF, AJFSF). Also, they seem to prefer physical rather than online or e-learning platforms (AJPH), although it needs to stay concrete and efficient:

“All good. Just keep everything short and to the point! You’re usually talking to us at the end of a long day at training and we just want to go home.”

7. Conclusion and recommendations for future antimanipulation education programmes

The monitoring and evaluation of the PROtect Integrity Online programme confirm the need to increase the reach of awareness-raising and education activities to prevent forms of competition manipulation. As notified by former Erasmus + projects and scientific literature (van der Hoeven, 2023), the risks of manipulation of sports competitions are not spread equally across countries, levels and genders of competitions or sports disciplines. Nonetheless, a growing number of sport participants are exposed to the threat of manipulators, in particular in connection with the exponential growth of online illegal betting. The rapid increase of betting habits, if not betting addiction, across European populations represents a heightened risk for athletes. Not only are they exposed to potential sanctions if caught, but betting athletes are also more vulnerable to financial difficulties and corruptive temptations. Our evaluation within the seven partners' membership confirms the prevalence of manipulation risks and the ubiquity of betting behaviour across European sports. Hence there is a need to develop education programmes and monitor and evaluate their effectiveness.

The positive feedback on the integrity sessions by the end-users is a clear output of our evaluation. The format and modalities of the programme, in rather short and lively physical sessions, are adapted to the needs and constraints of high-level athletes. The delivery of the session by player associations explains why integrity subjects such as betting are as important as other sensitive subjects such as financial situations, career transitioning, sport governance and rules changes. In many cases, player association representatives are more likely to appear as credible and trustworthy stakeholders. The repetition of such visits every year is required not only to update the messages (to cover changing rules or risks), but also to ensure that all players have understood the message and to inform any new arrivals from player transfers or promoted youngsters.

On the basis of the players' feedback, both from their answers in focus groups or to the questionnaires, it can be concluded that the sessions contribute to a rise in the general awareness of the subject of competition manipulation and betting. However, it is not possible to measure exactly to what extent the five rules of the Code of Conduct are understood and remembered after the sessions. Some results suggest that the rules are not equally covered across all sessions, leaving some athletes unaware of some dimensions such as inside information or the duty to report. Nor is it possible, yet, to measure to what extent the programme has contributed to influence attitudes and behaviours regarding sports integrity.

Given the salience of the manipulation and betting subjects for contemporary elite sports, prevention programmes such as PROtect Integrity Online are bound to be expanded. In order to ensure the effectiveness of such future programmes, here is a list of recommendations to be considered before the implementation awareness-raising/education programmes. These recommendations are in line with the conclusion of the D2.1 Report.

Recommendation 1: Base your education strategy on a sound risk- and need-assessment. Our survey led to surprising results with regard to manipulation risks and betting behaviour. Such risk-assessment should serve as a basis to the format, modalities and content of the programme. It will help you to better grasp the realities of the phenomenon you wish to address, and understand how the target audience perceive the subject. Both items can actually be decoupled. In any case it's important that when you address the audience you are as much as possible familiar with their perceptions and opinions on the subjects. This will increase your credibility.

Recommendation 2: Consider “education” and in-club visits as a two-way approach. As explained in the D2.1 Report, face-to-face interventions are praised as they are more likely to raise attention of the audience and build connections. They will also allow you to complete the general risk-assessment with qualitative feedback from specific contexts. It is therefore important to use those sessions as discussion platforms instead of top-down interventions. Not only is it more likely that it will produce on-hand knowledge on perceptions and realities from athletes, but it will also make them more receptive to the learning parts of the sessions. To bolster the interaction and effectiveness of on-site sessions, the use of illustrative case studies, testimonies, videos, group discussions, interactive quizzes are recommended.

Recommendation 3: On-demand education. Regular in-teams visits should be completed by “on-demand” education: clear information should be made available at any time for persons that are suddenly confronted with situations or who are just curious. It can be through leaflets, online platforms, or posters, but it should be easily found by the stakeholders. This available information should include additional knowledge, links and contacts points to access further resources and support if necessary.

Recommendation 4: Engage with other organisations in and outside your field. Many third parties are likely to help in the preparation and delivery of the sessions. Player associations, national sport governing bodies, national antidoping agencies, ministries or non-governmental associations could be interested in exchanging on the education modalities, specific materials and techniques that could improve respective programmes.

