



FACULTY OF EDUCATION

**Weighing up the odds:
Young Tasmanians' knowledge of,
attitudes to, experiences of, and
future intentions about gambling**

A report commissioned by the
Department of Health and Human Services, Tasmania

Christine Gardner and John Williamson

Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania

August 2011

The views expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of Health and Human Services, Tasmania.

Acknowledgements

The study about which this report is written could not have been undertaken without the participation of 606 young Tasmanians who completed questionnaires and the two young people who, with parental agreement, volunteered to participate in individual face-to-face interviews¹. The assistance of youth development officers (based in municipalities and at health services) in extending invitations to young people to participate and have their voices heard is very much appreciated. We thank the schools and colleges that either welcomed us into their busy programs and/or publicized the project in their newsletters.

We would also like to thank the Gambling Support Program (GSP), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Tasmania for commissioning this research. In particular we acknowledge the advice and assistance received from Mr Gavin Miller (Co-ordinator, GSP), Mr Ben Ross (Health Promotion Officer, GSP) in 2008 and Mr Baden Phillips (Community Education Officer, GSP) during 2009, and Ms Simone Zell (Youth Policy Officer, DHHS).

Special thanks are owed to Dr Elkana Ngwenya who conducted the statistical procedures.

¹ All young people who participated in this study by completing questionnaires were provided with information about the interviews. Only two young people expressed interest in being interviewed and provided parental permission for these to be conducted. It is clear that data from only two young people can in no way be representative of the views of young Tasmanians; however, interview participants' comments that are in accordance with majority views expressed through the survey were considered to be of relevance to the overall picture of participants' views perceptions of gambling. In addition, some of their comments were used in the construction of the vignette about gambling problems that may be faced by a small number of participants.

Contents

- Acknowledgements iii**
- Contents.....iv**
- List of Tables viii**
- List of Figures..... x**
- Executive summary 1**
- Introduction 1
- Procedures and the sample..... 1
- Findings..... 2
 - Contexts in which young people live and socialise 3
 - Factors that influence young people’s views about gambling 3
 - Knowledge and beliefs of young people about gambling 4
 - Young people’s experiences with gambling 5
- Introduction 8**
- A brief literature review 8**
- Introduction 8
- Defining problem gambling 8
- Problem gambling and young people 9
- Prevalence of gambling 9
- Misperceptions of gambling 10
- Causes of gambling..... 11
- Games of skill and games of chance 11
- Potential outcomes of gambling..... 11
- Gender and gambling 12
- Responsible gambling education programs and treatment support for problem gambling..... 13
- Procedures and the sample 14**
- Results..... 16**

Demographics: The young Tasmanians who participated in this study	17
Age (in years) of participants	17
Gender of participants	18
Intention of participants to complete Year 12	18
Parents' study at university	19
Participants who identified as Aboriginals / Torres Strait Islanders	19
Location of participants' homes: city, town and rural	19
Location of participants' homes: by region	21
Languages Other Than English (LOTE) spoken at home	21
Contexts in which young Tasmanians live and socialise	21
Item 12: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?	21
Factors that influence young people's views about gambling...and their interest/intentions regarding future gambling	25
Item 12: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements [about future gambling]?	25
Item 13a: How have the following influenced your attitude to gambling?	26
TEST: Views about gambling and family context. Cross-tabulated regular gambling by at least one family member with influence-family	27
Item 15: To what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements?	28
TEST: Views about gambling. 'Gambling can give high returns'	30
TEST: Views about gambling. 'Gambling is fun'	30
TESTS: Views about gambling and region. Cross-tabulated 'gambling is risky' with region south, and with region north-west	31
TESTS: Views about gambling and location of home. Cross-tabulated 'gambling is risky' with each of town and city	33
TESTS: Views of gambling, location of home and father's education. Cross-tabulated 'gambling is a good way to hang out with friends' with rural and with father's education.....	35

TESTS: Gender and age and views about gambling. Cross-tabulated gender and age with 'gambling is fun' and 'gambling is a good way to hang out with friends'	35
Knowledge and beliefs of young people about gambling	37
Item 16: How much skill (rating out of 10) do you think is potentially involved in the activities listed below?	37
Item 17: The 'House Edge' is the built-in advantage (profit) that the gambling venue has in every game. Percentages change from game to game. Tick either 'true' or 'false' for each statement.	39
Item 18: If two coins with tail on one side and head on the other are tossed, what is the chance of getting two tails?	40
TESTS: Knowledge and age. Cross-tabulated probability of heads/tails with age (in years)	41
TESTS: Knowledge and views of gambling. Cross-tabulated probability of heads/tails with 'gambling is risky'	41
Knowledge of heads/tails with Item 15, sub-item, 'gambling is risky'	41
Item 19: Imagine that two gamblers Bob and Sue are playing poker machines. If you look at the table below you can see how much they won each game. Who is most likely to get a big win on the next game?	42
Item 23: For each of the four statements please tick to show whether you agree or disagree.	43
Item 22: Have you taken part in any 'responsible gambling' school/college activities last year or this year?	44
Participants' experiences with gambling	44
Item 20a: Thinking about the last 12 months please tick the extent to which these questions apply to your own gambling.	45
Participants' experiences with types of gambling	50
Item 7a: How often have you gambled on the following during the last 12 months?	50
Item 8: On which activities do you usually use your own money to gamble?	51

TESTS: Region in which participants lived, gender and gambling experiences. Cross-tabulated region with playing scratch tickets and gender with playing bingo	54
TESTS: Views of gambling and gambling experiences. 'A good way to hang out with friends', 'fun' and risky cross-tabulated with gambling experiences, that is, playing cards for money, scratch tickets, and bingo.....	55
Item 21a: How often do you play video/computer or arcade games? If you play, how many hours do you usually play?	56
Item 21c: If you play video/computer or arcade games, how many hours would you usually play?.....	58
Item 9: Have you ever done any of the following? If so, how did you do it?	60
Item 10: At what age did you first gamble on any of the activities listed in Item 9?	61
Item 11: Did you have a big win when you first tried gambling?	62
Item 14a: If you have obtained cigarettes, scratch tickets and/or alcohol, how easy was it?.....	63
TEST: Ease of difficulty of access and age. Ease or difficulty of access to all of cigarettes, scratch tickets and alcohol with age	64
Item 22: Have you taken part in any 'responsible gambling' school/college activities last year or this year?	64
Vignette	65
Summary	67
References	69
Appendices	75
Appendix A: Demographic data and Item 22	76
Appendices B1 & B2: The Information Sheets.....	80
Appendix C: The Questionnaire	87
Appendix D: The Interview Schedule.....	101

List of Tables

Table 1. Participants' friends and family and gambling (Item 12 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)	22
Table 2. Participants' intentions re future gambling (Item 12 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)	25
Table 3. Influences on participants' attitudes to gambling (Item 13a - How have the following influenced your attitude to gambling?)	27
Table 4. Participants' reactions to statements about risk, financial returns and social activity with respect to gambling (Item 15 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)	28
Table 5. Young people's beliefs about skill levels involved in gambling activities (Item 16 - How much skill (rating out of 10) do you think is potentially involved in the activities listed below?)	37
Table 6. Participants' beliefs about the House Edge (Item 17 - Tick either 'true' or 'false' for each statement)	40
Table 7. Participants' knowledge of probability (Item 18 - If two coins are tossed what is the chance of getting two tails?)	40
Table 8: Participants' knowledge of probability (Item 19 - Who is most likely to get a big win on the next game?)	43
Table 9. Participants' knowledge of probability (Item 23 - For each of the statements please tick to show whether you agree or disagree.)	43
Table 10. Participants' experiences with gambling (Item 20a - Thinking about the last 12 months, please tick the extent to which these questions apply to your own gambling, if you have gambled)	45
Table 11. Examples of age group analyses for five sub-items (Item 20a)	48
Table 12. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (Item 7a: How often have you gambled on any of the following during the last 12 months?)	

	50
Table 13. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (derived from Item 8a - On which activities do you usually use your own money to gamble?)	52
Table 14. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (derived from Item 8b - How many dollars do you usually spend each time?)	53
Table 15. Frequency of playing a variety of games (Item 21a - How often do you play video / computer or arcade games?)	57
Table 16. Frequency of playing a variety of games (Item 21a - If you play, how many hours do you usually play?)	58
Table 17. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (Item 21c - How many dollars do you usually spend each time?)	58
Table 18. Problems with gambling grouped according to responses of no gaming* and at least one hour gaming	59
Table 19. Participants' experiences of gambling (Item 9 - Have you ever done any of the following? If so, how did you do it?)	60
Table 20. Participants' experiences of gambling (Item 10 - At what age did you first gamble on any of the activities listed in Item 9?)	61
Table 21. Participants' experiences of gambling (Item 11 - Did you have a big win when you first tried gambling?)	63
Table 22. Participants' experiences of risky behaviours (Item 14a - If you have obtained cigarettes, scratchies and / or alcohol, how easy was it?)	63
Table 23: Age (in years) of participants (Item 2b)	77
Table 24: Gender of participants (Item 2a)	77
Table 25: Intention to complete Year 12 (Item 1d)	77

Table 26: Father studied at university (Item 3a)	77
Table 27: Mother studied at university (Item 3b)	77
Table 28: Identified as Aboriginal /Torres Strait Islander (Item 5)	78
Table 29: Location of participants' homes - city, town or rural (Item 1b)	78
Table 30: Location of participants' homes - by region (Item 1b)	78
Table 31: Language Other Than English spoken at home (Item 6a)	78
Table 32: Have you taken part in any 'responsible gambling' school/college activities last year or this year? (Item 22)	78

List of Figures

Figure 1. Part of introductory information provided for Item 19	42
---	----

Executive summary

Introduction

In 2008, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Tasmania commissioned the authors at the Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania, to investigate the knowledge, attitudes and experiences of young Tasmanians, specifically those aged between 14 and 17 years. The results and findings from this study are intended to provide the Gambling Support Program (GSP) with data and analysis that pertains to young people in Tasmania.

The study had three main purposes. First, to report the perceptions, knowledge, experiences and attitudes of young Tasmanians with respect to gambling; second, to examine critically the data and to identify statistically significant results; and finally, to discuss briefly the results of the questionnaires and highlight findings about the views of young Tasmanians that the DHHS and GSP may wish to use to inform policy and programs in community education and harm minimisation.

Accordingly, the authors conducted this study in order to identify the perceptions, knowledge, experiences and attitudes of young Tasmanians with respect to gambling. Six hundred and six young Tasmanians completed questionnaires and two of these young people, with parental agreement, volunteered to participate in individual face-to-face interviews.

