

Manitobans and Gambling II

Report

December 2007



Manitoba Gaming Control Commission

Our Vision

To be a recognized leader in the regulation and control of gaming activity by: continuously seeking opportunities to anticipate and respond to the evolving needs of those we serve; championing fair, balanced and responsible gaming policy; and inspiring public confidence in the integrity of gaming in Manitoba.

Our Mission

To fulfill our vision by ensuring that gaming activity is conducted honestly, with integrity and in the public interest. We will achieve this by strengthening our knowledge base, implementing best practices, building strong communication channels, and using a balanced approach to deliver services and policy advice to effectively and responsively regulate and control gaming activities in our province for the benefit of all Manitobans.

For further information, or to obtain additional copies of this report, please contact:

Department of Research, Communications and Planning
Manitoba Gaming Control Commission
200-215 Garry Street
Winnipeg MB R3C 3P3

T: 204-954-9400, or toll free in Manitoba 1-800-782-0363

F: 204-954-9450, or toll free in Manitoba 1-866-999-6688

E: research@mgcc.mb.ca

The Manitoba Gaming Control Commission's research agenda and research reports are available on its website at www.mgcc.mb.ca.

Table of Contents

Background.....	1
Research Design.....	2
Purpose.....	2
Methodology.....	2
Results & Discussion.....	4
Participation in Gambling Activities.....	4
Beliefs and Knowledge about Gambling Myths.....	6
Responsible Gambling.....	11
Recognizing Problem Gambling.....	15
Public Education Campaign Recall.....	17
Public Awareness of the Manitoba Gaming Control Commission.....	19
Future Directions.....	21
References.....	22
Acknowledgements.....	23
Appendix A: Survey Instrument.....	24

Background

The Manitoba Gaming Control Commission (MGCC) is legislated to conduct research and annually publishes a research agenda to articulate its research goals and priorities. The MGCC is committed to the research goal of ensuring that accurate information about the risk and realities of gambling is available to guide responsible gambling initiatives. In order to accomplish this goal, the MGCC regularly measures Manitobans' attitudes, awareness, knowledge and behaviours related to gambling in order to analyze Manitoba's changing gaming environment.

In 2003, the MGCC undertook a cognitive-behavioural survey of 1,309 Manitoban adults to benchmark information about these gambling-related factors, including information about gambling myths and responsible gambling. Following this survey, the MGCC conducted focus group testing in 2004 with regular VLT and slot machine players to explore how to best convey responsible gambling information to Manitobans. The focus groups equipped participants with a clearer understanding of how VLTs and slot machines operate and then proceeded to discuss the most effective messaging and media to use to achieve widespread awareness of this information. Results from both the survey and focus groups are presented in *Manitobans and Gambling* (2004).

Key findings from the report were used to select the target audiences, messaging and media for the MGCC's award-winning, province-wide public education campaign in 2005. The campaign aimed to empower all adult Manitobans to make informed choices when gambling, in keeping with the growing trend to encourage all people who gamble to do so knowledgeably and responsibly. While the MGCC recognizes the importance of education and treatment for problem gamblers, the goal of this campaign was to *prevent* problem gambling by:

- Correcting Manitobans' faulty beliefs about randomness and odds related to VLT and slot machine play,
- Encouraging responsible play practices, and
- Helping young adults recognize subtle signs of problem gambling.

While the MGCC was delighted with the favourable anecdotal response to the campaign, it is committed to conducting valid and reliable empirical research to evaluate the impact of its responsible gambling initiatives. As such, the MGCC conducted a formal evaluation survey of the campaign in 2006 in order to determine its effectiveness and to gain insight as to how to improve future campaigns. The survey results are presented in the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006), which was intended to serve as a baseline against which to measure the impact of future social marketing initiatives.

In fall 2006, the MGCC launched a second run of its public education campaign, after making slight refinements to target audience and media choices based on the findings of the campaign evaluation. The same revised campaign ran for a third time in fall 2007.

Research Design

Purpose

The purpose of this public perception survey was to obtain a comprehensive picture of adult Manitobans' current gambling attitudes, awareness, knowledge and behaviours. The research was also intended to assess Manitobans' level of awareness of the MGCC's public education campaign after the second campaign run. The survey was designed to maximize the data's comparability with data collected in 2003 and 2006. Conducting similar surveys over time enables the MGCC to chronicle the changing impact of its responsible gambling initiatives and to monitor changes in gambling attitudes, awareness, knowledge and behaviours in the province.

Like the earlier surveys, this study was based on a cognitive-behavioural logic model that presupposes that changes in attitudes and awareness can lead to improved knowledge, and that these three cognitive factors are generally required, although not always sufficient, to change behaviour.

Methodology

Following a rigorous tendering process, the MGCC contracted Kisquared, a Winnipeg research firm, to conduct a 15-minute telephone interview with a representative sample of adult Manitobans. The 63-item survey was developed by the MGCC based on its 2003 public perception survey and 2006 campaign evaluation survey, although sections were reworked to update the study, to address timely research questions and to incorporate recommendations from the peer review of the *Manitobans and Gambling* (2004) report. The survey is presented in Appendix A.

Kisquared obtained a representative random sample of Manitoba's population and established quotas to ensure accurate representation by gender and region among the completed surveys. Following a pre-test to finalize question wording, telephone interviews were completed with 1,200 adult Manitobans between January 19 and February 6, 2007, from Kisquared's call centre in Winnipeg. Nearly 8,000 telephone numbers were dialled up to six times in order to complete the requisite number of interviews, for a final response rate of 29%. Responses are accurate within +/-3.12%, nineteen times out of twenty; this overall margin of error has been adjusted to account for differential sampling rates by region.

Although the response rate is a limitation of the study, weights derived from the 2001 Canadian Census were applied to ensure that the results are representative of Manitobans in terms of gender, region, age and household income. Figure 1 on the next page presents a comprehensive demographic profile of the sample by comparing weighted sample data with data from the 2001 Canadian Census. All results presented in this report were calculated using weighted data.

Quantitative analysis of the data was performed using SPSS. The majority of variables in the dataset were nominal and ordinal, thus nonparametric statistics were used. The MGCC

acknowledges that inferences drawn to a population from a sample must be considered in the context of the power of the statistical tests used. As ordinal and nominal-level statistical tests were necessarily used in this analysis, caution should be exercised when inferring the findings to the general population. Please note that significance levels are noted throughout this report using asterisks as follows: * $<.05$; ** $<.01$; *** $<.001$; more asterisks indicate stronger evidence that statements are true.

Figure 1 Demographic profile

Demographic variables	2001 adult population		2007 weighted sample ⁵
Region¹			
Winnipeg	58.2%		58.2%
Outside Winnipeg	41.8%		41.8%
Brandon	4.0%		4.0%
Southern Manitoba	32.6%		32.6%
Northern Manitoba	5.1%		5.1%
Gender			
Male	48.4%		48.4%
Female	51.6%		51.6%
Age (years)			
18 to 24	12.4%		12.5%
25 to 34	17.1%		17.3%
35 to 44	21.2%		21.4%
45 to 54	18.6%		18.8%
55 to 64	12.0%		12.1%
65 and over	18.7%		17.9%
Education (population aged 20+)²			
Less than high school	34.4%		14.2%
Completed high school	11.4%	22.8%	41.2%
Some post-secondary	11.4%		
Completed post-secondary	42.8%		44.6%
Household income (\$) ⁴			
Under 20,000	14.7%		12.8%
20,000 to 29,999	11.6%		12.6%
30,000 to 49,999	23.2%		22.9%
50,000 to 79,999	27.6%		29.1%
80,000 and over	23.0%		22.5%
Employment status (population aged 15+)^{2,3}			
Employed full-year, full-time	35.9%		55.7%
Employed part-year or part-time	27.4%		10.9%
Unemployed/out of labour force	13.0%		11.8%
Retired	23.8%		21.6%

Source: This study and Statistics Canada, Canadian Census 2001.

¹ Northern Manitoba is defined based on amalgamations of the following postal code regions: R0B, R8A, R8N and R9A. Southern Manitoba is defined based on all other postal code regions outside of Winnipeg and Brandon.

² Statistics Canada does not provide this data for ages 18+.

³ The full-time/part-time census breakdown is an estimate based on those reporting employment income. The retired percentage is an estimate based on data from Human Resources and Development Canada.

⁴ Household income data is based on the household income data of individuals rather than households.

⁵ Survey data is simultaneously weighted by region, age, gender and income. Small discrepancies between the population and the sample data for these variables results from rounding and merging categories, which are strategies necessary to protect the anonymity of census and survey respondents.