Recommendation 5: Monitor and evaluate. Monitor the implementation of your programme, by keeping a database with the audience, content and modalities of the programme. Evaluate the learning process by checking if the information has been understood. Instant online quizzes, google forms or basic oral questions can be used. It is also a recommendation to evaluate the long-term effectiveness of the programme by measuring integrity behaviour (number of reported/detected manipulation cases, number of betting cases, etc.), individual psychosocial aspects (moral disengagement, attitude to manipulation, intentions to accept manipulation offers, etc.) or perceived social norms (perceived prevalence of manipulation, ethical climate index, perceived legitimacy of the anti-manipulation system, etc.). Scientific experts can be mobilised, but it’s not compulsory.

Bibliography

Nelson, S. E., Slabczynski, J. M., Lee, T. G., & LaPlante, D. A. (2024). All in: a scoping review of the association between gambling and athletic participation. *International Gambling Studies*, 24(2), 185-209.

Turk, M. A., Murphy, C., McCaffrey, J., & Murray, K. (2023). Predictors of adverse gambling behaviours amongst elite athletes. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 823.

Van Der Hoeven, S., Constandt, B., Manoli, A. E., van Bottenburg, M., Caneppele, S., & Willem, A. (2023). Match-Fixing in European Sports: Attitudes and Experiences. *Deviant Behavior*, 44(11), 1664-1681.

Annexe 1: Full results of the questionnaire

RPI (Rugby Union, Ireland)	Do you think there is a gambling culture in Rugby?			Do you ever bet on rugby?				Do you bet on other sports?			
	Yes	No	Not sure	Sometimes	Always	Occasionally	Never	Sometimes	Always	Occasionally	Never
Connacht (41)	27%	44%	29%	0%	0%	2%	98%	12	2	54	32
Leinster (18)	6%	83%	11%	0%	0%	0%	100%	28	6	39	28
Men 7s (9)	11%	78%	11%	0%	0%	0%	100%	33	0	22	44
Munster (19)	5%	68%	26%	0%	0%	0%	100%	11	0	32	58
Ulster (36)	0%	83%	11%	0%	0%	0%	100%	19	0	47	36
Women 7s (15)	7%	93%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	13	0	7	80
Women XVs (16)	0%	100%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	0	0	13	88
TOTAL (nbr)	15	113	24	0	0	1	153	24	2	57	72
154 questionnaires	152			154				155			
TOTAL (%)	9.96%	74.18%	15.63%	0.00%	0.00%	0.53%	99.47%	15.36%	1.23%	36.95%	46.57%

RPI (Rugby Union, Ireland)	Are you aware of any restrictions on betting on rugby?		Are you aware of the sanctions if you breach the regulations?		Would you know where to go if you were approached to fix any aspect of a game?		Did you find this presentation helpful?	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Connacht (41)	98%	2%	95%	5%	88%	12%	100%	0%
Leinster (18)	94%	6%	94%	6%	94%	6%	94%	6%
Men 7s (9)	89%	11%	100%	0%	89%	11%	100%	0%
Munster (19)	95%	5%	95%	5%	53%	47%	89%	11%
Ulster (36)	97%	3%	92%	8%	78%	22%	97%	3%
Women's 7s (15)	100%	0%	100%	0%	80%	20%	100%	0%
Women's XVs (16)	100%	0%	100%	0%	88%	13%	100%	0%
TOTAL (nbr)	149	5	147	7	125	29	150	4
154 questionnaires	154		154		154		154	
TOTAL (%)	96.81%	3.19%	95.48%	4.52%	81.32%	18.78%	97.24%	2.76%

AIP (Volleyball, Italy)	1. What is inside information? Tick the correct answer(s).				2. If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?			3. Can you bet on your own sport?				
	Information on injuries	Match tactics	Team line-up that has already been announced	I don't know	Yes	No, because I rejected the offer	I don't know	Yes	Yes if it's not a game you're playing in	No, betting on any game of your own sport is prohibited	No, but I can ask someone else to bet for me	I don't know
CLUB (nbr)												
Padova (15)	36.36%	54.55%	0%	9.09%	33.33%	53.33%	13.33%	0%	0%	80%	13.33%	6.67%
Verona (14)	45.83%	54.17%	0%	0%	92.86%	7.14%	0%	0%	7.14%	85.71%	7.14%	0%
Mantova (11)	31.25%	37.5%	18.75%	12.5%	11.11%	55.56%	33.33%	0%	9.09%	45.45%	45.45%	0%
Brescia W (9*)	11.11%	33.33%	44.44%	11.11%	12.5%	62.5%	25%	0%	28.57%	28.57%	28.57%	14.29%
Brescia M (11*)	18.18%	27.27%	45.45%	9.09%	10%	70%	20%	0%	33.33%	22.22%	22.22%	22.22%
TOTAL (nbr)	27	37	12	6	21	26	9	0	7	33	12	4
60 questionnaires	82				56			56				
TOTAL (%)	32.93%	45.12%	14.63%	7.32%	37.50%	46.43%	16.07%	0.00%	12.50%	58.93%	21.43%	7.14%