Procedures and the sample

This qualitative study was designed to gather data about young people's experiences and views and used a quantitative data-gathering method (questionnaires with closed questions) in which data were gathered from 606 young Tasmanians during the second half of 2008 and early 2009. The young people were sought through formal education institutions such as schools and colleges, and through a variety of other agencies and bodies, such as council youth groups, health/support centres, the Tasmanian Youth Forum and Centrelink. In some instances, and to assist with seeking responses from whole classes in schools and colleges, as per teachers' requests, some data were obtained

from 13 and 18 year olds. Following discussion with the GSP (DHHS) liaison officer for this project at the time, it was decided that data from all participants would be included as much as was practicable. This decision has implications for consideration of some of the results as it means that inclusion of a small number of respondents aged 13 and 18 years as well as those who may not have answered all of the relevant items. Questionnaires were available for completion in hard copy and on-line.

Interviews were included in the research design as a qualitative data-gathering method (Burns, 2000) that would enable rich data to be gathered to complement, and delve into, the quantitative data gathered from the questionnaires; however, the researchers were able to achieve only two interviews with two young people, of course, with their parental approval.

The sampling procedure can be best described as opportunity sampling (Burns, 2000), which typically produces a sample that does not necessarily permit a strong confident generalisation to the broader population from which the sample was drawn. In this study a variety of recruitment sources was utilised and many opportunity samples were achieved. Comparisons between several characteristics of the entire sample and the broader population indicated similarities between these two groups. These similarities increase the confidence when making some generalisations to the broader population of young Tasmanians aged 14 years to 17 years. The limited number of 13- and 18-year-olds meant that comparisons and generalisations were not made.

The collected data has been categorised into five key areas relating to: demographics; contexts in which young people live and socialise; factors that influence young people's views about gambling; knowledge and beliefs of young people about gambling; and, their experiences with gambling.

Findings

The findings presented are both broad findings expressed in general terms and statistically significant findings based on the more than 70 STATA 9.2 Data analysis and

statistical software data tests² (StataCorp, 1996-2010) that were performed to identify results significant at an alpha level of $p < 0.05$. These two types of findings are structured under the four key areas directly related to gambling.

Contexts in which young people live and socialise

1. Many of the participants were not interested in gambling now or in the future, nor did they report that their families or friends gambled or approved of gambling. One-quarter of the participants who completed questionnaires, however, were non-committal about their intentions to gamble in the future.
2. *While many participants reported that no one in their family gambled once a week or more often, those participants in a family in which one member gambled regularly were more likely to report that their family approved of and supported gambling.

Factors that influence young people's views about gambling

3. Participants reported that major influences against gambling were family and teachers. Toy gambling games were reported as influencing participants' views in favour of gambling by the highest number of participants, closely followed by the influences of friends, advertising on TV, other advertising, and family.
4. *While participants generally agreed that gambling is risky, participants who lived in the southern region of Tasmania were less likely, than participants in the other two regions, to view gambling as risky.
5. *While participants generally agreed that gambling is risky, participants who lived in the north-western region of Tasmania were more likely, than participants in the other two regions, to agree that gambling is risky.

The participants in the north-western region of Tasmania were most likely, when compared with the participants in the northern/north-eastern and southern regions to agree that gambling is risky and the participants in the southern region were least likely

² *Statistically significant findings

to agree that gambling is risky. These two results place the participants who live in the northern/north-eastern region somewhere in between their peers in the other two regions.

6. *While participants generally agreed that gambling is risky, participants who lived in a Tasmanian town or city were more likely than participants who lived in rural areas to agree that gambling is risky.

With respect to the findings about those participants who are more likely than not to consider gambling as a risky activity, the region in which participants lived and whether they live in a rural area both need consideration. The population of the southern region is more urban than those of the combined northern/north-eastern and north-western regions. (DCAC, n.d.; DPAC, 2009b). In addition, it was only in the northern/north-eastern region that the sample size was of similar proportion to the population.

7. *Participants who agreed that gambling was a good way to socialise and spend time with friends were more likely to live in rural areas and/or to have fathers who had not studied at university and/or to be females 16 years of age.
8. *Participants who agreed that gambling was fun were more likely than not to be males who were 14 years of age or 15 years of age.

Knowledge and beliefs of young people about gambling

9. Many participants indicated that gambling was not a good way to make money; however, one-third of participants agreed that gambling could provide high returns. More than half the participants considered that gambling was not a good way to impress their peers and nearly half disagreed that gambling was a great way to socialise and spend time with friends. The 'fun' aspect of gambling, however, was dismissed by only approximately one-quarter of the participants while nearly one-third thought that gambling was fun. Two in five of the participants were non-committal about the whether or not gambling was fun.
10. Poker and Black Jack were perceived by participants to require more skill than chance. Poker Machines, Lottery Games and Roulette were perceived to require more chance than skill.
11. Many of the participants did not understand the House Edge.

12. More than half of the participants appeared to understand that the odds of winning by one of two players playing against each other on poker machines are 50:50 for each game and that this is independent of any other game's result
13. Many participants were of the view that it was unlikely anyone could win substantial amounts of money at the casino or that they (the participants) could win more than \$10,000 from Tattslotto sometime in the future. Nonetheless approximately one in eight participants maintained they would at some stage win \$10,000 or more.

Young people's experiences with gambling

14. Fewer than one in ten of the participants reported that they had participated in any 'responsible' gambling education at school or college, such as *What's the Real Deal?*, during 2007-2008.
15. Scratch tickets, keno and playing card games for money were most popularly reported by participants, in that order, as gambling activities undertaken during the previous 12 months. Weekly participation, or more frequent participation, in gambling activities occurred for a very small number of participants through playing card games for money, using scratch tickets, gambling on the internet, or gambling using a mobile phone.
16. Three participants reported gambling \$20 on card playing weekly or more often.
17. One in twenty of the participants reported gambling for the first time before they turned 10 years of age.
18. Around one in forty participants, especially participants who were 14 or 15 years of age, reported experiencing two or more of a variety of problems: namely, betting more than they could afford, finding they needed to spend more money than they wanted to, needing to spend more money to maintain the same level of excitement, going back another day to win back losses, feeling that they might have a problem with gambling, and having caused financial problems for their family.
19. Overall, participants reported it was easy to obtain cigarettes, scratch tickets and alcohol. Specifically, participants who were 14 years of age were the group most likely accessing all three of cigarettes, scratch tickets and alcohol.

20. *While most participants held the view that gambling is risky, those who agreed that gambling was more risky were more likely to provide the correct answer to the item regarding their knowledge of probability, namely the heads and tails item.
21. *Not only did the participants who believed that gambling is less risky miscalculate the odds of obtaining two tails, they were more likely to overestimate, rather than underestimate, their chances of obtaining two tails.

In brief, many participants reported not being interested in gambling now or in the future. Fewer than one in ten participants reported anticipation of turning 18-years-old so they could go to adult gambling venues and/or so that they could gamble more frequently. Around double the number of participants (1 in 5) reported that they would like to gamble some time in the future.

Half of the participants did not report they had gambled in the twelve months prior to completing the questionnaire. Participants reported that their friends and families approved of gambling (around 1 in 7 for each sub-item) and that most of their friends gambled (around 1 in 15). Around one in five participants reported that at least one person in their family gambled at least weekly.

Participants reported that toy gambling games, friends and advertising were more likely to influence them to gamble. Family and teachers were reported more often as influencing participants against gambling.

The element of fun stood out when compared with other perceived benefits for participants of their participation in gambling activities.

Some gender and age differences became evident in the analysis of participants' responses about the element of fun in gambling and the role gambling plays in socialising with friends. Some gender differences were evident in the participants' preferred gambling activities.

Variations with respect to questionnaire items about perceptions of risk in gambling, impressing friends by gambling, gambling being a good way to socialise and use of scratch tickets were evident in responses from participants in the three Tasmanian regions and between participants residing in city, town and rural locations.

Between one and nine per cent of participants reported experiencing one of the listed problems as a result of their gambling 'most of the time' or 'almost always'. Around six per cent of participants reported experiencing two or more of the listed problems. Financial problems, stealing, arguments with family and/or friends and health problems were some of these.

One in 20 participants reported gambling for the first time before they turned 10 years of age and one in 10 reported gambling before they turned 16 years of age.

Anywhere between one half and one third of participants misunderstood the "House Edge" and knowledge of probability, for example, results of a two-coin toss or independence of each game's results from previous game results.

Around one in eight participants reported high odds for winning substantial money at a casino, or for winning more than \$10,000 one day playing Tattsлото, or they thought they might have the power to make their numbers come up in gambling games. One in five participants reported that they would "strike it lucky" while gambling".

Fewer than one in ten participants reported undertaking any "responsible" gambling programs at school, for example, *What the Real Deal?*

Analysis of the demographic data and the data relating to this study's participants' views, knowledge, and beliefs about their current and future participation, or lack of participation, in gambling has revealed some significant results that may provide useful information to assist targeting Tasmanians, 14-years of age to 17 years of age as a whole and/or sub-groups of this population.

One issue that emerged and that is not so clearly defined is the matter of transference of articulated beliefs, knowledge and understandings into attitudes towards gambling and resultant behaviour.

A second issue derives from research conducted by Derevensky, Gupta and Baboushkin (2007) and Fisher (1991). These works indicated that conducting research with children and adolescents younger than 14 years of age is another area that is deserving of attention.

Introduction

In 2008, the Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) Tasmania commissioned the authors at the Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania, to investigate the knowledge, attitudes and experiences of young Tasmanians, specifically those aged between 14 to 17 years, in relation to gambling. The results and findings from this study are intended to provide the Gambling Support Program (GSP) with data and analysis that pertains young people in Tasmania.

The study has three main purposes: first, to report the perceptions, knowledge, experiences and attitudes of young Tasmanians with respect to gambling; second, to examine critically the data and to identify statistically significant results; and finally, to discuss briefly the results of the questionnaires and highlight findings about the views of young Tasmanians that the DHHS and GSP may wish to use to inform policy and programs in community education and harm minimisation.

A brief literature review

Introduction

The literature suggests that, more than ever before, the widespread proliferation of gambling opportunities has gone hand-in-glove with an increasing social acceptance of gambling as a pastime not only for adults, but also for youth, and that a resultant increase in gambling problems has occurred (Gupta & Derevensky, 1998; Messerlian, Gillespie & Derevensky, 2007; Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007).

Defining problem gambling

In Australia, problem gambling is typically defined "in terms of its social impacts rather than with references to individual behaviours" (SA Centre for Economic Studies, 2005, p. viii) and, in terms of harm, problem gambling refers "to the situation where a person's gambling activity gives rise to harm to the individual player and/or his or her family, and may extend to the community" (Dickerson, McMillen, Hallebone, Volberg & Woolley, cited in SA Centre for Economic Studies, 2005, p. vii). Gambling expenditure beyond

that which can “be reasonably afforded relative to the individual’s available disposable income and [which] as a result produces financial strain” (Blaszczynski, Walker, Sagris & Dickerson, cited in SA Centre for Economic Studies, 2005, p. vi) leads to most gambling problems in Australia.