Results and Discussion¹

Participation in Gambling Activities

Respondents were first asked how often they participate in specific gambling activities; results are presented in Figure 2. These statistics are very consistent with those shown in the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006) in terms of the number of Manitobans who participate in different gambling activities and in terms of their average frequency of participation. Although slightly fewer people now report buying lottery, instant win or scratch tickets (48.7% vs. 54.0% in 2006) and buying charity raffle or fundraising tickets (38.4% vs. 44.9% in 2006), these are still the gambling activities with the highest participation rates. Playing electronic games and betting on poker, cards or board games with friends and family are other popular gambling activities. Less than 10% of Manitobans are involved in gambling activities other than these top six; many gambling activities are undertaken by very small fractions of the population.

Figure 2 Participation in specific gambling activities

	Once a week or more	One to three times per month	One to eleven times per year	Less than once a year	Never
Buying lottery, instant win or scratch tickets at lottery kiosks or through subscriptions	13.1%	16.9%	18.7%	2.4%	48.9%
Buying charity raffle or fundraising tickets, including charity lotteries, charity breakopens and charity Nevada tickets	0.5%	8.7%	29.7%	5.3%	55.8%
Playing slot machines at a casino	1.8%	5.8%	17.2%	3.7%	71.5%
Playing poker at home with friends or family	1.8%	5.6%	13.8%	3.4%	75.4%
Playing VLTs at a bar, lounge or racetrack	2.2%	3.6%	13.6%	3.3%	77.2%
Betting on cards or board games with family and friends, not including poker, or on games of skill such as pool, bowling or darts	1.1%	4.0%	8.5%	1.3%	85.2%
Playing a sports lottery like Sport Select or betting on sport pools	2.1%	3.0%	3.7%	0.5%	90.8%
Playing bingo	2.0%	1.7%	4.8%	1.8%	89.7%
Playing table games, such as blackjack and roulette, at a casino	0.4%	1.6%	5.4%	2.0%	90.7%
Betting on horse races, whether live at the track or off-track	0.3%	0.6%	4.3%	2.8%	92.0%
Playing poker in a bar, lounge or other public facility	0.6%	1.3%	2.0%	0.4%	95.7%
Betting on casino games, such as blackjack or poker, on the Internet	0.6%	0.3%	0.4%	0.2%	98.5%
Betting on sports on the Internet	0.2%	0.5%	0.1%	0.5%	98.7%

Note: Total percentages across rows may not equal 100% due to rounding.

¹ As mentioned in the Methodology section of this report, significance levels are noted throughout using asterisks as follows: *<.05; **<.01; ***<.001; more asterisks indicate stronger evidence that statements are true.

Participation levels from all gambling activities were used to dichotomize respondents. Those who reported never participating in any of the gambling activities listed in Figure 2 were classified as ‘non-gamblers’, while the rest were classified as ‘gamblers’. On this basis, 69.2% of Manitobans are gamblers. Although quite similar to the comparable statistic from 2006², this number is not consistent with the *Manitobans and Gambling* (2004) finding that 94% of Manitobans gamble. Although we can assume that the number of gamblers in the province may be slightly lower than it was four years ago, this gap is likely more attributable to methodological differences (i.e., the earlier data were not weighted) than to such a major drop in the number of gamblers.

Cross-tabulations reflect some of the same basic demographic patterns as those noted in the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006) and *Manitobans and Gambling* (2004). That is, young adults between the ages of 18 and 24 are more likely to gamble than Manitobans in all other age brackets** and Manitobans who completed high school are more likely to be gamblers than both those with less than a post-secondary education and those who pursued education beyond high school***. Also, gambling differs by region, such that significantly fewer people from southern Manitoba are gamblers, compared with Winnipeggers, Brandonites, and people from northern Manitoba***, and Winnipeggers gamble more than people in all other regions***. Gambling participation does not differ significantly by gender, nor are there notable differences across income or employment categories³; the changes since 2006 in some of these correlations suggest that individuals’ participation in gambling may fluctuate somewhat, even though the population rate of participation is stable. Please note that these correlations show which groups tend to gamble and that these data cannot be extended to develop a profile of *problem* gamblers.

Some gaming activities do not follow these demographic trends exactly. Although there are no overall differences by gender, men are more likely than women to participate in several activities, including playing sports lotteries***, playing poker at home***, playing poker in bars and lounges**, playing table games at casinos*** and betting online on casino games**.

Bingo and charity raffles also diverge from the demographic trends. Women tend to play more bingo than men***, people aged 65 and older play most often** and Manitobans living in the north of the province are more likely to play bingo than those living in other regions*. Frequency of bingo play tends to decrease with increasing income*** and education*** levels. With regard to charity raffles, more Manitobans who work full- or part-time purchase charity raffle or fundraising tickets, compared with homemakers, students, retirees and unemployed

² It is important to note that the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006) classified people who never gambled and those who gambled less than once a year as ‘non-gamblers’. It was decided that the current classification is superior because people who gamble infrequently may still experience benefit or harm from their gambling, and so research should include these people as ‘gamblers’. It can be assumed that the 2006 statistic on the number of gamblers (70%) would have been slightly higher if the current classification was applied, which suggests that the number of gamblers may have decreased very slightly in the year between studies.

³ The MGCC also included ethnicity as a socio-demographic variable for the first time in this study. This report, however, does not present results tabulated by ethnic groups because any observed differences cannot be generalized to the larger ethnic groups in Manitoba. The endorsement of individual ethnic categories was very low and did not correspond well to the ethnic makeup of Manitoba. The data could thus not be reliably weighted on ethnicity.

people***. Those with annual household incomes greater than \$30,000 are also more likely to purchase these tickets for charity***, as are people between the ages of 25 and 54**.

Respondents who gamble were asked if they prefer playing games of skill. As Figure 3 indicates, the majority of respondents state a preference for games of skill. Cross-tabulations show that men are more likely than women to prefer skill-based games** and that this preference is positively related to income***, education** and participation in the workforce***. Seniors agree least that they prefer gambling on skill-based games**.

Figure 3 Preference for games of skill when gambling

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total agree
I prefer playing games where some skill is involved in winning.	13.4%	9.1%	31.5%	46.1%	77.6%

Respondents who reported playing electronic games (i.e., slot machines and/or VLTs) were asked if they prefer card games or line-up games. As Figure 4 indicates, slot machine players have an almost negligible preference for line-up games, and VLT players have a slight preference for card games. Not surprisingly, there is a strong correlation between game preferences – those who play both VLTs and slot machines prefer the same kind of game across venues***. Slot machine and VLT play are themselves highly related, such that more frequent VLT players also tend to be more frequent slot machine players, and those who never play one tend to never play the other***.

Figure 4 Preference for card games or line-up games when playing electronic games

	Prefer card games	Prefer line-up games	No preference
Play slot machines at a casino	37.5%	39.4%	23.1%
Play VLTs at a bar, lounge or racetrack	43.5%	36.5%	20.0%

Women are more likely than men to state that they prefer line-up games when playing slot machines* and VLTs***. People who work full- or part-time are more likely to prefer card games when playing slot machines*** and VLTs** than homemakers, students, retirees and the unemployed.

Beliefs and Knowledge about Gambling Myths

Respondents, both gamblers and non-gamblers, were read a series of statements concerning gambling and were asked to indicate whether they agree or disagree with each statement. These questions are used to measure the number of Manitobans who believe common gambling fallacies; although all statements are false, a number of Manitobans agree with each, as shown in Figure 5. Manitobans are not unique in their erroneous beliefs; the literature affirms that many members of the general public hold significant myths about chance, randomness and outcome control when gambling (e.g., Blaszczynski, Ladouceur, Nower & Shaffer, 2005; Ayton and Fisher, 2004; Delfabbro, 2004).

Cross-tabulations corroborate most of the patterns noted in the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006). That is, adherence to these gambling myths is correlated with employment status, income and education. Manitobans with higher levels of education and income are generally less likely to believe in the individual myths than those with lower levels, and those employed full- or part-time generally believe fewer myths than homemakers, students, retirees and the unemployed. In general, neither men nor women tend to believe more myths than the other group. The data show no regional patterns.