AIP (Volleyball, Italy)	4. How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?					5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?					6. Do you ever bet on volleyball?			
	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Very rarely	Sometimes	Always	Occasionally	Never
CLUB (nbr)														
Padova (15)	13.33 %	73.33 %	6.67%	6.67%	0%	0%	26.67 %	26.67 %	13.33 %	33.33 %	0%	6.67%	20%	73.33 %
Verona (14)	21.43 %	42.86 %	14.29 %	21.43 %	0%	0%	14.29 %	21.43 %	35.71 %	28.57 %	14.29 %	0%	7.14%	78.57 %
Mantova (11)	18,18	54,55	9,09	9,09	9,09	9,09	9,09	36,36	27,27	18,18	0,00	9,09	18,18	72,73
Brescia W (9*)	11,11	55,56	33,33	0,00	0,00	0	62,5	12,5	25	0	11,11	44,44	33,33	11,11
Brescia M (11*)	18,18	45,45	36,36	0	0	0	50	30	20	0	9,09	36,36	45,45	9,09
TOTAL (Nbr)	10	33	11	5	1	1	17	15	14	11	4	10	14	32
60 questionnaires	60					58					60			
TOTAL (%)	16.67 %	55%	18.33 %	8.33%	1.67 %	1.72 %	29.31 %	25.86 %	24.14 %	18.97 %	6.67%	16.67 %	23.33 %	53.33 %

AIP (Volleyball, Italy)	7. Do you ever bet on other sports?				8. Are you aware of the sanctions if you breach the regulations?	
CLUB (nbr)	Sometimes	Always	Occasionally	Never	Yes	No
Padova (15)	0%	6.67%	33.33%	60%	46.67%	53.33%
Verona (14)	28.57%	7.14%	28.57%	35.71%	85.71%	14.29%
Mantova (11*)	9.09%	0%	27.27%	63.64%	9.09%	90.91%
Brescia W (9*)	11.11%	44.44%	22.22%	22.22%	22.22%	77.78%
Brescia M (11*)	9.09%	36.36%	27.27%	27.27%	27.27%	72.73%
TOTAL (Nbr)	7	10	17	26	25	35
60 questionnaires	60				60	
TOTAL (%)	11.67%	16.67%	28.33%	43.33%	41.67%	58.33%

AIP (Volleyball, Italy)	9. Do you believe that the session was clear and useful?					10. Could you please evaluate the quality of the digital materials presented?					11. Do you have any suggestions for enhancement of the digital materials?	12. Please make any suggestion or remark to improve the delivery of such sessions
CLUB (nbr)	Definitely yes	Yes	Medium	No	Definitely no	very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low		
Padova (15)	33.33%	60%	6.67%	0%	0%	26.67%	60%	13.33%	0%	0%		
Verona (14)	42.86%	42.86%	14.29%	0%	0%	42.86%	35.71%	21.43%	0%	0%		
Mantova (11*)	54.55%	18.18%	18.18%	9.09%	0%	63.64%	18.18%	18.18%	0%	0%		
Brescia W (9*)	22.22%	44.44%	33.33%	0%	0%	22.22%	55.56%	22.22%	0%	0%		
Brescia M (11*)	27.27%	45.45%	27.27%	0%	0%	27.27%	54.55%	18.18%	0%	0%		
TOTAL (nbr)	22	26	11	1	0	22	27	11	0	0		
60 questionnaires	60					60						
TOTAL (%)	36.67%	43.33%	18.33%	1.67%	0%	36.67%	45%	18.33%	0%	0%		

AJPH (Handball, France)	1. What types of information are classified as sensitive and should not be disclosed by players?				2. If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?			3. Can you bet on your own sport?					4. How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?				
CLUB (nbr)	Information on injuries	Match tactics	Team line-up that has already been announced publicly	I don't know	Yes	No, because I rejected the offer	I don't know	Yes	Yes if it's not a game you're playing in	No, betting on any game of your own sport is prohibited	No, but I can ask someone else to bet for me	I don't know	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
AJPH	201	201	48	4	99	65	59	0	1	219	2	1	9	31	83	76	24
TOTAL (nbr)	454				223			223					223				
TOTAL (%)	44.27%	44.27%	10.57%	0.88%	44.39%	29.15%	26.46%	0%	0.45%	98.21%	0.90%	0.45%	4.04%	13.90%	37.22%	34.08%	10.76%