Problem gambling and young people

Indeed, in Australia and in many other western countries, adolescents and young adults form the group at highest risk for problem gambling (SA Centre for Economic Studies, 2008; Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007). In the international literature there is evidence that young problem gamblers exhibit higher rates of depression, suicidal thoughts and suicide attempts similar to other addictions (Dickson, 2002; Gupta & Derevensky, 1998; Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007) and that they experience more difficulties at school (Ólason, Skarphedinsson, Jonsdottir, Mikaelsson & Gretarsson, 2006). Many pathological adult gamblers start gambling at a very young age (Shaffer & Bethune, 2000; Winters, Stichfield & Kim, 1995). Young people are more likely than older people to develop gambling related problems (Amberlight, n.d.; Derevensky & Gupta, 2007; Govoni, Rupich & Frisch, 1996; Gupta & Derevensky, 1998; Messerlian et al., 2007; Shaffer & Bethune, 2000; Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007) as well as misuse drugs and alcohol (Shaffer & Bethune, 2000). Gambling has been identified as one of the risky behaviours in which young people participate, which include smoking, substance abuse, dietary fads, unsafe sexual practices, delinquency, and dangerous driving (Derevensky & Gupta, 2007; Vitaro, Brengden, Ladouceur & Tremblay, 2001). Australian research findings reflect many of these international trends (Dowling, Clarke, Memery & Corney, 2005; Monaghan & Blaszczynski, 2009; Relationships Australia, 2004).

Prevalence of gambling

International studies, such as those completed by Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan (2007) and Winters et al. (1995), indicate a high incidence of gambling behaviour by adolescents who report commencing gambling at an increasingly younger age. These two studies also have revealed that between 70 per cent and 96 per cent of Canadian and American adolescents and 96 per cent of Norwegian youth have gambled at some time.

In a South Australian survey of 505 adolescents drawn from six metropolitan high schools located in a variety of socio-economic areas, Delfabbro and Thrupp (2003) found that over 60 per cent of years 10, 11 and 12 adolescents had gambled in the year prior to participating in the study and that 15 per cent of study participants gambled weekly or more often.

Ólason and colleagues conducted studies with 750 Icelandic 16- to 18-year olds (Ólason, Sigurdardottir & Smari, 2006) and 3,511 13- to 15-year-olds (Ólason, Skarphedinsson et al., 2006) with both samples completing questionnaires and found that nearly all the 16- to 18-year old participants had gambled at least once during their lifetime, that almost 80 per cent had gambled at least once during the 12 months prior to participating in the research and that 10 per cent had gambled at least once per week during this 12 month period. Male participants were more likely to have gambled in this 12 month period both in the 'at least once' and 'at least once per week' categories. Ninety three per cent of the 13- to 15-year-olds had gambled at least once, nearly 70 per cent had gambled during the 12 months prior to completing the questionnaire and eight per cent had gambled at least once a week during this lead-up period.

Access to the internet has heralded opportunities to gamble anonymously on-line at any time (Ladouceur, Boudreault, Jacques, & Vitaro, 1999; Vitaro, Arseneault, & Tremblay, 1999). This development combined with the reduced 'psychological value' (Derevensky & Gupta, 2007, p. 95) of electronic cash has introduced new opportunities and contexts for gambling.

Minors are most likely to gain access to gambling activities through family members (Gupta & Derevensky, 1998; Relationships Australia, 2004). Initial exposure to gambling may occur through gambling at home with parents or accompanying parents to gambling venues while underage (Relationships Australia, 2004; Winters et al., 1995).

The first 'win' typically changes the gambling experience (Relationships Australia, 2004).

Misperceptions of gambling

Younger children experience problems of underestimating the addictive nature of gambling, exhibiting unwarranted confidence levels, and over-estimating their capacity

to exert influence over gambling outcomes (Dickson, 2002). Young people who have more permissive and less responsible attitudes are more likely than their peers to hold mistaken beliefs about the degree of skill entailed in gambling (Derevensky et al., 2007; Dickson, 2002; Goodie, 2005). Mistaken beliefs about the degree of skill entailed in gambling also are more likely to be held by pathological and problem gamblers (Goodie, 2005). People who, in part, assign the locus of control in gambling to themselves rather than to external random events are more prone to continue gambling despite extensive losses (Frank & Smith, 1989).

Causes of gambling

The question of what exactly influences young people to gamble has been highlighted as an area that requires ongoing inquiry. Researchers have proposed investigation of: first, the quest for sensation versus early experiences or sex-role socialization (Wolfgang, 1988); second, links between motivation and preference for games of skill or luck (Chantal & Vallerand, 1996); and finally, engaging with arcade games and video games and subsequent involvement in gambling (Blaszczynski, 2008; Delfabbro as cited in Herbert, 2009; Delfabbro, King, Lambos & Pugliese, 2009); Gupta & Derevensky, 1996).

Games of skill and games of chance

Amberlight (n.d.) described gambling games as being of two types: (1) games involving skill, for example, sports betting, some card games and the stock market, in which calculation of odds and use of concentration can be used to advantage; although, for which disproportionate confidence can lead to excessive gambling; and (2) games involving chance, for example, lottery, bingo and poker machines. Games of skill draw gamblers who are more likely to be intrinsically motivated, to enjoy a challenge, and who seek opportunities to prove their capabilities. Amberlight (n.d.) has proposed that games of chance attract gamblers who are more likely to be externally motivated and who are less interested in skill; however, these people may gamble to excess in an attempt to avoid stress.

Potential outcomes of gambling

While gambling outcomes are uncontrollable and often random (Frank & Smith, 1989), gambling may offer: first, potential financial gain; second, a feeling of excitement; third, 'escape' from problems; fourth, a feeling of importance; fifth, the experience of feeling older; sixth, approval from peers; seventh, fun and enjoyment; and finally, relief from feelings of depression, solitude or other negative thoughts (Gupta & Derevensky, 1998; Langhinrichsen-Rohling 2004; Relationships Australia, 2004; Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007). For problem gamblers, the social aspects of gambling are more crucial than, for example, the potential to win money gambling or the excitement they may experience (Gupta & Derevensky, 1998). One Canadian study revealed that more than 20 per cent of participants felt 'bad' about their gambling and a similar percentage experienced problems controlling their gambling (Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007). The same study revealed that this loss of control is closely linked with evidence of problem gambling in around five per cent to seven per cent of young people. Ólason, Sigurdardottir et al. (2006) in their Icelandic study revealed that between two per cent and three per cent of the participants reported experiencing problem gambling and that problem gambling was more reported by boys than girls.

Gender and gambling

More males than females gamble (Amberlight, n.d.; Ólason, Skarphedinsson et al., 2006; Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007). Some research indicates that males, more so than females, experience gambling problems (Ólason, Sigurdardottir et al., 2006; Ólason, Skarphedinsson et al., 2006; Winters et al., 1995), particularly in relation to casino games and racing (Amberlight, n.d.). Males express less fear of being caught gambling than do females and they express more tolerance towards gambling behaviours (Dickson, 2002). In the UK it is primarily male teenagers, who commence gambling before they turn 10 years old and who may play on their own, who expend unusually high amounts of time and money on gambling, and who borrow, steal or truant to gamble (Fisher, 1991); Canadian research has produced similar gendered results (Gupta & Derevensky, 1998). Gupta and Derevensky (1996) used a screening process with approximately 500 9- to 14-year-old students to select 104 children and adolescents roughly spread between high-frequency players and low-frequency players of video-games as determined by completion of a questionnaire. They found that males who played video-games more

often appeared to gamble more money on a computerised blackjack game than did less frequent players of video-games.

Females appear to be more satisfied by participation in games of chance rather than games of skill (Amberlight, n.d.). Govoni et al. (1996) purported that gender differences emerge in gambling behaviours more so than differences in age.

Lotteries and poker machines have been found to attract equal numbers of male and female gamblers (Amberlight, n.d.).

Responsible gambling education programs and treatment support for problem gambling

Derevensky et al. (2007) have examined evidence from studies that points to significant success in reducing problematic gambling in adults with the use of cognitive therapy to heighten awareness, improve knowledge and enhance education. Furthermore, these authors have demonstrated links between children's experiences of gambling losses and a reduction of their "illusion of control" (p. 292) and their belief that "much skill is involved in gambling in general" (p. 292). In their study of 174 children, Derevensky et al. found that 10-year-old children experienced a greater extent of cognitive change which was also more enduring than did 12-year-old children; thus, and also because of children being exposed to gambling and gambling venues at earlier ages than previously, these researchers argue for prevention strategies to be implemented in the primary school years (see also, Gupta & Derevensky, 1996).

Data from Minnesota, USA, have indicated that young people rarely avail themselves of gambling treatment options (Winters et al., 1995). Further investigation of the consequences of winning, or losing and the extent to which these consequences affect resultant development of irrational beliefs have been highlighted by Monaghan and Blaszczynski (2009) as potentially informing the development of educational approaches and intervention strategies. Delfabbro, Lambos, King and Puglies (2009) as a result of their survey study of 2,669 13- to 17-year-old students highlighted the likelihood that providing students with factual information is insufficient to educate particularly the students most likely to experience problems with gambling; rather, the authors argue for

an increased focus on flawed thinking and use of knowledge, for example, of odds and calculating the probability of various outcomes in role-playing or supervised interactive tasks in ways that are relevant to the students' likely knowledge of gambling activities.

Moreover, Williams, Connolly, Wood and Nowatzki (2006) in their study of 585 university students in southern Alberta, Canada pointed to the possibility of an ostensible contradiction between being mathematically skilled and, first, possibly feeling sufficiently skilled to gamble comparatively successfully and/or, second, being cognisant of the mathematical odds that pertain to the likelihood of incurring gambling losses. The question of possible effects of heightening gambling literacy on attitudes of young people who have not gambled, however, occupies uncertain territory. For example, an earlier study of Tasmanian students in three high schools (Gardner & Williamson, 2006) pointed to a possibility that students' experience of gambling activities as part of their learning about responsible gambling may increase the attractiveness of gambling to them (p. 30).

Procedures and the sample

This qualitative study was designed to gather data about young people's experiences and views and used a quantitative data-gathering method (questionnaire with closed items—see Appendix C) in which data were gathered from 606 young Tasmanians. Questionnaires were available for completion in hard copy and on-line. Young people were sought through formal education institutions such as schools and colleges, and through a variety of other agencies and bodies, such as council youth groups, health/support centres, the Tasmanian Youth Forum, and Centrelink.