Figure 5 Adherence to gambling myths (highlighted myths were addressed in the MGCC’s public education campaign)

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	“Don’t know”	Total agree
It is important to understand exactly how a slot machine or VLT works in order to play better.	47.2%	14.8%	13.6%	11.3%	13.1%	24.9%
If you flip a coin and get heads 5 times in a row, your next flip is likely to be tails.	46.7%	16.8%	15.8%	7.4%	13.4%	23.2%
If a machine has not paid out in a while, odds are it’s due for a win.	48.1%	16.8%	18.0%	5.2%	11.8%	23.2%
A series of numbers such as 12-5-23-7 is more likely to win than a series of numbers like 1-2-3-4.	47.9%	17.2%	12.8%	7.4%	14.8%	20.2%
The odds of winning on a slot machine or VLT change as you are playing.	51.6%	13.2%	11.8%	7.5%	15.9%	19.3%
Staying at the same slot machine or VLT will improve your chances of winning.	57.3%	16.4%	10.6%	3.0%	12.8%	13.6%
If you have been losing for a while, odds are you are due for a win.	69.4%	15.2%	6.9%	2.0%	6.5%	8.9%
Having a strategy or system when playing slot machines or VLTs increases the chances of winning.	64.5%	14.8%	6.2%	2.4%	12.0%	8.6%

Note: Total percentages across rows may not equal 100% due to rounding.

Belief in the individual myths varies across age groups. Both *Manitobans and Gambling* (2004) and the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006) found that young adults were more likely to believe the myths than older age groups; however, the results suggest that this is no longer the case for all individual myths. Although 18 to 24 year olds are slightly more likely than older age groups to agree that the odds of winning on electronic gaming machines change during play*** and that understanding how the machines work leads to better play***, younger age groups (18 to 24 years and 25-34 years) are *less* likely to agree that staying at the same gaming machine improves the chances of winning*** and that if a machine has not paid out in a while, odds are it’s due for a win***. For the myths about the randomness of a coin flip and of a series of numbers, young adults (18 to 24 years) are slightly more likely to agree with the myths***; however, this is not because more young adults disagree, but rather because more people in older age groups report that they “don’t know”. This suggests that young adults have stronger convictions about their erroneous beliefs, but not necessarily that many more young adults believe the myths than in other age groups. There are no differences between age groups for the other myths.

Adherence to the myths is also related to respondents' gambling behaviour. Those who gamble are more likely to believe in all of the individual myths except for the myth that having a strategy or system when playing electronic games increases the chances of winning. The more frequently respondents play VLTs, the more they agree that the odds of winning on electronic gaming machines changes during play***. People who never play slot machines or VLTs are generally more likely to say that they don't know whether they agree or disagree with the myths.

Figure 6 compares the statistics with the results of the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006). While it is critical to note that there is a consistent decrease in the number of Manitobans who hold each erroneous belief, it is also important to note that the table shows consistently fewer people replying that they "don't know". The fact that more Manitobans are taking a firm stance and disagreeing with the myths suggests that the MGCC's public education campaign is having a continued impact on Manitobans' misconceptions about VLT and slot machine play. As illustrated in Figure 7, a broader comparison with the data from 2006 and 2004 further demonstrates the decrease in erroneous beliefs over time.


Figure 6 Comparison of adherence to gambling myths in 2006⁴ and 2007 (highlighted myths were addressed in the MGCC's public education campaign)

	2006	2007	2006	2007	2006	2007
	Total disagree		Total agree		Total "Don't know"	
It is important to understand exactly how a slot machine or VLT works in order to play better.	58.1%	62.0%	25.1%	24.9%	16.7%	13.1%
If you flip a coin and get heads 5 times in a row, your next flip is likely to be tails.	61.2%	63.5%	25.5%	23.2%	13.4%	13.4%
If a machine has not paid out in a while, odds are it's due for a win. ¹	-	64.9%	-	23.2%	-	11.8%
A series of numbers such as 12-5-23-7 is more likely to win than a series of numbers like 1-2-3-4.	56.0%	65.1%	26.5%	20.2%	17.6%	14.8%
The odds of winning on a slot machine or VLT change as you are playing.	57.1%	64.8%	22.5%	19.3%	20.4%	15.9%
Staying at the same slot machine or VLT will improve your chances of winning.	66.7%	73.7%	16.2%	13.6%	17.1%	12.8%
If you have been losing for a while, odds are you are due for a win.	76.1%	84.6%	13.3%	8.9%	10.6%	6.5%
Having a strategy or system when playing slot machines or VLTs increases the chances of winning.	71.8%	79.3%	11.0%	8.6%	17.3%	12.0%

¹ Data from 2006 are not available as this statement was included for the first time in this study. Previously, the MGCC has only asked about *people* becoming due for a win; however, it was suggested that the more prevalent myth could be that *machines* become due for a win. Both statements were included in this study to test this possibility, and, as Figure 6 demonstrates, it is indeed the case that more Manitobans are compelled by the idea that machines become due for a win. This highlights the complexities and subtleties of Manitobans' erroneous beliefs about chance, randomness and outcome control.

⁴ The statistics presented here differ from those presented in the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006). It was noted during this analysis that "don't know" is a very common response to the gambling myth statements. Although "don't know" responses are often excluded from data analysis, in this case, this represents an important analytical category, as it is critical that myth-busting initiatives target people who do not know the correct information in addition to those who actively believe incorrect information. The "don't know" category was thus retained for analysis of the present data, and so the 2006 data were analyzed again to be comparable for this report.

Figure 7 Comparison of adherence to gambling myths in 2004, 2006⁴ and 2007



Note: Although some of the difference between the 2004 results and the two later studies may reasonably be attributed to the impact of responsible gambling messaging, it is likely that some of the difference is due to methodological changes (e.g., sampling strategies, survey types, response rates) that have occurred as the MGCC's research standards have evolved. The 2006 and 2007 data are directly comparable, but the 2004 study is not. Also, the results presented in the figure are potentially much closer when margins of error are taken into account. The *Manitobans and Gambling* (2004) study had a response rate of 20%; responses are accurate within +/-2.7%, nineteen times out of twenty. The *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006) had a response rate of 31%; responses are accurate within +/-3.12%, nineteen times out of twenty.

A scale was created of the five myths that were addressed in the MGCC's public education campaign. As shown in Figure 8, more than half of Manitobans believe no myths and nearly another quarter believe just one. More people believe no myths when compared to the same scale from 2006 (55.2% vs. 47.4% in 2006). A scale was also created of all eight erroneous statements asked in the 2007 survey, as shown in Figure 9.

Figure 8 Adherence to the five gambling myths addressed in the MGCC's public education campaign

	0 myths	1 myth	2 myths	3 myths	4 myths	5 myths
% of respondents adhering to myths	55.2	22.7	12.3	6.4	2.1	1.4

Figure 9 Adherence to multiple gambling myths

	0 myths	1 myth	2 myths	3 myths	4 myths	5 myths	6 myths	7 myths	8 myths
% of respondents adhering to myths	40.2	21.4	14.7	10.4	5.3	3.6	2.8	1.1	0.5

Analyses of variance with both myth scales indicate that belief in multiple myths is linked to many of the same socio-demographic and gambling variables as the individual myths. As with the individual myths, adherence to multiple myths has an inverse relationship with education*** and income***. Interestingly, young adults do not believe higher average numbers of myths than other ages groups, but those aged over 65 *do* believe more myths*. Gamblers

believe higher numbers of myths on average than non-gamblers***, and more frequent VLT and slot machine play is also linked with adherence to more myths***.

In addition to the myth questions, respondents who gamble were asked whether they agree or disagree that they are lucky gamblers. As Figure 10 shows, just 13.5% of Manitobans believe that they are lucky gamblers; however, this number was slightly lower (10.8%⁵) in 2006. Cross-tabulations indicate that men are more likely than women to believe that they are lucky gamblers***. Manitobans with lower levels of education are also more likely to agree with the statement***, as are 18 to 24 year olds***. A belief in gambling luck is also positively related to frequency of VLT and slot machine play; that is, the more people play slot machines and VLTs, the more likely it is that they agree with this statement***. No patterns were noted by region or by income levels.

Figure 10 Belief in Gambling Luck

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	“Don’t know”	Total agree
I am a lucky gambler	63.0%	17.5%	10.7%	2.8%	6.1%	13.5%

Principal-axis factor analysis was conducted to explore the factor structure of the eight myth statements and the statement about belief in gambling luck. The Factor Analysis 1 text box on the next page provides full details about the factor analysis.