AJPH (Handball, France)	5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?						6. Do you think the information was clear and useful?					7. Could you evaluate the quality of the digital materials presented (video, posters,...?)				
CLUB (nbr)	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Very rarely	Definitely yes	Yes	Medium	No	Definitely no	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	
AJPH	9	51	103	44	16	96	120	7	0	0	56	155	11	1	0	
TOTAL (nbr)	223						223					223				
TOTAL (%)	4.04%	22.87%	46.19%	19.73%	7.17%	43.05%	53.81%	3.14%	0%	0%	25.11%	69.51%	4.93%	0.45%	0%	

AJPH (Handball, France)	8. Do you have any suggestions to improve the digital material?	9. Please give us any suggestions or comments to improve the delivery of these sessions:
CLUB (nbr)		
AJPH	<p>Send a presentation in English to foreigners beforehand so that it is easier to follow them.</p> <p>Have the translations in English for foreign players</p> <p>,Questionnaire on situation like this one To do it in French and English for foreigners so that they feel just as concerned</p>	<p>A little more interactive, MCQs or questions from time to time?</p> <p>Set up small games during the presentation, things to interact together that are more fun and educational</p> <p>Do a quiz at the end or a game that stimulates</p> <p>Maybe bring in former players</p> <p>"The intervention was great, I think it would be more effective if there were reminders during the year. Maybe a poster on the internet sent to the players/teams but the message is already clear", Insist on old files, without taboo, to show that it has existed and that it still exists</p> <p>Insist on the consequences and risks of betting on handball.</p>

HSF (Handball, Denmark)	1. What is inside information? Tick the correct answer(s).				2. If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?			3. Can you bet on your own sport?				
	CLUB (nbr)	Information on injuries	Match tactics	Team line-up that has already been announced publicly	I don't know	Yes.	No, because I rejected the offer	I don't know	Yes	Yes if it's not a game you're playing in	No, betting on any game of your own sport is prohibited	No, but I can ask someone else to bet for me
15 Questionnaires	50%	46.67 %	3.33%	0%	66.67 %	6.67%	26.67 %	6.67%	0%	93.33%	0%	0%
16 Questionnaires	51.72%	48.28 %	0%	0%	75%	0%	25%	12.50 %	6.25%	81.25%	0%	0%
21 Questionnaires	51.35%	45.95 %	2.70%	0%	80%	15%	5%	15%	30%	55%	0%	0%
21 questionnaires**	42,55%	40.43 %	14.89%	2.13 %	90.48 %	4.76%	4.76%	5%	0%	95%	0%	0%
35 questionnaires*	50%	45.45 %	4.55%	0%	65.71 %	20%	14.29 %	0%	11.43 %	88.57%	0%	0%
TOTAL (nbr)	102	94	12	1	80	12	15	7	11	88	0	0
TOTAL (%)	48.80%	44.98 %	5.74%	0.48 %	74.77 %	9.29%	15.14 %	6.60%	10.38 %	83.02%	0%	0%

HSF (Handball , Denmark)	4. How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?					5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?					6. Did you find it useful?				
	CLUB (nbr)	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Very rarely	Definitely yes	Yes	Medium	No
15 questionnaire s*	0%	6.67 %	26.67 %	53,3 %	13.3 %	0%	28.5 %	35.71%	35.7 %	0%	0%	85.7 %	14.29 %	0 %	0%
16 questionnaires	0%	6.25 %	12.50 %	62.5 %	18.7 %	6.25 %	31.2 %	43.75%	6.25 %	12.5 %	31.25 %	68.7 %	5%	0 %	0%
21 questionnaire s*	0%	0%	40%	35%	25%	25%	25%	15%	20%	15%	20%	70%	10%	0 %	0%
21 questionnaire s**	0%	19.0 %	19.05 %	42.8 %	19.0 %	4.76 %	38.1 %	28.57%	23.8 %	4.76 %	38.10 %	52.3 %	9.52%	0 %	0%
35 questionnaire s*	2.86 %	2.86 %	22.86 %	40%	31.4 %	2.86 %	34.2 %	17.14%	28.5 %	17.1 %	9.09%	81.8 %	9.09%	0 %	0%
TOTAL (nbr)	1	7	26	48	25	8	34	27	25	12	20	75	9	0	0
TOTAL (%)	0.93 %	6.54 %	24.3 %	44.8 %	23.3 %	7.55 %	32.0 %	25.47%	23.5 %	11.3 %	19.23 %	72.1 %	8.65 %	0 %	0%