Interviews (see Appendix D for the Interview Schedule) were included in the research design as a qualitative data-gathering method that would enable rich data to be gathered to complement and delve into the quantitative data gathered from the questionnaire (Burns, 2000); however, the researchers were able to achieve only two interviews with two young people, of course, with their parental approval.

The sampling procedure can be best described as opportunity sampling (Burns, 2000), which typically produces a sample that does not necessarily permit a strong confident

generalisation to the broader population from which the sample was drawn. In this study a variety of recruitment sources was utilised and many opportunity samples were achieved. Comparisons between several characteristics of the entire sample and the broader population indicated similarities between these two groups. These similarities increase the confidence when making some generalisations to the broader population of young Tasmanians aged 14 years to 17 years. The comparisons between the sample and the broader population and some associated observations are provided in the results section.

In some instances, and to assist with seeking responses from whole classes in schools and colleges, as per teachers' requests, some data were obtained from 13- and 18-year-olds. While some 18-year-olds indicated in conversation after they had returned their questionnaires that they had not answered some items because they thought that being 18 years old meant that some questions were not relevant to their situation, some others indicated that they had answered questions by thinking back to when they were 17 years old. Furthermore, some participants chose not to reveal their age. Thus it was difficult to identify with certainty given the data analysis able to be conducted within the parameters of this study exactly which participants answered each question. Following discussion with the GSP (DHHS) liaison officer for this project at the time, it was decided that data from all participants would be included as much as was practicable. This decision has implications for consideration of some of the results as it will include respondents aged 13 and 18 years and those who may not have answered all of the relevant items.

After gaining approval from the University of Tasmania's Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (SSHREC) invitations were extended to young people through a range of locations:

- Schools and colleges; to complete questionnaires, subsequent also to gaining approval from the Department of Education, in the case of government schools, and individual principals for all schools. Principals were provided with information about the study in a suitable format to assist them inform their school communities, for example, through publication in school newsletters. Students were provided with a take-away Information Sheet. Most students who elected to take part

completed the questionnaire at school. Students were also provided with the option of completing the questionnaire on-line in their own time;

- Council youth development officers;
- Health/support centres;
- Tasmanian Youth Forum;
- On-line; and,
- Centrelink, subsequent to gaining approval from Centrelink.

The Information Sheet (for full version³ see Appendix B1 and for condensed version see Appendix B2) provided to all participants presented brief details about opportunities to participate in individual interviews. A list of the interview questions and a set of information about the study addressed to parents were provided to the young people at the time they expressed interest in finding out more about a possible interview. The young people were invited to directly contact the researcher who gathered the data. Only two young people expressed interest in participating in individual interviews and, with their parental approval, agreement was obtained. The semi-structured interviews were used to provide young participants more flexibility in their responses than was available in the questionnaire.

The questionnaires sought information that was categorised into five sections: demographic data; contexts in which young people live and socialise; factors that influence young people's views about gambling; knowledge and beliefs of young people about gambling; and, their experiences with gambling.

Results

In addition to presenting the results for each item on the questionnaire, chi-square tests were performed using STATA data analysis and statistical software (StataCorp, 1996-2010) to determine the independence, or the dependence, of two proportions where the numbers of responses permitted such analysis. Null hypotheses were assumed, that is,

³ The full version of the Information Sheet required minor wording changes to suit the varying locations at which these Sheets were distributed.

that there were no differences between two population proportions (Berenson, Levine & Krehbiel, 2006).

This analysis was undertaken with data from each of the five types: demographic; contexts in which young people live and socialise; factors that influence young people's views about gambling; knowledge and beliefs of young people about gambling; and, their experiences with gambling.

More than 70 tests were performed. This report contains results of the tests that were significant at an alpha level of $p < 0.05$.

Demographics: The young Tasmanians who participated in this study

This study targeted young Tasmanians aged 14 years to 17 years; however, some responses were received from 13- and 18-year-olds, for example, in post year 10 classes or from youth groups and youth functions. Five hundred and fifty seven (557) young Tasmanians aged 14 years to 17 years, who were a subset of six hundred and six (606) young Tasmanians aged 13 years to 18 years, participated in this study. The cohorts of 13 year-olds and of 18 year-olds were comparatively small and data from these participants were insufficient to be compared with demographic data of the broader population.

At the time of the study the Department of Education, Tasmania (2008) reported student enrolments of 16,000 at Tasmanian Government secondary schools. Allowing another 25 per cent or another 4,000 for enrolments in non-government schools results in a total of around 20,000 young people aged approximately 13 to 16 years of age in the state. Searches of government and demographic data websites have not enabled the obtaining of exact figures for the 14-year-old to 17-year-old age group. Therefore, what can only be an approximation indicates that the sample for this study is around three per cent of the population. With this sample size it is particularly important to consider the demographic data and compare it as much as feasible with the population.

Age (in years) of participants

Ninety-two per cent of response sets were gathered from 14- to 17-year-olds. The counts for each age group are: 14-year-olds, 121 participants; 15-year-olds, 180; 16-year-olds, 113; 17-year-olds, 143 (see Appendix A, Table 23). The remaining 49 participants were 13-year-olds, 18-year-olds and/or young people who did not indicate their ages. As indicated above, government and demographic data websites did not provide details of each age group therefore it was not possible to calculate the representativeness of the participants in this study with respect to age.

Gender of participants

Just over half the participants, who indicated their gender, were female (n=312 or 51.5%) and nearly half were male (n=288 or 47.5%) (Appendix A, Table 24). Estimates of the Tasmanian population show that males outnumber females, that is, 51:49 according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) (2007a) up to and including the 20 to 24 year age group (ABS, 2007c). Given the circumstance of female participation being disproportionate to their numbers in the population (Smith, 2008) and the possible role of “social distance” models (pp. 12-13) in gender-based decision-making about participation in questionnaires, a 51.5:47.5 ratio is a particularly satisfactory outcome (the missing 1% did not specify their gender).

Intention of participants to complete Year 12

Approximately two-thirds of the participants (n=408 or 67.3%) specified their intention to complete Year 12; less than one-third (n=181 or 29.9%) indicated they did not intend to finish Year 12 (see Appendix A, Table 25). In 2006, the retention rates to year 12 for Tasmanian students in were 56.9 per cent for males and 73.3 per cent for females (DPAC, 2009a).

Parents' study at university

Approximately one-quarter of the participants (n=145 or 23.9%) indicated that their fathers had studied at university; three-quarters (n=434 or 71.67%) reported that their fathers had not studied at university level (see Appendix A, Table 26).

Approximately one-third of the participants (n=180 or 29.7%) indicated that their mothers had studied at university; two-thirds (n=398 or 65.7%) reported that their mothers had not studied at university level (see Appendix A, Table 27).

ABS (2003a) data showed that in 2001, 25 per cent of Tasmanian adults' highest level of qualification was at bachelor degree level, while eight percent had achieved a post graduate qualification. Use of these ABS data, which include parents and non-parents, does not permit an assertion of the representativeness or not of the sample obtained for this study.

Participants who identified as Aboriginals / Torres Strait Islanders

Approximately one-tenth of the participants (n=57 or 9.4%) indicated they identified as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (see Appendix A, Table 28). The sample for this study provided a higher proportion of young people who identified as Aboriginal or as Torres Strait Islanders. The estimated resident Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander population in Tasmania as at June 30, 2001 was 3.7 per cent of the total population (ABS, 2008).

Perhaps the over-representation of the Aboriginal population in the sample for this study occurred as a result of the locations where participants were sought. In this context, any findings pertaining to Aboriginal youth based on results that have statistical significance need to be made with a high level of caution.

Location of participants' homes: city, town and rural

The city: town: rural spread of the participants in this study was in an approximate ratio of 4:4:1.5 (refer Appendix A, Table 29). It has to be acknowledged that the use of postcodes in some cases provides only some broad indication of whether or not people live in a city, town or rural area; some postcodes encompass a city or a town and some of its surrounding rural area. Notwithstanding, ABS (2003b) data indicated that in 2001,

20 per cent of Tasmanians lived in rural areas compared with the estimated 15 per cent of participants in this study who lived in rural areas.

Location of participants' homes: by region

Regional population figures for Tasmania in 2006 (ABS, 2007b) indicate that the north-western sample for this study is over-represented (34% of participants compared with 23% of the Tasmanian population) and the southern region, although having the highest percentage of participants, is under-represented (36%, 49%). The northern/north-eastern region representation is most accurate of the three regions statistically (27%, 28%) (Appendix A, Table 30).

Languages Other Than English (LOTE) spoken at home

Eight per cent of participants spoke languages other than English at home (see Appendix A, Table 31). This is similar to the approximately nine per cent of Tasmanians who spoke a language other than English at home in 2006 (ABS, 2007d).

Tables that represent the results for the items that sought demographic data are presented in Appendix A. The final table presented results for an item that asked participants about their participation at school in "responsible" gambling programs or activities, for example, *What's the Real Deal?* (DHHS, 2007).

In the following section the sub-headings used in the Executive Summary will be used to structure the presentation of results.

Contexts in which young Tasmanians live and socialise

Four sub-items in Questionnaire Item (Item 12) sought information about the contexts in which young people live and socialise. These sub-items were concerned with young people friends' and families' gambling and their approval of gambling.

Item 12: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- Most of my friends gamble.
- Most of my friends approve of gambling.
- At least one person in my family gambles once a week or more.

- My family approves of gambling.

Participants' responses to these four sub-items in Questionnaire Item 12 were designed to seek the views and experiences of participants' families and friends that may, in turn, influence the thoughts about gambling and intention about future gambling of the participants (see Table 1). Many of the items in the questionnaire used were Likert items for which, in the instance of Item 1, possible answers were: 'I strongly agree', 'I agree', 'I neither agree nor disagree', 'I disagree' and 'I strongly disagree'.

Table 1. Participants' friends and family and gambling (Item 12 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)

Sub-item	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I neither agree or disagree		I agree		I strongly agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Most of my friends gamble.	261	43.1	170	28.1	94	15.5	28	4.6	16	2.6
Most of my friends approve of gambling.	117	19.3	139	22.9	231	38.1	60	9.9	22	3.6
At least one person in my family gambles once a week or more.	239	39.4	136	22.4	77	12.7	89	14.7	31	5.1
My family approves of gambling.	152	25.1	138	22.8	197	32.5	65	10.7	17	2.8
I can't wait until I am 18 so I can go to adult gambling venues.	256	42.2	144	23.8	104	17.2	35	5.8	28	4.6
When I turn 18 I will gamble a lot more than I do now.	267	44.1	145	23.9	106	17.5	34	5.6	17	2.8
In the future I would like to gamble some time.	181	29.9	134	22.1	147	24.3	90	14.9	17	2.8

The majority of participants ($n=431$ or 71%) reported that most of their friends did not gamble; considerably fewer participants ($n=256$ or 42%) believed that most of their friends did not approve of gambling.