Figure 11 Pattern matrix of eight myth statements, with oblique rotation (highlighted myths indicate the factor upon which each myth loaded best)

	Misperception about randomness (VLT and slot machine)	Misperception about randomness (not VLT and slot machine)	Illusion of control
It is important to understand exactly how a slot machine or VLT works in order to play better.	-.070	.034	.751
If you flip a coin and get heads 5 times in a row, your next flip is likely to be tails.	.103	.569	-.044
If a machine has not paid out in a while, odds are it’s due for a win.	.661	.063	.061
A series of numbers such as 12-5-23-7 is more likely to win than a series of numbers like 1-2-3-4.	-.066	.645	.054
The odds of winning on a slot machine or VLT change as you are playing.	.272	-.026	.206
Staying at the same slot machine or VLT will improve your chances of winning.	.771	-.017	-.019
If you have been losing for a while, odds are you are due for a win.	.565	.050	-.048
Having a strategy or system when playing slot machines or VLTs increases the chances of winning.	.175	.045	.374

Note: The rotation converged in 6 iterations.

⁵ This statistic is different from the one noted in the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006). It was noted during this analysis that “don’t know” is a very common response to the gambling myth statements, including statements about gambling luck. Although “don’t know” responses are often excluded from data analysis, in this case, this represents an important analytical category, as it is critical that myth-busting initiatives target people who do not know the correct information in addition to those who actively believe incorrect information. The “don’t know” category was thus retained for analysis of the present data, and so the 2006 data were analyzed again to be comparable for this report.

The purpose of factor analysis is to seek patterns in relationships between measured variables and to identify latent variables, called factors, which contribute to explaining these relationships. As Figure 11 indicates, four statements loaded most heavily on the first factor and all are based on the common thread that odds change during VLT and slot machine play and play and that persistence pays off for gamblers. The two statements that loaded most heavily on the second factor are related to a pure understanding of randomness, unrelated to VLT and slot machine play. The final two statements that loaded most heavily on the third factor share the common theme that strategy can change outcomes when playing slot machines and VLTs.

These results are in keeping with previous research, although two factors – a set of misperceptions about randomness and an illusion of control – have generally been proposed (e.g., Steenbergh, Meyers, May & Whelan, 2002; Ladouceur and Walker, 1996). Previous research, however, has tended to use statements that are either all related to electronic gaming or not at all particular to any one type of gambling. It is not unlikely that this analysis uncovered three factors because of the mix of questions related and unrelated to VLTs and slot machines. A two-factor solution was forced in order to consider this option; this did not result in a better model. Although this series of statements was not derived empirically and is certainly not thought to capture all possible cognitive fallacies that could relate to gambling, it is satisfying that these statements do hinge on the same factors that have been proposed theoretically and in previous empirical work.

Factor Analysis 1 Gambling myths and luck

The Keyer-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (.78) and Bartlett's test of sphericity*** both indicated that the correlation matrix is appropriate for principal-axis factor analysis.

Three factors with eigenvalues greater than one were extracted from the correlation matrix and examination of the scree plot suggested that a three-factor solution warranted consideration from a theoretical lens. Factor loadings were also examined: the statement about belief in gambling luck was dropped from the analysis because it failed to load above 0.15 on any of the factors. The analysis was run again with the remaining eight statements and, again, three factors with eigenvalues greater than one were extracted. The three-factor solution explains 60.8% of the variance in belief in myth statements.


Orthogonal (i.e., varimax) rotation was performed to increase the interpretability of the factors. All eight statements loaded above 0.25 on at least one factor; however, some of the statements loaded heavily on more than one factor. Due to the strong potential for correlation between the factors, the analysis was run again using oblique (i.e., oblimin) rotation. The factor correlation matrix indicated correlations of at least 0.3 between all three factors, and so this was retained as the final solution that is presented in Figure 11.

Responsible Gambling

In order to explore Manitobans' understanding of gambling behaviours, respondents were asked what "responsible gambling" means to them. They described the term in their own words and interviewers then recorded their responses into a list of pre-determined categories. Interviewers were instructed to probe for further details when respondents provided vague definitions. As Figure 12 illustrates, the majority of respondents correctly identify aspects of responsible gambling; however 9% of respondents feel that there is "no such thing as responsible

gambling.” These statistics are very similar to those from the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report (2006)*.

Figure 12 Perceptions of “responsible gambling” (Highlighted items are widely recognized as being aspects of responsible gambling practice; e.g., *Preparing for Change Gambling Handbook, 2001*).



Note: Percentages exceed 100% due to multiple responses.


Respondents who gamble were next asked about their responsible gambling practices, more particularly, whether they limit their own gambling. Limit setting is one of the defining aspects of responsible gambling for players (*Preparing for Change Gambling Handbook, 2001*). Limit setting may be particularly critical for gambling because the continuum of risk of harm increases with greater participation (e.g., Shaffer, 2005) and because, compared with other addictions, the outward signs of problem gambling are often subtle (Hodgins, 2006).

This study's section on limit-setting was expanded from previous years in order to better explore common limit-setting strategies used by Manitobans who gamble. Previously, the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report (2006)* only asked respondents how often they set spending or time limits when gambling and how often they stuck to these limits; these categories were broken down further in this research.

Respondents were asked about four different kinds of limits: duration limits (i.e., “Do you set a limit on how long you play?”), frequency limits (i.e., “Do you limit how often you gamble?”), spending limits (i.e., “Do you set a spending limit or budget where you decide in advance the maximum amount you’ll spend gambling?”) and financial access limits (i.e., “Do you limit your available cash, for example, by leaving debit cards at home or by stopping play when you run out of cash?”). As Figure 13 illustrates, setting a spending limits is the most common strategy used by Manitobans to gamble responsibly, followed by financial access limits, frequency limits, and duration limits.

Cross-tabulations show very few socio-demographic patterns among people who gamble responsibly by setting limits. Winnipeggers are less likely than Manitobans from other areas to always set duration* and frequency** limits, but there are no regional differences for spending and financial access limits. Women are more likely than men to set spending** and financial access** limits, but not to limit the duration or frequency of their play. Limit setting does not otherwise differ significantly by age, participation in the workforce, income levels or education levels.

Figure 13 Use of four limit-setting strategies




Respondents who reported setting limits were asked more questions about their average limits and how often they stick to these limits. Those who limit the duration of their gambling report a mean limit of 60 minutes (median of 80 minutes) of play and 68.3% of these people report that they always stick to their duration limits. Those who set frequency limits report an

average limit of approximately two gambling occasions per month (median of once per month) and 76.0% report always sticking to their limits. Even more people (79.3%) who set spending limits report always sticking to them; the average spending limit is \$38.22 (median of \$20.00). These questions were not asked about financial access limits.

A scale was created with the four limit strategies (i.e., duration, frequency, spending and financial access limits) in order to examine whether Manitobans use multiple strategies to gamble responsibly. Sixty-four percent (64%) of Manitobans always set at least one kind of limit when they gamble, as illustrated in Figure 14. Analyses of variance with this limits scale show no significant links between the number of limits that a person always sets and their socio-demographic characteristics. Cross-tabulations comparing the people who never set a limit with those who always set at least one limit indicate that women set at least one limit more often than men*** and that young adults (18 to 24 years) and seniors (65+ years) report always setting limits less often than people in other age groups*.

Figure 14 Use of multiple limit-setting strategies



Principal-axis factor analysis was conducted to explore the factor structure of the four limit-setting strategies; the Factor Analysis 2 text box provides full details. As Figure 15 indicates, all four strategies load well on this factor. A single-factor solution suggests that there is one latent variable, for instance, a value for limit-setting, that drives Manitobans to use different limit-setting strategies.

Factor Analysis 2 Limit-setting strategies

The Keyer-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (.67) and Bartlett's test of sphericity*** both indicated that the correlation matrix is appropriate for principal-axis factor analysis.

Just one factor with an eigenvalue of 1.93 was extracted from the correlation matrix and examination of the scree plot suggested that additional-factor solutions did not warrant consideration. The single-factor solution explains 48.1% of the variance in use of limit-setting strategies.

Figure 15 Factor matrix of four limit-setting strategies

	Factor loadings
Duration: Do you set a limit on how long you play?	.436
Frequency: Do you limit how often you gamble?	.499
Spending: Do you set a spending limit or budget where you decide in advance the maximum amount you'll spend gambling?	.717
Financial access: Do you limit your available cash, for example, by leaving debit cards at home or by stopping play when you run out of cash?	.568

Note: The analysis converged in 12 iterations.

The survey asked four questions about Manitobans' opinions, including two opinions that relate to responsible gambling and people's motivations for gambling. As Figure 16 indicates, very few Manitobans (2.0%) feel that gambling is a good way to make money, which indicates a healthy perspective on randomness and the true chances of winning. A majority of Manitobans (58.2%) see the fun in gambling, although they recognize the high likelihood of losing. These statistics do not differ significantly by socio-demographic categories.