HSF (Handball, Denmark)	7. Could you please evaluate the quality of the digital materials presented?					11. Do you have any suggestions for enhancement of the digital materials?	12. Please make any suggestion or remark to improve the delivery of such sessions
CLUB (nbr)	very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low		
15 questionnaires *	7.14 %	50%	42.86 %	0 %	0 %	"in addition to the sanctions, such huge fines"	
16 questionnaires	12.50 %	81.25 %	6.25 %	0 %	0 %	"million people in club bet?"	
21 questionnaires *	15%	75%	10%	0 %	0 %	"more or damage"	"examples of betting that is illegal"
21 questionnaires **	33.33 %	57.14 %	9.52 %	0 %	0 %		"not qualified"
35 questionnaires *	11.76 %	73.53 %	14.71 %	0 %	0 %		"fire everyone in the top position. in IHF us EHF us start forefather"
TOTAL (nbr)	17	72	16	0	0		
TOTAL (%)	16.19 %	68.57 %	15.24 %	0 %	0 %		

GIBA (basketball, Italy)	1. What is inside information? Tick the correct answer(s).				2. If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?			3. Can you bet on your own sport?				
CLUB (nbr)	Information on injuries	Match tactics	Team line-up that has already been	I don't know	Yes.	No, because I rejected the offer	I don't know	Yes	Yes if it's not a game you're playing in	No, betting on any game of your own sport is prohibited	No, but I can ask someone else to bet for me	I don't know
GIBA	60	20	8	2	40	45	5	0	0	75	8	7
Total (nbr)	90				90			90				
TOTAL (%)	66.67%	22.22%	8.89%	2.22%	44.44%	50%	5.56%	0%	0%	83.33%	8.89%	7.78%

GIBA (basketball, Italy)	4. How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?	5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?	6. Do you believe that the session was clear and useful?

CLUB (nbr)	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Very rarely	Definitely yes	Yes	Medium	No	Definitely no
GIBA	48	35	7	0	0	44	15	14	12	5	45	40	5	0	0
Total (nbr)	90					90					90				
TOTAL (%)	53.3 3%	38.8 9%	7.78%	0%	0%	48.8 9%	16.6 7%	15.56%	13.3 3%	5.56 %	50%	44.4 4%	5.56%	0 %	0%

SNB (Basketball, France)	1. Have you ever bet on basketball before this presentation?		2. Can you bet on basketball?		3. Have you ever bet on sports other than basketball before this presentation?		4. Can you bet on sports other than basketball?			5. Can you give inside information about your team to people around you for a sports betting action?	
	Yes	No	Yes.	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	I don't know	Yes	No
SNB	8	88	0	96	28	68	77	17	2	0	96
96 réponses	96		96		96		96			96	
TOTAL (%)	8.33%	91.67%	0%	100%	29.17%	70.83%	80.21%	17.71%	2.08%	0%	100%

SNB (Basketball, France)	6-Do you think it's a good idea to report an attempt to get you to fix a match for money?			7-Can you be punished for betting on your sport?			8-How do you assess the risk of match-fixing in basketball?				9-How often do you think basketball players make sports bets (basketball or other)?				10-Did you find the prevention session presented by the SNB on sports betting clear and useful?		
	Yes	No	I don't know	Yes	No	I don't know	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very Often	Often	Occasionally	Rarely	Very rarely	Very clear
SNB	90	2	4	95	0	1	5	22	33	34	2	5	34	38	16	3	96
96 réponses	96			96			96				96				96		
TOTAL (%)	93.7 5%	2.0 8%	4.1 7%	98.9 6%	0 %	1.0 4%	5.2 1%	22.9 2%	34.38 %	35.4 2%	2.0 8%	5.2 1%	35.4 2%	39.58%	16.6 7%	3.1 3%	10 0%

AJFS (Men's futsal, Spain)	1. What is inside information? Tick the correct answer(s).	2. If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?	3. Can you bet on your own sport?	4. How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?