Nearly one-fifth of the participants ($n=120$ or 20%) indicated that at least one family member gambled once a week or more. One quarter of these 120 responses ($n=31$ or 5%

of the total) selected the 'strongly agree' response for this sub-item. Three-fifths of participants (n=475 or 62%) reported that no one in their family gambled; two-fifths of all participants (n=239 or 39%) were strongly of this view. With respect to family approval of gambling 82 participants (14%) indicated agreement with this sub-item or strong agreement while 290 (48%) disagreed or disagreed strongly.

Nearly double the number of participants (n=82 or 14%) indicated that their friends approved of gambling compared with the number that indicated that their friends in fact gambled (n=44 or 7%). In contrast, with respect to family gambling behaviour and family approval of gambling, more participants (n=120 or 20%) indicated that at least one family member gambled once a week or more compared with the number that indicated family approval of gambling (n=82 or 14%).

Ambivalence ostensibly prevailed in the young Tasmanians' responses to the statements regarding their perceptions of friends' approval and family's approval of gambling when compared with their responses about their friends' and family's gambling behaviour. That is, the participants' responses to 'most of my friends approve of gambling' and 'my family approves of gambling' resulted in the 'neither disagree nor agree' option attracting more than double the rate of responses (for friends' approval, n=231 or 38%; for family's approval, n=197 or 33% respectively) than for 'most of my friends gamble' (n=94 or 16%) and for 'at least one person in my family gambles once a week or more' (n=77 or 13%). With respect to the apparent nature of the ambivalence in responses to these sub-items, some of the participants may not have been aware of friends' or family's approval of gambling or they may not have wished to disclose, albeit anonymously, gambling by friends or family.

These data were analysed using the STATA software and significant results are presented.

TEST: Family context. Cross-tabulated regular gambling by at least one family member with family approval

'At least one person in my family gambles' with 'my family approves of gambling'

The test results ($\chi^2=91.8839$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis that there is

no difference in their view of their family's approval of gambling and whether or not at least one person gambles once week or more often is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that there is a link between the approval of the family and regular gambling by at least one family member.

Specifically, while many participants reported that no one in their family gambled once a week or more often, those participants in a family in which one member gambled regularly were more likely to report that their family approved of gambling.

Factors that influence young people’s views about gambling...and their interest/intentions regarding future gambling

Three Questionnaire items (Items 12, 13a and 15) sought information about the factors that influence participants’ views about gambling.

Item 12: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements [about future gambling]?

- I can’t wait until I am 18 so I can go to adult gambling venues.
- When I turn 18 I will gamble a lot more than I do now.
- In the future I would like to gamble some time.

Participants’ responses to the last three sub-items in Questionnaire Item 12 were designed to seek information about participants’ future with respect to gambling (refer Table 2). Response options included ‘I strongly agree’, ‘I agree’, ‘I neither agree nor disagree’, ‘I disagree’ and ‘I strongly disagree’.

Table 2. Participants’ intentions re future gambling (Item 12 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)

Sub-item	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I neither agree or disagree		I agree		I strongly agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Most of my friends gamble.	261	43.1	170	28.1	94	15.5	28	4.6	16	2.6
Most of my friends approve of gambling.	117	19.3	139	22.9	231	38.1	60	9.9	22	3.6
At least one person in my family gambles once a week or more.	239	39.4	136	22.4	77	12.7	89	14.7	31	5.1
My family approves of gambling.	152	25.1	138	22.8	197	32.5	65	10.7	17	2.8
I can’t wait until I am 18 so I can go to adult gambling venues.	256	42.2	144	23.8	104	17.2	35	5.8	28	4.6
When I turn 18 I will gamble a lot more than I do now.	267	44.1	145	23.9	106	17.5	34	5.6	17	2.8

Table 2. Participants' intentions re future gambling (Item 12 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)

Sub-item	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I neither agree or disagree		I agree		I strongly agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Most of my friends gamble.	261	43.1	170	28.1	94	15.5	28	4.6	16	2.6
Most of my friends approve of gambling.	117	19.3	139	22.9	231	38.1	60	9.9	22	3.6
At least one person in my family gambles once a week or more.	239	39.4	136	22.4	77	12.7	89	14.7	31	5.1
My family approves of gambling.	152	25.1	138	22.8	197	32.5	65	10.7	17	2.8
I can't wait until I am 18 so I can go to adult gambling venues.	256	42.2	144	23.8	104	17.2	35	5.8	28	4.6
When I turn 18 I will gamble a lot more than I do now.	267	44.1	145	23.9	106	17.5	34	5.6	17	2.8
In the future I would like to gamble some time.	181	29.9	134	22.1	147	24.3	90	14.9	17	2.8

Fewer than 10 per cent of participants expressed agreement that they would gamble a lot more than they did at the time they completed the questionnaire; although, nearly double the number of participants (nonetheless under 20%) reported that they would like to gamble some time in the future. Notable was the number of participants who remained uncommitted to their possible gambling behaviour in the future. Almost 25 per cent of participants selected the neutral response regarding gambling some time in the future; around 18 per cent chose the neutral response regarding gambling a lot more when they reached 18 years of age.

Item 13a: How have the following influenced your attitude to gambling?

Item 13a sought information about participants' agreement or disagreement with six possible influences on their attitudes to gambling (refer Table 3). Participants also were asked to list any other influences they could identify. Possible answers were 'strongly against', 'against', 'no influence', 'for' and 'strongly for'.

Table 3. Influences on participants' attitudes to gambling (Item 13a - How have the following influenced your attitude to gambling?)

Sub-item	Strongly against		Against		No influence		For		Strongly for	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Family	143	23.6	108	17.8	238	39.3	53	8.7	31	5.1
Advertising on TV	94	15.5	84	13.9	300	49.5	61	10.1	29	4.8
Friends	91	15.0	67	11.1	313	51.7	68	11.2	26	4.3
Advertising – e.g., billboards, in the newsagent ...	87	14.4	60	9.9	329	54.3	63	10.4	25	4.1
Teachers	130	21.5	86	14.2	304	50.2	18	3.0	25	4.1
Toy gambling games	90	14.9	52	8.6	319	52.6	75	12.4	27	4.5
Other, please list							6	1.0	8	1.3

Many participants indicated that they were not influenced by any of the listed influences while major influences against gambling were family and teachers. Approximately one in five participants reported that four types of influences had some bearing on their attitudes: toy gambling games were indicated as influential by the highest number of participants, closely followed by the influences of friends, advertising on TV and other advertising.

These data were analysed using the STATA software and significant results are presented.

TEST: Views about gambling and family context. Cross-tabulated regular gambling by at least one family member with influence-family

'At least one person in my family gambles' with 'influence of family on your attitude to gambling'

The test results ($c^2=77.9337$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis that there is no difference in their view of their family's influence, supportive or not, of gambling and whether or not at least one person gambles once week or more often is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that

there is a link between the influence of the family and regular gambling by at least one family member.

Specifically, while many participants reported that no one in their family gambled once a week or more often, those participants in a family in which one member gambled regularly were more likely to view their family's influence on their view of gambling as supportive of gambling.

Item 15: To what extent to you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Item 15 sought the reactions of participants to 12 statements about gambling (see Table 4). Issues canvassed included participants' understandings of gambling and risks, financial returns and social activity with friends while gambling. Responses from which participants could choose were: 'I strongly disagree', 'I disagree', 'I neither agree nor disagree', 'I agree' and 'I strongly agree'.

Table 4. Participants' reactions to statements about risk, financial returns and social activity with respect to gambling (Item 15 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)

Sub-item	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I neither agree nor disagree		I agree		I strongly agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gambling is a risky activity.	16	2.6	14	2.3	74	12.2	234	38.6	231	38.1
You can lose all your money gambling.	15	2.5	9	1.5	53	8.7	182	30.0	314	51.8
Gambling is a waste of money.	15	2.5	23	3.8	109	18.0	172	28.4	251	41.4
Gamblers usually lose in the long run.	17	2.8	21	3.5	100	16.5	207	34.2	226	37.3
To gamble is to throw away money.	27	4.5	32	5.3	145	23.9	173	28.5	187	30.9
You can make a living from gambling.	164	27.1	149	24.6	129	21.3	74	12.2	50	8.3

Table 4. Participants' reactions to statements about risk, financial returns and social activity with respect to gambling (Item 15 - To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?)

Sub-item	I strongly disagree		I disagree		I neither agree nor disagree		I agree		I strongly agree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Gambling is a good way to get rich quickly.	200	33.0	164	27.1	139	22.9	32	5.3	38	6.3
Gambling is a better way to make money than working.	302	49.8	150	24.8	78	12.9	13	2.1	26	4.3
Gambling can give high returns.	95	15.7	98	16.2	159	26.2	156	25.7	58	9.6
Gambling is fun.	83	13.7	60	9.9	246	40.6	124	20.5	57	9.4
Gambling is a good way to impress friends.	199	32.8	172	28.4	153	25.2	17	2.8	28	4.6
Gambling is a great way to hang out with friends.	161	26.6	112	18.5	199	32.8	64	10.6	34	5.6

Many participants indicated that gambling was not a good way to make money; although more than 35 per cent of participants agreed that gambling could provide high returns. More than 60 per cent considered that gambling was not a good way to impress their peers, while only 7 per cent agreed; 45 per cent disagreed that gambling was a great way to 'hang out' with friends, while 16 per cent agreed. The 'fun' aspect of gambling, however, was dismissed by only approximately 25 per cent of participants while 30 per cent of participants thought that gambling was fun. A further 40 per cent of participants were non-committal about the whether or not gambling was fun. In the words of one participant, some people may gamble for "something to do...a bit of entertainment...bit of a laugh" (Interview 1, female, 17 years of age).

The sub-items in Item 15 (Table 4) were reviewed with respect to whether they were likely to be viewed as describing positive or negative experiences or outcomes. For example it was reasonable to expect that the first five sub-items—from "gambling is a risky activity"

through to “to gamble is to throw away money”—addressed negative experiences or outcomes that may occur as a result of engaging in gambling and that the young people would agree with this view. Similarly, it was reasonable to expect that the final seven sub-items—from “you can make a living from gambling” through to “gambling is a great way to hang out with friends”—addressed aspects of gambling that if they occurred as a result of engaging in gambling would be positive experiences and that the young people would agree with this view. Based on these two premises the participants’ responses to two of the sub-items were observed to be of likely interest: “gambling can give high returns” and “gambling is fun.”

These data were analysed using the STATA software and significant results are presented.