Figure 16 Opinions about motivations for gambling


	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	Total agree
Gambling is a good way to make money.	94.6%	3.3%	1.5%	0.5%	2.0%
It's fun to gamble, even if I'll probably lose in the end.	28.5%	13.4%	43.6%	14.6%	58.2%
Spending money gambling is like spending money to see a movie or concert or going out to dinner.	50.2%	8.9%	27.0%	13.9%	40.9%
Spending money on gambling run by charities is a way of donating to the charity.	24.1%	9.0%	43.3%	23.6%	66.9%

The other two questions also relate to the reasons why Manitobans gamble. Again as Figure 16 indicates, many Manitobans feel that spending money gambling is akin to spending money on other entertainment options (40.9%) or on charitable donations (66.9%). Manitobans who gamble agree with these opinions much more than those who do not***. People with higher levels of education* also agree slightly more often than those with lower levels, but seniors (65+ years) agree with these statements less than younger people**.

Recognizing Problem Gambling

Following the section on responsible gambling, respondents were asked a series of questions about recognizing problem gambling. Respondents were not asked to rank the seriousness of signs of problem gambling, as previous surveys (*Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report, 2006; Manitobans and Gambling, 2004*) found that respondents tend to rate all signs as being very serious. Instead, an open-ended question asked respondents to generate signs that would indicate to them that a friend, family member or colleague might be having a problem with their gambling. Figure 17 shows the percentage of respondents who offered responses in different categories. Just 9% of respondents were unable to offer any signs that might indicate problem gambling, which suggests that many Manitobans would be able to recognize problem gambling if they saw it.

Figure 17 Perceptions of signs of problem gambling (Highlighted items are recognized as signs that someone could be experiencing harm from their gambling; e.g., *Preparing for Change Gambling Handbook*, 2001).



v

Note: Percentages exceed 100% due to multiple responses. Three other response categories that were mentioned too infrequently to include in this figure are: pawning or selling possessions to gamble (0.8%); abusing substances such as alcohol, drugs and tobacco while gambling (0.7%); and marital or family breakup / disintegration of relationships as a result of gambling (0.4%).

Respondents were then asked whether they had experienced difficulties due to gambling. Less than five percent (3.4%) reported that their own gambling had caused them difficulties at work, with finances, with relationships, or in any other areas. More (16.7%) indicated that someone else’s gambling had caused them difficulties in these same areas. Please note that this is self-report data on harm from gambling, and *is not* a measure of problem gambling prevalence.

Cross-tabulations indicate that fewer females than males reported experiencing harm from their own gambling***, as had fewer people in higher income brackets, compared with those in lower brackets*. This is the first time the MGCC asked these questions about gambling-related difficulties, and so these statistics cannot be compared to earlier ones.

Finally, the survey asked respondents three questions about problem gambling in Manitoba. As Figure 18 indicates, nearly all Manitobans are aware that problem gambling can affect people across all socio-demographic categories, although young adults (18 to 24 years) and seniors (65+ years) are less aware of this reality than people in other age groups***.

Figure 18 Opinions about gambling in Manitoba

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree	“Don’t know”	Total agree
Problem gambling is an issue that affects people of all ages, ethnicities and economic backgrounds	2.4%	1.8%	14.6%	78.8%	2.3%	93.4%
Gambling is a serious problem in Manitoba.	3.4%	11.8%	27.2%	45.1%	12.6%	72.3%

Figure 18 also shows that nearly three-quarters (72.3%) of Manitobans feel that gambling is a serious problem affecting the province. Those who gamble agree with this statement less than non-gamblers***, and young adults (18 to 24 years) agree less than people in other age groups***. Women are more likely than men to say that gambling is a serious problem**.

In addition to assessing seriousness, respondents were asked the question, “What do you think is the rate of problem gambling in Manitoba; that is, what percentage of Manitobans would you guess have gambling problems?” Responses ranged from 1% to 100%, with an average guess that one-quarter (25.1%) of Manitobans have gambling problems⁶. This is much higher than the true rate; the most recent prevalence statistics are based on data from the 2002 Canadian Community Health Survey and estimate that 2.9% of Manitobans are moderate risk or problem gamblers (Cox, Yu, Afifi & Ladouceur, 2005). This suggests that Manitobans are misinformed about the magnitude of gambling problems in the province, but underscores that Manitobans feel that problem gambling is common.

Public Education Campaign Recall


The final section of the survey asked respondents a number of questions related to their awareness of the MGCC’s public education campaign. The MGCC’s monitors the impact of its

⁶ The MGCC does not measure the prevalence of problem gambling and this statistic is certainly not a measure of prevalence, but rather of Manitobans’ (inaccurate) perceptions of prevalence.

campaign messaging in order to ensure that its public education initiatives continue to respond to the changing needs of Manitobans.

Respondents were first asked if they recalled seeing or hearing an advertisement by the MGCC, with a description of the creative treatment read out along with its corresponding phrase (e.g., ‘Think you can twist my arm?’, ‘So you think I’m hot?’). As Figure 19 illustrates, a fifth (20%) of Manitobans recalled seeing or hearing the MGCC advertisements; this is a combination of 1% who recalled the campaign without prompts and an additional 19% who required prompts. This is higher than one year earlier (*Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report, 2006*), when 13% of Manitobans recalled the campaign. It is encouraging and significant that more Manitobans recalled the campaign after its second run; research (e.g., Gonzales, Glik, Davoudi & Ang, 2004; Price, 2001) has suggested that social marketing campaigns are an effective way to shift public perceptions, albeit this process is slow. For comparison, the proportion of respondents who are aware of *any* public messages about gambling – including promotional messages about gambling products and messages about gambling treatment – is 81%.

Figure 19 Overall awareness of the MGCC campaign



Cross-tabulations indicate that people who gamble are more likely to recall the MGCC’s public education campaign**. Recall is also higher for those with higher incomes*, those educated beyond high school*** and those who work full- or part-time***. Recall is negatively associated with age; that is, people in younger age groups (18 to 24 years and 25 to 34 years) are much more likely to recall the campaign, and recall decreases with age***. No patterns were noted by region or gender, which has changed since the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report (2006)*, when Winnipeggers and women had higher recall than other groups. The MGCC made some changes to the campaign’s target audience following the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report (2006)*, including making more efforts to target young adults, Aboriginals and

people living outside of Winnipeg. These statistics suggest that these changes had the desired effect of reaching Manitobans who were previously unaware of the campaign.

Respondents who recalled the campaign were asked in what media source or sources these messages appeared. Results, as shown in Figure 20 indicate that radio, transit buses and shelters and newspapers have the highest rates of recall, which is consistent with the results from 2006. Some confusion with other responsible gambling messaging is evident, given that many respondents recalled seeing or hearing the MGCC advertisements in media where they did not actually appear.

Figure 20 Recall of campaign media sources (the campaign did actually appear in the highlighted media sources listed; media in which the campaign did not appear have been grouped as “other”)

	Percentage
Radio	35%
Transit bus or bus shelter/stop	16%
Newspaper	4%
Movie theatre	1%
Bar or restaurant	1%
Other	54%
Don't know	6%

Note: Percentages exceed 100% due to multiple responses.

Public Awareness of the Manitoba Gaming Control Commission

Public awareness of the MGCC is monitored on an ongoing basis by regularly including tracking questions in various research surveys. A public awareness section was incorporated into this study, as its results are generalizable to the population of Manitoba. Respondents were asked to identify the MGCC and to describe its activities, to the best of their knowledge.

Although 71.9% of respondents remembered hearing of the MGCC, only 8% were able to correctly name the MGCC as the organization that regulates gambling in Manitoba. This is slightly higher than in 2006, when just 5.3% identified the MGCC without prompting. Similar to 2006, 39.0% of Manitobans could not answer this question at all, and 39.4% incorrectly named Manitoba Lotteries Corporation. Other incorrect answers included the Addictions Foundation of Manitoba, Western Canadian Lottery Corporation, “the government” and “the casinos”. Gamblers are more likely than non-gamblers to be aware of the MGCC*** as are those who live in Winnipeg, compared to those living in other areas of the province**. Manitobans with higher levels of income and education have slightly higher awareness of the MGCC* and those who work full- or part-time are much more likely to be aware of the MGCC than homemakers, students, retirees and the unemployed***. Young adults (18-24 years) and seniors (65+ years) have the lowest levels of awareness**. When respondents were asked to describe the MGCC’s responsibilities, 66.0% of responses correctly identified aspects of the MGCC’s role, as shown in Figure 21. This suggests that many Manitobans understand that there is a gaming regulator in the province, even if its name is not top of mind.