CLUB (nbr)	Information on injuries	Match tactics	Team line-up that has already been announced publicly	I don't know	Yes.	No, because I rejected the offer	I don't know	Yes	Yes if it's not a game you're playing in	No, betting on any game of your own sport is prohibited	No, but I can ask someone else to bet for me	I don't know	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
AJFS	200	172	47	14	172	27	38	1	1	235	0	0	16	20	46	65	90
TOTAL (nbr)	433			237			237			237							
TOTAL (%)	46.19%	39.72%	10.85%	3.23%	72.57%	11.39%	16.03%	0.42%	0.42%	99.16%	0%	0%	6.75%	8.44%	19.41%	27.43%	37.97%

AJFS (Men's futsal, Spain)	5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?					6. Do you think the information was clear and useful?					7. Could you evaluate the quality of the digital materials presented (video, posters,...?)				
CLUB (+nbr questionnaires)	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Very rarely	Definitely yes	Yes	Medium	No	Definitely no	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
AJFS	27	67	86	37	20	204	19	3	4	7	114	88	23	9	3
TOTAL (nbr)	237					237					237				
TOTAL (%)	11.39%	28.27%	36.29%	15.61%	8.44%	86.08%	8.02%	1.27%	1.69%	2.95%	48.10%	37.13%	9.70%	3.80%	1.27%

AJFS (Men's futsal, Spain)	8. Do you have any suggestions to improve the digital material?	9. Please give us any suggestions or comments to improve the delivery of these sessions:
CLUB	"Match-fixing videos would be good to raise awareness among players"	Very good, without videos. Good talk
AJFS		Expose cases of match-fixing
	"Access to a page with information and training course options".	Discuss the topic of psychology more
		Very good session, everything is very clear!
		Discuss the topic of psychology more
		Do it through a presentation projecting it on the screen. Also, exemplify in a clearer way everything that is mentioned, especially with the topic of match-fixing and betting to make us see a reality that perhaps we are not aware of.

AJFSF (women's futsal, Spain)	1. What is inside information? Tick the correct answer(s).	2. If you were approached to fix a game, reject the offer but do not report the approach, can you be sanctioned?	3. Can you bet on your own sport?

CLUB (+nbr questionnaires)	Information on injuries	Match tactics	Team line-up that has already been announced publicly	I don't know	Yes.	No, because I rejected the offer	I don't know	Yes	Yes if it's not a game you're playing in	No, betting on any game of your own sport is prohibited	No, but I can ask someone else to bet for me	I don't know
AJFSF	58	53	12	10	75	3	3	0	1	80	0	0
TOTAL (nbr)	133				81				81			
TOTAL (%)	43.61%	39.85%	9.02%	7.52%	31.65%	1.27%	1.27%	0%	1.23%	98.77%	0%	0%

AJFSF (Women's futsal, Spain)	4. How high do you perceive manipulation risks in your sport?					5. How often do you believe players from your sport engage in betting activity?					6. Do you think the information was clear and useful?				
CLUB (+nbr questionnaires)	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Very rarely	Definitely yes	Yes	Medium	No	Definitely no
AJFSF	5	5	8	23	40	1	8	31	18	23	65	9	2	1	4
TOTAL (nbr)	81					81					81				
TOTAL (%)	6.17%	6.17%	9.88%	28.40%	49.38%	1.23%	9.88%	38.27%	22.22%	28.40%	80.25%	11.11%	2.47%	1.23%	4.94%

AJFSF (Women's futsal, Spain)	7. Could you evaluate the quality of the digital materials presented (video, posters,...?)				
CLUB (nbr)	Very high	High	Medium	Low	Very low
AJFSF	37	27	15	2	0
TOTAL (nbr)	81				
TOTAL (%)	45.68%	33.33%	18.52%	2.47%	0%

AJFSF (Women's futsal, Spain)	8. Do you have any suggestions to improve the digital material?	9. Please give us any suggestions or comments to improve the delivery of these sessions:
CLUB (nbr)		
AJFSF	QR CODES with direct link to all information	Create more regular events and talks
		Give more examples to better understand the concepts.
	Reach across all platforms. Conduct more interviews via YouTube or a podcast with important content on legal aspects that the player should be up to date with.	A portable whiteboard like the ones used by children to leave the posters posted
		Make a Kahoot or similar to reflect the results on a screen/projector anonymously instead of raising your hands.
		Structures more actions-consequences, in addition to the information.

		<p>I really liked this year's talk. I would propose giving it much more reach through social networks although a lot is already done. Thank you very much for your work.</p>
		<p>I really liked it and it was very useful, thank you for coming.</p>