TEST: Views about gambling. ‘Gambling can give high returns’

For the sub-item “gambling can give high returns” the numbers of responses for ‘strongly disagree’ and ‘disagree’ were combined, as were the responses for ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’. The test results revealed that based on the number of responses that indicated disagreement, that is, 193 responses or 47.4 per cent and the number of responses that indicated agreement, that is, 214 responses or 52.6 per cent, that the mean was 0.5258 and the p value was 0.1492; thus not a statistically result at the 0.05 level.

TEST: Views about gambling. ‘Gambling is fun’

The same procedure was used to investigate the sub-item “gambling is fun.” The STATA test results revealed that based on the number of responses that indicated disagreement, that is, 143 responses or 44.1 per cent, and the number of responses that indicated agreement, that is, 181 responses or 55.9 per cent, that the mean was 0.5586 and the p value was 0.0173; thus a statistically result at the 0.05 level. The results of the analysis of Item 15 suggest that the issue of fun stands out as an aspect of gambling that may have attracted participants despite their knowledge of chance and probability and the negative outcomes of gambling. The element of fun in gambling has been canvassed in the literature (see, e.g., Gupta & Derevensky, 1998; Langhinrichsen-Rohling 2004; Relationships Australia, 2004; Verbeke & Dittrick-Nathan, 2007).

In earlier research that evaluated a trial in three Tasmanian government high schools of the *What's the Real Deal?* curriculum materials analysis of a pre-test and a post-test completed by each of 33 students found that "students' experience of gambling activities may have increased the attractiveness of gambling to them" (Gardner & Williamson, 2006, p. 30) while at the same time improving their knowledge of some aspects of gambling (e.g., chances of winning, problems that may result, reason people gamble). These results regarding the participants' view of gambling as fun as found in the 2006 study and the present study draw attention to the Recommendation 6 (p. 56) with respect to further development of curriculum materials, which refers to the importance of assimilating the cognitive domain (knowledge about gambling with the affective domain (emotions and attitudes).

Further tests were applied using the STATA software and significant results are presented.

TESTS: Views about gambling and region. Cross-tabulated 'gambling is risky' with region south, and with region north-west

'Region south' and 'region not south' with 'gambling is risky'

The test results ($\chi^2=3.9339$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether or not the participants live in the southern region and their view of the statement that gambling is risky is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the risk involved in gambling are significantly different with respect to whether participants were living or not living in the southern region.

Specifically, while participants generally agreed that gambling is risky, participants who lived in the southern region viewed gambling as less risky, than participants in the northern/north-eastern and north-western regions.

'Region north-west' and 'region not north-west' with 'gambling is risky'

The test results ($\chi^2=13.3574$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether or not the participants live in the north-western region and their view of the statement that gambling is risky is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the risk involved in

gambling are significantly different with respect to whether participants were living or not living in the north-west.

Specifically, while participants generally agreed that gambling is risky, participants who lived in the north-west were more likely, than participants in the other two regions, to agree that gambling is risky.

The participants in the north-western region were more likely, than their peers from the northern/north-eastern and southern regions, to agree that gambling is risky, and the participants in the southern region were least likely to agree that gambling is risky. These two results place the participants who live in the northern/north-eastern region somewhere in between their peers in the other two regions with respect to their perceptions about the risks inherent in gambling.

TESTS: Views about gambling and location of home. Cross-tabulated 'gambling is risky' with each of town and city

'Lives in a town' and 'does not live in a town' (i.e., lives in a city or a rural area) with 'gambling is risky'

The test results ($\chi^2=6.6239$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether or not the participants live in a town and their view of the statement that gambling is risky is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the risk involved in gambling are significantly different with respect to whether the participants were living or not living in a town.

Specifically, while participants generally agreed that gambling is risky, participants who lived in a town were more likely, than participants who did not live in a town (i.e., lived in a city or a rural area), to agree that gambling is risky.

'Lives in a city' and 'does not live in a city' (i.e., lives in a town or a rural area) with 'gambling is risky'

The test results ($\chi^2=6.4158$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether or not the participants live in a city and their view of the statement that gambling is risky is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the risk involved in gambling are significantly different with respect to whether or not the participants were living or not living in a city.

Specifically while participants generally agreed that gambling is risky, participants who lived in a city were more likely, than participants who did not live in a city (i.e., lives in a town or a rural area), to agree that gambling is risky.

The significance of the two tests—gambling is risky with town and with city—points to a perception by the rural group of participants that there is a lower level of risk associated with gambling than is assumed by their town and city peers. As a result of these perceptions, participants who live in rural areas are more likely to support gambling. It is important, however, to keep in mind the findings regarding regional difference in views about risk. Equally important to consider is the possibility that individuals' knowledge or

understandings about the risk involved in gambling may not translate into behaviour that reflects their knowledge and understanding.

TESTS: Views of gambling, location of home and father's education.

Cross-tabulated 'gambling is a good way to hang out with friends' with rural and with father's education

'Lives in a rural area' and 'does not live in a rural area' (i.e., lives in a city or a town) with 'gambling is a good way to hang out with friends'

The test results ($\chi^2=3.6768$, $df=1$, $p=0.055$) show that this result (where p is .005 outside the 0.05 level of significance) is of possible interest.

Specifically, while participants generally disagreed that gambling is a good way to socialise and spend time with friends, participants who lived in a rural area were more likely, than participants who did not live in a rural area (i.e., lived in a city or a town), to agree that gambling is a good way to hang out with friends.

'Father studied at university' with 'gambling is good for hanging out with friends'

The test results ($\chi^2=4.9892$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether father's tertiary study and the participant expressing the view that gambling is good for socialising with friends is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that participants' whose fathers have studied at university level are less likely to think that gambling is good for socialising and spending time with friends.

Specifically, while many participants thought that gambling was not good for socialising and spending time with friends, participants whose fathers had studied at university were less likely to agree with this statement than their peers whose fathers had not undertaken tertiary study.

TESTS: Gender and age and views about gambling. Cross-tabulated gender and age with 'gambling is fun' and 'gambling is a good way to hang out with friends'

'Gender male' with 'gambling is fun'

The test results ($\chi^2=10.7449$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether male participants are likely than female participants to think

that gambling is fun is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that male participants are more likely to think that gambling is fun. Indeed almost double the number of male participants agreed than disagreed with the statement that gambling is fun while slightly more female participants disagreed than agreed that gambling is fun.

'Gender female' with 'age 14' with Item 15, sub-item – 'gambling is fun'

The test results ($c^2=6.5302$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether 14-year-old female participants are likely than 14-year-old male participants to think that gambling is fun is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that 14-year-old male participants are more likely than 14-year-old female participants to think that gambling is fun.

'Gender male' with 'age 15' with Item 15, sub-item – 'gambling is fun'

The test results ($c^2=10.8360$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether 15-year-old female participants are likely than 15-year-old male participants to think that gambling is fun is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that 15-year-old male participants are more likely than 15-year-old female participants to think that gambling is fun.

The 14-year-old and 15-year-old participants comprise the age groups whose results, when tested, generated a difference in the results between genders with respect to the perception of fun in gambling.

'Gender female' with 'age 16' with Item 15, sub-item – 'gambling is good for hanging out with friends'

The test results ($c^2=5.1447$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether 16-year-old female participants are likely than 16-year-old male participants to think that gambling is good for hanging out with friends is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that 16-year-old female participants are more likely than 16-year-old male participants to think that gambling is good for socialising and spending time with friends.

Specifically, while 16-year-old male participants and 16-year-old female participants generally thought that gambling was not good for socialising and spending time with friends, the females in this age group were more likely than the males to agree, than to disagree, that gambling was good for socialising and spending time with friends.

Knowledge and beliefs of young people about gambling

There were six Questionnaire items that sought information about participants' knowledge and beliefs about gambling: Items 16, 17, 18, 19, 22 and 23.

Item 16: How much skill (rating out of 10) do you think is potentially involved in the activities listed below?

Item 16 was designed to seek information about participants' understandings of the skill and/or chance involved in seven gambling activities (poker, black jack, poker machines, roulette) or groups of activities (racing, sports, lottery games) (refer Table 5). There were 11 possible responses each of which was assigned a numerical value from '0' to '10' and three of which included the options: 'no skill at all (0)', 'equal skill and chance (5)' and 'it's all skill (10)'.

Table 5. Young people's beliefs about skill levels involved in gambling activities (Item 16 - How much skill (rating out of 10) do you think is potentially involved in the activities listed below?)

Sub-item	No skill at all (0)		1		2		3		4		Equal skill & chance		6		7		8		9		It's all skill (10)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
Poker	81	13.4	9	1.5	29	4.8	16	2.6	12	2.0	151	24.9	32	5.3	46	7.6	75	12.4	20	3.3	59	9.7
Black Jack	75	12.4	13	2.1	27	4.5	25	4.1	32	5.3	142	23.4	47	7.8	47	7.8	48	7.9	19	3.1	47	7.8
Poker Machines	319	52.6	39	6.4	24	4.0	17	2.8	14	2.3	85	14.0	8	1.3	5	0.8	4	0.7	1	0.2	12	2.0
Racing ^a	137	22.6	19	3.1	35	5.8	33	5.4	28	4.6	151	24.9	37	6.1	33	5.4	21	3.5	12	2.0	22	3.6
Sports ^b	134	22.1	17	2.8	25	4.1	34	5.6	27	4.5	145	23.9	50	8.3	44	7.3	19	3.1	11	1.8	22	3.6

Table 5. Young people’s beliefs about skill levels involved in gambling activities (Item 16 - How much skill (rating out of 10) do you think is potentially involved in the activities listed below?)

Sub-item	No skill at all (0)		1	2	3	4	Equal skill & chance	6	7	8	9	It’s all skill (10)										
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%										
Lottery games ^c	301	49.7	37	6.1	33	5.4	18	3.0	17	2.8	93	15.3	8	1.3	8	1.3	0	0	3	0.5	13	2.1
Roulette	227	37.5	28	4.6	27	4.5	32	5.3	23	3.8	120	19.8	20	3.3	15	2.5	9	1.5	5	0.8	14	2.3

Note: ^aRacing – horses, dogs ^bSports not including horses, dogs ^cLottery games e.g., keno, lotto

For almost all items ‘equal skill and chance’ was selected by around 20 to 25 per cent of young people.

Overall, participants were more likely to identify that ‘no skill’ was required for the listed activities than ‘all skill’. The ‘no skill’ response was selected more frequently than ‘equal skill and chance’ in the case of poker machines, lottery games and roulette. These two responses were selected at approximately the same frequency for racing and sports.