Figure 21 Awareness of the MGCC's activities (highlighted items are true MGCC responsibilities)

Response	Percentage
Regulates gambling in Manitoba	46.5%
Runs casinos and/or VLTs and/or sells lottery tickets	10.7%
Licenses charitable gaming activities in Manitoba	7.6%
Helps problem gamblers / has a helpline	5.8%
Collects money/profit	4.8%
Ensures integrity/fairness/honesty of gambling	4.4%
Educates Manitobans about responsible gambling	4.1%
Makes policies or decisions about gambling	3.4%
Promotes gambling	1.8%
Sets payoffs / controls winnings	1.7%
Redistributes governmental profits from gambling	1.3%
Taxes people / rips people off / breaks up families	1.3%
Provides information on gambling	1.3%
Other	5.5%
Don't know	34.5%

Note: Percentages exceed 100% due to multiple responses.

Future Directions

This study was intended to inform the MGCC's responsible gambling initiatives, including the evolution of the MGCC's public education campaign, and the results do suggest some interesting directions.

Comparing the findings of this study with those from the *Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report* (2006) and *Manitobans and Gambling* (2004) shows a marked decrease over time in Manitobans' faulty cognitions about gambling-related odds and outcome control. This, combined with the finding that young adults are no longer more likely to believe the myths than older age groups, suggests that myth-busting messaging like the MGCC's may be close to reaching a saturation point in the province. This does not mean that this messaging is no longer important, that targeted groups (e.g., frequent and regular gamblers) do not still need this information, or that accurate information on gambling-related odds does not still need to be easily accessible for the public. Rather, this suggests that the bulk of the MGCC's public education funds might now be better used for different initiatives that would more widely benefit the Manitoban public.

The results suggest that the public might benefit greatly from a broad new responsible gambling campaign that would depict the key behaviours, including limit-setting, that constitute responsible gambling. Although nearly all respondents – gamblers or not – could describe aspects of responsible gambling, 36% indicated that they do not always use even one limit-setting strategy. Research suggests that offering information to encourage responsible gambling practice is one of the key aspects of enabling informed choice (Blaszczynski et. al., 2005) and that goal setting – or limit-setting in this case – is essential for gamblers to be able to properly regulate their behaviour (Brown and Newby-Clark, 2005; Gollwitzer, Fujita & Oettingen, 2004).

The Addictions Foundation of Manitoba already promotes a list of responsible gambling guidelines (*Preparing for Change Gambling Handbook*, 2001); more recent research (Currie, Hodgins, Wang, el-Guebaly, Wynne & Chen, 2006) also suggests quantitative limits that may be important to include in a campaign of responsible gambling strategies. Qualitative research to further explore how these strategies resonate with Manitobans would be required to translate this information into a responsible gambling campaign. This study suggests that such a campaign should be widely directed at Manitoban adults, as there are no strong relationships between socio-demographic characteristics and limit-setting practices. The success of the MGCC's myth-busting campaign suggests that the MGCC should use similar media for any future campaigns.

Comparing this study to earlier ones clearly indicates that gambling-related behaviours, attitudes and knowledge have changed in Manitoba in just a few short years. This highlights the need for the MGCC to continue to monitor these in order to always be basing its public education initiatives on an accurate and comprehensive picture of gambling in the province. Evaluation studies should also follow any future campaigns, as the MGCC continues to take a science-based approach to ensuring that its responsible gambling initiatives anticipate and respond to the changing needs of Manitobans.

References

- Ayton, P. & Fischer, I. (2004). The hot hand fallacy and the gambler's fallacy: Two faces of subjective randomness? Memory & Cognition, *32*, 1369-78.
- Blaszczynski, A., Ladouceur, R., Nower, L., & Shaffer, H.J. (2005, November). Informed Choice and Gambling: Principles for Consumer Protection. (Current Issues). Melbourne: Australian Gaming Council.
- Brown, A. & Newby-Clark, I.R. (2005, November). Self-Regulation and Problem Gambling. Final report submitted to the Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre: Guelph, Ontario.
- Cox, B.J., Yu, N., Afifi, T.O., Ladouceur, R. (2005). A National survey of gambling problems in Canada. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, *50*(4), 213-7.
- Currie, S.R., Hodgins, D.C., Wang, J., el-Guebaly, N., Wynne, H. & Chen, S. (2006). Risk of harm among gamblers in the general population as a function of level of participation in gambling activities. Addiction, *101*, 570-80.
- Delfabbro, P. (2004). The Stubborn Logic of Regular Gamblers: Obstacles and Dilemmas in Cognitive Gambling Research. Journal of Gambling Studies, *20*(1), 1-21.
- Gollwitzer, P.M., Fujita, K. & Oettingen, G. (2004). Planning and the Implementation of Goals. In R.F. Baumeister & K.D. Vohs (Eds.), Handbook of Self-regulation: Research, Theory and Application, 211-28. New York: The Guilford Press.
- Gonzales, R., Glik, D., Davoudi, M. & Ang, A. (2004). Media Literacy and Public Health: Integrating Theory, Research, and Practice for Tobacco Control. American Behavioral Scientist, *48*(2), 189-201.
- Hodgins, D. (2006, April). Using Population Health Data to Develop Responsible Gambling Limits. Paper presented at the Discovery 2006 Conference, Toronto.
- Ladouceur, R. & Walker, M. (1996). A cognitive perspective on gambling. In P.M. Salkoskvis (Ed.), Trends in cognitive and behavioural therapies, 89-120. New York: Wiley.
- Manitobans and Gambling. (2004). Winnipeg: Manitoba Gaming Control Commission.
- Preparing for Change Gambling Handbook. (2001). Retrieved May 25, 2006, from the World Wide Web: http://www.afm.mb.ca/pdfs/afm_Filapino_english_book.pdf. Winnipeg: Addictions Foundation of Manitoba.
- Price, N. (2001). The performance of social marketing in reaching the poor and vulnerable in AIDS control programmes. Health Policy and Planning, *16*(3), 231-9.

Public Education Campaign Evaluation Report. (2006). Winnipeg: Manitoba Gaming Control Commission.

Shaffer, H.J. (2005). From disabling to enabling the public interest. Addiction, 100(9), 1226-39.

Steenbergh, T.A., Meyers, A.W., May, R.K. & Whelan, J.P. (2002). Development and Validation of the Gamblers' Beliefs Questionnaire. Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 16(2), 143-9.

Acknowledgements

The MGCC is grateful to the 1,200 Manitobans who participated in this research. The MGCC also acknowledges Kisquared for their skilled data collection and the Addictions Foundation of Manitoba and Manitoba Lotteries Corporation for providing input to the survey questionnaire.

Appendix A: Survey Instrument

N = 1,200

INTERVIEWER: _____ PHONE: _____ - _____ # _____

REGION Winnipeg..... 1 Brandon 2 MB South 3 MB North 4

GENDER: Male 1 Female 2

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling from **kisquared**. We're a research company in Winnipeg and today we're calling a random sample of adult Manitobans to ask their opinions about gambling. Are you over 18 and have a few minutes to share your views?

IF RESPONDENT SAYS AT ANY POINT THAT HE/SHE IS "NOT A GAMBLER" SAY: We're interested in what Manitobans think about gambling and we'd like to include your opinion in the study, regardless of whether or not you gamble.

IF RESPONDENT ASKS HOW LONG THE SURVEY WILL TAKE SAY: The survey will take less than 20 minutes of your time. You can quit the survey at any time or refuse to answer any questions.

IF RESPONDENT ASKS TO CONTACT SOMEONE TO VERIFY THAT THE STUDY IS LEGITIMATE SAY: If you want further information about the study, you may call Kristianne Dechant at the Manitoba Gaming Control Commission, at 954-9430 (**for respondents in Winnipeg**) or 1-800-782-0363 (**for respondents outside of the city**).

Just before we begin, I would like to assure you that all the information gathered through this study is completely confidential. We guarantee your anonymity.

IF RESPONDENT ASKS WHO THE CLIENT IS SAY: My first questions will tell you the name of the client. **CIRCLE "Early MGCC" BELOW AND GO TO Q64.**

Early MGCC01 **GO TO Q64**

First, I'd like to ask some questions about activities that you may or may not participate in. For each, please tell me if you participate daily, 2 to 6 times per week, about once a week, 2 to 3 times a month, about once a month, 6 to 11 times a year, 1 to 5 times a year, less than once a year, or never.

Q1 Playing a sports lottery like Sport Select or betting on sports pools?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q2 Buying other lottery, instant win, or scratch tickets at lottery kiosks or through subscriptions? **IF ASKED FOR EXAMPLES:** This includes 6/49, Super7, POGO, breakopens, or Nevada tickets, but not *any* charity tickets or charity breakopens.

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q3 Buying charity raffle or fundraising tickets, including charity lotteries, charity breakopens and charity Nevada tickets?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q4 Playing bingo?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q5 Playing electronic games, like slot machines, at a casino?

Never.....	01	GO TO Q7
Less than once a year	02	
1 to 5 times a year	03	
6 to 11 times a year	04	
About once a month	05	
2 to 3 times a month.....	06	
About once a week.....	07	
2 to 6 times a week.....	08	
Daily.....	09	
Don't know	88	
Refused	99	

Q6 When you play slot machines do you prefer card games or line-up games?

Card games.....	1
Line-up games.....	2
No preference.....	3
Don't know	8
Refused	9

Q7 Playing table games, such as blackjack and roulette, at a casino? TABLE GAMES ALSO INCLUDE TEXAS HOLD'EM POKER, PAI GOW, TEXAS SHOOTOUT, MIDI BACCARAT, LET IT RIDE POKER, THREE CARD POKER, SEVEN CARD STUD POKER AND CARIBBEAN POKER.

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q8 Playing VLTs at a bar, lounge or racetrack?

Never.....	01	GO TO Q10
Less than once a year	02	
1 to 5 times a year	03	
6 to 11 times a year	04	
About once a month.....	05	
2 to 3 times a month.....	06	
About once a week.....	07	
2 to 6 times a week.....	08	
Daily.....	09	
Don't know	88	
Refused	99	

Q9 When you play VLTs do you prefer card games or line-up games?

Card games.....	1
Line-up games.....	2
No preference.....	3
Don't know	8
Refused	9

Q10 Betting on horse races, whether live at the track or off-track?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q11 Playing poker in a bar, lounge or other public facility?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q12 Playing poker at home with friends or family?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q13 Betting on cards or games with family and friends, not including poker, or on games of skill such as pool, bowling or darts?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q14 Betting on casino games, such as blackjack or poker, on the Internet?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q15 Betting on sports on the Internet?

Never	Less than once a year	1 to 5 times a year	6 to 11 times a year	About once a month	2 to 3 times a month	About once a week	2 to 6 times a week	Daily	DK	Ref
01	02	03	04	05	06	07	08	09	88	99

Q16 Next, I'd like to ask you some questions about gambling behaviours in general. What do you think "responsible gambling" means? **PROBE** Anything else? Anything else? **CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.**

- Setting a time limit.....01
- Setting a spending limit02
- Not spending more than you can afford/not gambling with money for paying bills03
- Not borrowing money to gamble04
- Not gambling at all.....05
- Treating gambling as entertainment / not taking gambling too seriously.....06
- Knowing when to walk away.....07
- Being prepared to lose money.....08
- Taking breaks when gambling.....09
- Not gambling when stressed, anxious or depressed.....10
- There's no such thing as responsible gambling11
- I've never heard of it.....12
- Other13
- Don't know88
- Refused99

Q17 If you were worried about a friend or family member's gambling, what suggestions or advice would you give them to help them manage their gambling? **PROBE** Anything else? Anything else? **CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY**

- Set a time limit/play less often/play for shorter periods01
- Set a budget/limit spending/make smaller bets.....02
- Limit their available cash/leave debit cards at home03
- Not borrow money to gamble04
- Keep it social/gamble with friends or family.....05
- Treat gambling as entertainment/not take gambling
too seriously/know when to walk away06
- Take breaks when gambling07
- Get involved in other activities/focus on other hobbies.....08
- Have somebody else monitor their finances09
- Not gamble at all/stop gambling10
- Seek information about gambling11
- Get counseling/go to the AFM/ talk to a
doctor, social worker, spiritual advisor, etc.12
- Self-exclude from the casinos13
- No gambling with money for paying bills14
- Other (specify _____) ...15
- Don't know88
- Refused99

IF RESPONDENT ANSWERED NEVER TO ALL GAMBLING QUESTIONS, CODE AS A NON-GAMBLER.

- Gambler.....1 **GO TO Q29**
- Non-gambler2

I am now going to read a series of statements that people sometimes make about gambling and I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each statement. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers. **WHEN RESPONDENT SAYS “AGREE” OR “DISAGREE” SAY:** And would you say that you strongly [agree/disagree] or somewhat [agree/disagree]? **ROTATE**

Series A

	Strongly disagree	Somewt disagree	Somewt agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	DK	REF
Q18 The odds of winning on a slot machine or VLT change as you are playing.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q19 It is important to understand exactly how a slot machine or VLT works in order to play better.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q20 Having a strategy or system when playing slot machines or VLTs increases the chances of winning.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q21 Staying at the same slot machine or VLT will improve your chances of winning.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q22 If a <i>machine</i> has not paid out in awhile, odds are it's due for a win.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q23 If <i>you</i> have been losing for awhile, odds are you are due for a win.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q24 If you flip a coin and get heads 5 times in a row, your next flip is likely to be tails.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q25 A series of numbers, such as 12-5-23-7 is more likely to win than a series of numbers like 1-2-3-4.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q26 Gambling is a good way to make money.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q27 Spending money gambling is like spending money to see a movie or concert or going out to dinner.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q28 Spending money on gambling run by charities is a way of donating to the charity.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9

GO TO Q54.

For the next statements, please tell me whether or not you ever use the following strategies to manage your own gambling. **IF YES:** How often do you do this? Would you say rarely, sometimes, often or always? **ROTATE B SERIES.**

Series B1	No / never	Rarely	Some-times	Often	Always	DK	REF
Q29 Do you set a limit on how long you play? IF YES, ASK And would you say you set a limit rarely, sometimes, often, or do you always set a limit? IF NO, GO TO FIRST QUESTION IN NEXT SERIES	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q30 When you set a time limit, what's the average limit you set? ENTER 88 FOR DK OR 99 FOR REFUSED	___ ___ hours or ___ ___ minutes						
Q31 When you set a time limit, how often do you stick to your limit? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or do you always stick to your time limit?	1	2	3	4	5	8	9

Series B2

Q32 Do you limit how often you gamble? **IF YES, ASK** And would you say you limit how often you gamble rarely, sometimes, often, or do you always limit how often you gamble? **IF NO, GO TO FIRST QUESTION IN NEXT SERIES**

	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Q33 When you limit how often you gamble, what's the average limit you set? **ENTER 888 FOR DK OR 999 FOR REFUSED**

___ ___ ___ times

Q34 And is that ___ ___ ___ times per...**READ LIST**

Week	1
Month.....	2
Year.....	3
Don't know	8
Refused	9

Q35 When you limit how often you gamble, how often to you stick to your limit? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or do you always stick to you limit?

	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
--	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Series B3

Q36 Do you limit your available cash, for example, by leaving debit cards at home or by stopping playing when you run out of cash? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or do you always limit your available cash?

No / never	Rarely	Some-times	Often	Always	DK	REF
1	2	3	4	5	8	9

Series B4

Q37 Do you set a spending limit or budget where you decide in advance the maximum amount you'll spend gambling? **IF YES, ASK** do you set a spending limit or budget rarely, sometimes, often, or do you always set a spending limit or budget? **IF NO, GO TO FIRST QUESTION IN NEXT SERIES**

1	2	3	4	5	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

Q38 When you set a spending limit or budget, what's the average limit you set? **ENTER 8888 FOR DK OR 9999 FOR REFUSED**

___ ___ ___ dollars

Q39 When you set a spending limit or budget, how often do you stick to your limit? Would you say never, rarely, sometimes, often, or do you always stick to your spending limit or budget?

1	2	3	4	5	8	9
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

I am now going to read a series of statements that people sometimes make about gambling and I would like you to tell me whether you agree or disagree with each statement. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers. **WHEN RESPONDENT SAYS "AGREE" OR "DISAGREE" SAY:** And would you say that you strongly [agree/disagree] or somewhat [agree/disagree]? **ROTATE.**

Series C

	Strongly disagree	Somewt disagree	Somewt agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	DK	REF
Q40 The odds of winning on a slot machine or VLT change as you are playing.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q41 It is important to understand exactly how a slot machine or VLT works in order to play better.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q42 Having a strategy or system when playing slot machines or VLTs increases the chances of winning.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q43 Staying at the same slot machine or VLT will improve your chances of winning.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q44 If a <i>machine</i> has not paid out in awhile, odds are it's due for a win.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q45 If <i>you</i> have been losing for awhile, odds are you are due for a win.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q46 If you flip a coin and get heads 5 times in a row, your next flip is likely to be tails.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q47 A series of numbers, such as 12-5-23-7 is more likely to win than a series of numbers like 1-2-3-4.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q48 Gambling is a good way to make money.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q49 Spending money gambling is like spending money to see a movie or concert or going out to dinner.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q50 Spending money on gambling run by charities is a way of donating to the charity.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9

Using the same scale...**ROTATE**

Series D

	Strongly disagree	Somewt disagree	Somewt agree	Strongly agree	Neutral	DK	REF
Q51 I am a lucky gambler.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q52 It's fun to gamble, even if I'll probably lose in the end.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9
Q53 I prefer playing games where some skill is involved in winning.	1	2	3	4	5	8	9

The next series of questions asks about difficulties related to gambling.