Poker and Black Jack were perceived to require more skill⁴ than chance (Poker, ‘skill’ n=232 or 38% of responses, ‘chance’ n=147 or 24%; Black Jack, ‘skill’ n=208 or 34%, ‘chance’ n=172 or 26%). These results, however, appear to be contradicted when the ‘all skill’ and ‘no skill’ options are examined. Although the ‘all skill’ response attracted 59 responses (10% of responses) for Poker and 47 responses (8%) for Black Jack, the ‘no skill’ response was selected by 81 participants (13%) for Poker and 75 participants (12%) for Black Jack. Thus the results ‘no skill’ and ‘all skill’ contrasted with the results for more skill and less skill for both Poker and Black Jack and indicates some confusion about what skills are required, or not required, for playing these two games. This pattern of answering was not apparent for the remainder of the gambling types listed in Item 16.

⁴ ‘More skill’ was calculated by adding the results for responses between ‘6’ and ‘10’ inclusive; ‘less skill’ comprised the responses ‘0’ to ‘4’.

The participants expressed the view that gambling activities that required the least skill of the listed activities were:

- poker machines (413, or 68%, of responses; and of those young people who specified their age, 96 14-year-olds, 136 15 year-olds, 89 16-year-olds and 116 17-year-olds);
- lottery games (406, or 67%, of responses; 95 14-year-olds, 136 15-year-olds, 86 16-year-olds and 109 17-year-olds); and,
- roulette (337, or 55%, of responses; 82 14-year-olds, 114 15-year-olds, 76 16-year-olds and 92 17-year-olds).

A breakdown of the results for the participants who responded 'no skill' for each of: poker machines, lottery games and roulette were as follows:

- poker machines (no skill attracted 319, or 53%, of all responses to this sub-item; 15 14-year-olds, 34 15-year-olds, 13 16-year-olds and 9 17-year-olds);
- lottery games (301, or 50%, of responses; 14 14-year-olds, 33 15-year-olds, 11 16-year-olds and 9 17-year-olds); and,
- roulette (227, or 38%, of responses; 15 14-year-olds, 36 15-year-olds, 14 16-year-olds and 12 17-year-olds).

Nonetheless, there was a small group of the participants (approximately 2% on average; 3 14-year-olds, 4 15-year-olds, 4 16-year-olds and 2 17-year-olds) who indicated that all skill and no luck was involved in poker machines, lottery games and roulette' although half of this small number of participants showed possible questionnaire fatigue.

Item 17: The 'House Edge' is the built-in advantage (profit) that the gambling venue has in every game. Percentages change from game to game. Tick either 'true' or 'false' for each statement.

Item 17 comprised three statements that sought to investigate participants' understanding of the House Edge (refer Table 6). 'House Edge' was defined in an introductory statement that indicated the built-in advantage that 'the House' has prior to listing the statements, for which participants were asked to indicate ' true' or 'false' .

Table 6. Participants' beliefs about the House Edge (Item 17 - Tick either 'true' or 'false' for each statement)

Sub-item	True		False	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
The House Edge doesn't matter if you are a lucky person.	216	35.6	307	50.7
The House Edge affects the gambler's wallet more during a few bets than over a lot of bets.	250	41.3	259	42.7
The House Edge equals the profit that the gambling venue takes when people gamble.	216	35.6	283	46.7

Just over half of the participants ($n=307$ or 51%) indicated that luck has no bearing on the 'house edge' (first sub-item). The young people who participated in this study were divided almost equally (250 or 41% chose 'true': 259 or 43% 'false') on the second sub-item related to the effects of the House Edge on 'a few bets' compared to 'a lot of bets'. The third sub-item consisted of a re-statement of the definition of 'House Edge', however, the majority of participants ($n=283$ or 47%) were in disagreement.

These results indicate that many participants did not understand the House Edge. Indeed, if more young people understood that the House would not offer gambling activities without overall certainty of making money, their knowledge about the risks involved gambling may be improved.

Item 18: If two coins with tail on one side and head on the other are tossed, what is the chance of getting two tails?

Responses to Item 18 were used to check the knowledge of participants about the notion of probability, in this instance, the odds or chances in the context of a two-coin toss (refer Table 7). This type of question is one that students typically would encounter in the Year 8 mathematics curriculum.

Table 7. Participants' knowledge of probability (Item 18 - If two coins are tossed what is the chance of getting two tails?)

Sub-item	<i>n</i>	%
1 chance in 5 or 20%	18	3.0

1 chance in 4 or 25%	211	34.8
1 chance in 3 or 33%	64	10.6
1 chance in 2 or 50%	236	38.9

Approximately one-third (35%) only of the participants answered Item 18 correctly. Notably, nearly 50 per cent of participants indicated an unrealistic view, and one that could disadvantage them in calculating their odds of winning, when they indicated they had better than a 1-in-4 chance of achieving a result of two tails (that is 1 chance in 2, or, 1 chance in 3). In particular, almost two out of every five participants (n=236 or 39%) indicated that they had one chance in two of getting two tails from a two-coin toss.

Data were analysed using the STATA software.

TESTS: Knowledge and age. Cross-tabulated probability of heads/tails with age (in years)

Of the participants who responded to Item 18, significantly more participants ($p < .05$) in each of three age groups incorrectly identified the chances of winning: the 14-year-olds, the 15-year-olds and the 17-year-olds.

Of the participants who responded to Item 18, significantly more ($p < .05$) than 50 per cent of three age groups overestimated their chances of winning: the 14-year-olds, the 15-year-olds and the 17-year-olds.

TESTS: Knowledge and views of gambling. Cross-tabulated probability of heads/tails with 'gambling is risky'

Knowledge of heads/tails with Item 15, sub-item, 'gambling is risky'

The test results ($\chi^2=3.8935$, $df=1$, $p < 0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in knowing the odds of obtaining two tails and perception of the risks associated with gambling is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that there is a link between participants' knowledge of odds for a two-coin toss and their perception of risks related to gambling.

Specifically, while most participants held the view that gambling is risky, those who agreed that gambling was risky were more likely to provide the correct answer to the probability question.

A further cross-tabulation was performed to examine the link between overestimation of odds when presented with a heads/tails scenario and holding the view that gambling is risky. The test results ($\chi^2=4.4258$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in overestimating the odds of obtaining two tails and perception of the risks associated with gambling is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that there is a link between participants' overestimation of odds in their favour for a two-coin toss and their perception of risks related to gambling.

Specifically, while most participants held the view that gambling is risky, in the case of this cross-tabulation not only did the participants who believed that gambling is not risky miscalculate the odds of obtaining two tails, they were more likely to overestimate rather than underestimate their chances of obtaining two tails.

Item 19: Imagine that two gamblers Bob and Sue are playing poker machines. If you look at the table below you can see how much they won each game. Who is most likely to get a big win on the next game?

Item 19 provided a scenario and included a table of Sue and Bob's scores (Figure 1). Bob had won the first time, followed by several small wins during the subsequent turns. Sue had won the last three times. The participants were asked to predict the winner of the next game.

Who will get a big win here?

Figure 1. Part of introductory information provided for Item 19

Game	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th	13 th	14 th	15 th	16 th	17 th	18 th	19 th
Bob	45	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	2	0	0	?
Sue	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	15	25	50	?

The results for Item 19 are presented in Table 8.

Table 8: Participants' knowledge of probability (Item 19 - Who is most likely to get a big win on the next game?)

Sub-item	<i>n</i>	%
Bob is more likely to win the next game	75	12.4
Sue is more likely to win the next game	91	15.0
They have the same chance of winning the next game	341	56.3

Nearly 60 per cent of the participants' responses indicated they appeared to understand that each player's chance of winning is the same each game that is played; that is, the odds are 50:50 for each game and this is independent of any other game's result. It is interesting to view the responses to Item 19 in light of the answers to Item 16 (How much skill do you think is potentially involved in the activities listed below?) for which 68 per cent of participants considered playing poker machines to be more reliant upon chance than skill and for which the 53 per cent of participants who identified 'no skill' required was a similar result to the 56 per cent who indicated each player had the same chance (Item 19).

The purpose of the next item (Item 23) was to seek participants' responses to each of four statements that in order to obtain information about participants' understandings of chance when playing: (1) casino games; (2) Tattslotto; (3) generally about their beliefs about luck in gambling; and, (4) about their perceptions of their capacity to exercise power during gambling (refer Table 9).

Item 23: For each of the four statements please tick to show whether you agree or disagree.

Table 9. Participants' knowledge of probability (Item 23 - For each of the statements please tick to show whether you agree or disagree.)

Sub-item	Agree		Disagree	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
The chances of winning a substantial amount of money at the casino are quite high.	67	11.1	473	78.1
I think I'll win a good prize in Tattslotto (over \$10000) one day.	74	12.2	466	76.9

One day I am going to strike it lucky at gambling.	132	21.8	405	66.8
Sometimes I think I might have the power to make my numbers come up in gambling games.	74	12.2	465	76.7

Nearly 80 per cent (n=473 or 78%) of participants disagreed with the statement that the chances of winning substantial amounts of money at the casino are high. A similar number of participants (n=466 or 74%) disagreed that they would win more than \$10,000 from Tattsлото sometime in the future.

Twelve per cent (n=74) of participants maintained they would at some stage win \$10,000 or more. The idea of sometimes having the power to influence results was evident in 12 per cent of responses for the associated statement.

Twenty-two per cent of participants (n=132) held the view that at some stage they would 'strike it lucky' gambling.

These results may be considered in the light of Tattersall's calculation of a 1 in 700,000 chance of winning a second division prize that could yield approximately \$10,000 (Tattersall, 2009) and/or an unfounded belief in 'power' (as per Dickson, 2002).

Item 22: Have you taken part in any 'responsible gambling' school/college activities last year or this year?

Fifty-five participants (8.9%) indicated they had participated in one or more 'responsible gambling' school/college activities during 2007-2008. There were 479 (79.0%) responses that specified no such participation or awareness of taking part in a 'responsible gambling' activity.

Participants' experiences with gambling

Eight Questionnaire items sought information from participants about their experiences with gambling: Items 20a, 7a, 8, 21a, 21c, 9, 10, 11 and 14a.

Item 20a: Thinking about the last 12 months please tick the extent to which these questions apply to your own gambling.

Sixteen (16) statements in Item 20a sought information about participants' handling of money for gambling, occurrence of problems associated with gambling (e.g., financial, social, family) and effects of gambling on their behaviour from participants who had gambled during the 12 months prior to completing the questionnaire (refer Table 10). Participants had five options from which to choose: 'don't know', 'never', 'sometimes', 'most of the time', and 'almost always'.