Q54 There are many different signs that can indicate that somebody is having problems with their gambling. What sort of signs might indicate to you that a friend, family member or colleague might be having problems with their gambling? **PROBE** Anything else? Anything else? **CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.**

- Gambling to win back losses/chasing losses01
- Spending too much/spending more than they can afford.....02
- Gambling longer than planned.....03
- Expressing regret about gambling04
- Borrowing money to gamble/gambling on credit05
- Lying about gambling06
- Expressing stress or anxiety about gambling.....07
- Gambling with money meant for essentials.....08
- Neglecting important responsibilities
(e.g., work, school, family) to gamble09
- Having unpaid bills or increasing debt due to gambling10
- Talking a lot about gambling11
- Arguing with friends and family about money issues12
- Gambling too much/ a lot / more than planned /
compulsive gambling13
- Other (specify _____)14
- Don't know88
- Refused99

Q55 Has someone else's gambling ever caused you difficulties with finances, with relationships, at work or in any other areas?

- Yes1
- No.....2
- Don't know8
- Refused9

Q56 Has your own gambling ever caused you difficulties at work, with finances, with relationships, or in any other areas?

- Yes1
- No.....2
- Don't know8
- Refused9

My final series of questions is about your perceptions of gambling in Manitoba. Please tell me whether you agree or disagree with each statement. Keep in mind that there are no right or wrong answers. **WHEN RESPONDENT SAYS “AGREE” OR “DISAGREE” SAY:** And would you say that you strongly [agree/disagree] or somewhat [agree/disagree]?

Q57 Gambling is a serious problem in Manitoba.

- Strongly disagree1
- Somewhat disagree2
- Somewhat agree3
- Strongly agree4
- Neutral.....5
- Don't know8
- Refused9

Q58 Problem gambling is an issue that affects people of all ages, ethnicities and economic backgrounds.

- Strongly disagree1
- Somewhat disagree2
- Somewhat agree3
- Strongly agree4
- Neutral.....5
- Don't know8
- Refused9

Q59 What do you think is the rate of problem gambling in Manitoba; that is, what percentage of Manitobans would you guess have gambling problems? **ENTER 888 IF DK OR 999 IF REFUSED.**

_____ %

Q60 Do you recall ever seeing or hearing any public messages or advertising about gambling?

- Yes1
- No.....2 **GO TO Q64**
- Don't know8 **GO TO Q64**
- Refused9 **GO TO Q64**

Q61 Can you tell me what was the main message of these ads, or what you remember from the ads? **PROBE** Anything else? Anything else?

Q62 Where do you recall seeing or hearing these ads? **PROBE** Anything else? Anything else?
CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.

- Radio01
- Newspaper.....02
- Transit bus or bus shelter/stop03
- Movie theatre04
- Casino05
- Bar or restaurant.....06
- Billboard07
- Internet08
- Pamphlet/brochure09
- Coffee newsletters (e.g., *Coffeetime*,
News in a Minute)10
- TV11
- Other12
- Don't know88
- Refused99

Q63 Do you remember who sponsored the ads or messages?

- Manitoba Gaming Control Commission.....1
- Manitoba Lotteries Corporation.....2
- Addictions Foundation of Manitoba3
- Government.....4
- Casinos.....5
- Other6
- Don't know8
- Refused9

IF Q64 –Q66 ALREADY COMPLETED GO TO Q67

Q64 As far as you know, what is the name of the organization that regulates gambling in Manitoba?

- Manitoba Gaming Control Commission.....01 **GO TO Q66**
- Manitoba Lotteries Corporation.....02
- Addictions Foundation of Manitoba03
- Western Canada Lottery Corporation04
- Government (not specific)05
- Provincial government06
- Federal government07
- Casinos.....08
- Other09
- Don't know88
- Refused99

- Q65 Have you heard of the Manitoba Gaming Control Commission?
- Yes1
 - No.....2
 - Don't know8
 - Refused9

Q66 To the best of your knowledge what does the Manitoba Gaming Control Commission do?
PROBE Anything else? Anything else? **CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.**

- Regulates gambling in Manitoba01
- Ensures integrity/fairness/honesty of gambling.....02
- Collects money/profit.....03
- Runs casinos and/or VLTs and/or sells lottery tickets.....04
- Helps problem gamblers/has a hotline05
- Licenses gaming activities in Manitoba (charitable)06
- Makes policies/decisions about gambling07
- Taxes people/rips people off/breaks up families08
- Sets payoffs/controls winnings09
- Redistributes governmental profits from gambling10
- Promotes gambling11
- Educates Manitobans about responsible gambling12
- Provides information about gambling.....13
- Does research on gambling14
- Other15
- Nothing16
- Don't know88
- Refused99

RETURN TO Q1 IF APPLICABLE

Q67 Do you recall ever seeing or hearing advertisements by the Manitoba Gaming Control Commission that featured a photograph of a person's hand playing a VLT or the voice of a VLT and used phrases such as "Think you can twist my arm?" and "So you think I'm hot?" and "Think you can push my buttons?" and "Think you're in touch with your feelings?"
 Do you recall seeing or hearing one of these ads?

- Yes1
- No.....2 **GO TO Q70**
- Don't know8 **GO TO Q70**
- Refused9 **GO TO Q70**

Q68 Can you tell me what was the main message of the ads or what you learned from the ads?
PROBE Anything else? Any other message?

Q69 Where do you recall seeing or hearing these ads? **PROBE** Anything else? Anything else?
CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.

Radio	01
Newspaper.....	02
Transit bus or bus shelter/stop	03
Movie theatre	04
Casino	05
Bar or restaurant.....	06
Billboard	07
Internet	08
Pamphlet/brochure	09
Coffee newsletters (e.g., Coffeetime, News in a Minute).....	10
Other	11
Don't know	88
Refused	99

Q70 To close, I would like to ask you a few quick questions strictly for classification purposes.
 What is the highest level of schooling you have completed?

Less than high school.....	1
Completed high school	2
Some post-secondary	3
Completed post-secondary.....	4
Don't know	8
Refused	9

Q71 Which of the following best-describes your current employment status? **READ LIST**

Employed full-time	1
Employed part-time	2
Homemaker/student/unemployed/out of labour force	3
Retired.....	4
Don't know	8
Refused	9

Q72 For statistical purposes only, we need information about your income. Please tell me which category applies to your total household income before taxes. **READ LIST.**

Less than \$10,000	01
\$10,000 to \$19,999	02
\$20,000 to \$29,999	03
\$30,000 to \$39,999	04
\$40,000 to \$49,999	05
\$50,000 to \$59,999	06
\$60,000 to \$79,999	07
\$80,000 and over.....	08
Don't know	88
Refused	99

Q73 Which of the following categories best describes your age? **READ LIST.**

18-24 years old.....	01
25-34 years old.....	02
35-44 years old.....	03
45-54 years old.....	04
55-64 years old.....	05
65-74 years old.....	06
75-84 years old.....	07
85-94 years old.....	08
95 years and older	09
Don't know	88
Refused	99

Q74 In addition to being Canadian, to what other ethnic or cultural groups do you belong?
PROBE Anything else? Anything else? **CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY.**

Canadian only	01
British (English/Scottish/Welsh)	02
German	03
Ukrainian.....	04
Irish	05
French	06
Aboriginal (First Nations/Métis/Inuit).....	07
Polish.....	08
Dutch.....	09
Filipino.....	10
Scandinavian (Swedish/Norwegian/ Danish/Finnish).....	11
Russian.....	12
Icelandic.....	13
Italian	14
Belgian	15
Jewish.....	16
Other (specify _____)	17
Don't know	88
Refused	99

Thank you for helping us with this survey. Your responses are very important and we appreciate the time it has taken you to answer these questions.