Table 10. Participants' experiences with gambling (Item 20a - Thinking about the last 12 months, please tick the extent to which these questions apply to your own gambling, if you have gambled)

Sub-item	Don't know		Never		Sometimes		Most of the time		Almost always	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Have you bet more than you could really afford?	43	7.1	217	35.8	21	3.5	7	1.2	17	2.8
Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?	40	6.6	212	35.0	28	4.6	12	2.0	7	1.2
When you gambled, did you go back another day to try and win back the money you lost?	36	5.9	215	35.5	22	3.6	13	2.1	7	1.2
Have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble?	31	5.1	227	37.5	18	3.0	6	1.0	7	1.2
Have you felt that you might have a problem with gambling?	37	6.1	227	37.5	10	1.7	9	1.5	6	1.0
Has gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety?	38	6.3	228	37.6	9	1.5	9	1.5	2	0.3
Have people criticised your betting or told you that you have a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true?	40	6.6	220	36.3	18	3.0	3	0.5	6	1.0

Table 10. Participants' experiences with gambling (Item 20a - Thinking about the last 12 months, please tick the extent to which these questions apply to your own gambling, if you have gambled)

Sub-Item	Don't know		Never		Sometimes		Most of the time		Almost always	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Has your gambling caused you or your family any financial problems?	35	5.8	228	37.6	13	2.1	7	1.2	2	0.3
Have you had arguments with your family or friends about someone's gambling?	33	5.4	219	36.1	21	3.5	6	1.0	6	1.0
Have you felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble?	32	5.3	223	36.8	23	3.8	6	1.0	2	0.3
Have you lied to family members or others to hide your gambling?	34	5.6	229	37.8	11	1.8	1	0.2	7	1.2
Have you bet or spent more money than you wanted to on gambling?	34	5.6	211	34.9	33	5.5	4	0.7	2	0.3
Have you wanted to stop betting money or gambling, but didn't think you could?	37	6.1	230	38.0	12	2.0	3	0.5	2	0.3
Have you spent your school lunch money or bus fares on gambling activities?	35	5.8	222	36.6	19	3.1	5	0.8	4	0.7
Do you find you need to spend more and more money on gambling activities?	36	5.9	235	38.8	9	1.5	2	0.3	13	2.1
Do you find you need to steal so that you have enough money either to spend on gambling activities or to pay gambling debts?	31	5.1	242	39.9	8	1.3	4	0.7	9	1.5

Approximately half of the participants did not answer Item 20a. It is possible that because Item 20a was seeking an important disclosure, albeit anonymously, some

participants chose not to respond to this item. Furthermore between 35 per cent and 40 per cent of participants selected 'never' for each sub-item within Item 20a. Comments made by one of the interview participants may reflect the outlook of some of the questionnaire participants:

[Gambling that is OK is when] "you have a limit and you don't cross your limit and you have yourself under control and you only do it every now and then. Like when we go out to tea [someone] might put some money on keno, like a dollar or two and see if [that person] wins anything and when [that person] walks through the casino he might see if he has a dollar or two to put in the pokies and if he wins that's great and if he doesn't that's no big loss." [Interview 1, female, 17 years]

It was noted from the data that females were less likely than males to provide unambiguous responses.

When the data were separated into responses for each of the age groups—14-, 15-, 16- and 17-year-olds—it was evident that with respect to responses to some sub-items that the younger participants had experienced comparatively more problems. Five examples of some of the age group analyses are shown in Table 11, which is followed by a description of the tabled data. The five examples were selected from those sub-items for which the responses 'almost always' or 'most times' were more highly reported by participants.

Table 11. Examples of age group analyses for five sub-items (Item 20a)

Age (in years)	Sub-items and response options analysed							Total
	Sub-item	... bet more than you can really afford	...need to spend more and more...	...need ... larger amounts of money ... same feeling of excitement	...did you go back another day	Have you felt that you might have a problem	Has your gambling caused ... financial problems	
	Response	Almost always	Almost always	Most times	Most times	Most times	Almost always	
		<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>
14		6	3	2	4	1	3	121
15		7	5	8	5	5	5	180
16		1	2	1	3	0	0	113
17		2	3	1	1	1	1	143

Further details of the separation of responses for each of the age groups for some of these problems described in sub-items were:

- For the question "Have you bet more than you could really afford?" six of 121 14-year-olds and seven of 180 15-year-olds responded 'almost always' compared with one of 113 16-year-olds and two of 143 17-year-olds;
- With respect to the question "Do you find you need to spend more and more money on gambling activities?" five of 180 15-year-olds, three of 121 14-year-olds, three of 143 17-year-olds and two of 113 16-year-olds responded 'almost always'.
- For the question "Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?" the response 'most times' was selected by eight of 180 15-year-olds and two of 121 14-year-olds compared with one of 113 16-year-olds and one of 143 17-year-olds;
- Further examination of the question "When you gambled, did you go back another day to try and win back the money you lost?" revealed that four of 121

14-year-olds and five of 180 15-year-olds compared with three of 143 17-year-olds and one of 113 16-year-olds had returned "most times";

- With respect to the question "Have you felt that you might have a problem with gambling?" five of 180 15-year-olds responded "most times" compared with one of 121 14-year-olds, none of 113 16-year-olds and one of 143 17-year-olds; and,
- For the question "Has your gambling caused you or your family any financial problems?" five of 180 15-year-olds and three of 121 14-year-olds responded "most times" compared with none of 113 16-year-olds and one of 143 17-year-olds.

Clearly these experiences represent those of a very small number of participants. From five to 24 (mean=12.25) participants selected the 'mostly' or 'almost always' responses: betting more money than they could really afford (n=24 or 4%); 'mostly' or 'almost always' going back another day to attempt to win back lost money (n=20 or 3%); 'mostly' or 'almost always' needing to gamble with larger amounts of money in order to achieve the same feeling of excitement (n=19 or 3%); 'mostly' or 'almost always' feeling that they might have a problem with gambling (n=15 or 3%); and, 'mostly' or 'almost always' finding they needed to spend more and more money on gambling (n=15 or 3%). Reports of 'almost always' experiencing situations described by the questions in this Item 20a were reported typically by an average (mean) of five participants, or under one per cent of the participants who completed the questionnaire.

Further analysis of the Item 20a data responses 'most times' or 'almost always' indicates that if identification of one of the listed situations were to be considered as experiencing problems with their gambling then 8.5 per cent of the participants who responded to Item 20a would fall into a category of having experienced problems during the 12 months prior to completing the questionnaire. If experiencing two or more of the listed situations at the level of 'most times' or 'almost always' were to be considered as having experienced problems with their gambling then almost six per cent of the participants who responded to this item reported problem gambling during the 12 months prior to completing the questionnaire. It should be noted that based on responses to other items, it appears likely that some of the participants who responded to statements in Item 20a had never gambled.

These data suggest that between one and five participants are experiencing difficulty

managing their gambling behaviour across several or many of the listed situations before they turn 18 years old.

Participants' experiences with types of gambling

Item 7a: How often have you gambled on the following during the last 12 months?

The majority of participants reported having no experience with any of the listed gambling types nor did they add to the list (refer Table 12).

Table 12. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (Item 7a: How often have you gambled on any of the following during the last 12 months?)

Sub-item	Never		1-2 times per year		From 3 times per year up to once per month		2-3 times per month		Weekly or more often	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Card games for money, e.g., poker, blackjack	447	73.8	72	11.9	31	5.1	12	2.0	13	2.1
Poker machines	530	87.5	28	4.6	7	1.2	4	0.7	6	1.0
Racing (horses, dogs)	471	77.7	84	13.9	7	1.2	3	0.5	6	1.0
Sports (not including dog- or horse races)	495	81.7	53	8.7	13	2.1	5	0.8	7	1.2
Tattslotto	507	83.7	47	7.8	8	1.3	6	1.0	8	1.3
Keno	421	69.5	98	16.2	40	6.6	11	1.8	7	1.2
Scratch tickets	344	56.8	159	26.2	51	8.4	10	1.7	11	1.8
Bingo	514	84.8	39	6.4	8	1.3	4	0.7	6	1.0
Internet gambling	544	89.8	14	2.3	3	0.5	3	0.5	9	1.5
Mobile phone gambling	551	90.9	11	1.8	2	0.3	0	0	9	1.5

Of the participants who had gambled by participating in the listed activities, 72 (12%) reported using scratch tickets, 58 (10%) played keno and 56 (9%) played card games for money. These responses include those for whom participation occurred at least three times a year. A small number of participants, ranging from 9 to 13 young people

(approximately 2%) per type of gambling, reported at least once weekly playing cards for money, using scratch tickets, gambling on the internet, and gambling using a mobile phone. It appears that participants may gamble considerably less than their South Australian peers, 15 per cent of who gambled weekly when in years 10, 11 and 12 at school (Delfabbro & Thrupp, 2003).

Item 8: On which activities do you usually use your own money to gamble?

From the responses to Item 8, the following table (Table 13) was devised to illustrate whether or not participants who had gambled, had used their own money to bet on each of the gambling activities listed.

Table 13. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (derived from Item 8a - On which activities do you usually use your own money to gamble?)

Sub-item	Used your own money? -Yes		No	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Card games for money, e.g., poker, blackjack	88	14.5	25	4.1
Poker machines	40	6.6	26	4.3
Racing (horses, dogs)	45	7.4	27	4.5
Sports (not including dog- or horse races)	46	7.6	27	4.5
Tattslotto	28	4.6	31	5.1
Keno	71	11.7	27	4.5
Scratch tickets	85	14.0	28	4.6
Bingo	19	3.1	29	4.8
Internet gambling	48	7.9	21	3.5
Mobile phone gambling	16	2.6	28	4.6

The activities on which the participants most used their own money were: card games (n=88, 15%), scratch tickets (n=85, 14%), and Keno (n=71, 12%). These participants least used their own money to gamble using: mobile phones (n=16 or 3%); bingo (n=19 or 3%); and, Tattslotto (n=28 or 5%).

Some participants indicated that they had gambled not using their own money. These participants were typically in the minority; however, their responses are also shown in Table 13.

Mobile phone gambling was the notable exception with nearly twice the number of participants gambling without spending their own money, although responses were fewer for this method of gambling compared with any other methods in the list provided.

The responses to Item 8 that listed amounts usually spent each gambling session are set out in a second table (Table 14). This table illustrates the amounts spent ranging from 'up to \$2' through to 'more than \$20'.

Table 14. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (derived from Item 8b - How many dollars do you usually spend each time?)

Sub-item	up to \$2		\$2.05 up to \$5		\$5.05 up to \$10		\$10.05 up to \$15		\$15.05 up to \$20		more than \$20	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Card games for money, e.g., poker, blackjack	10	1.7	17	2.8	19	3.1	1	0.2	12	2.0	10	1.7
Poker machines	6	1.0	7	1.2	10	1.7	0	0	3	0.5	3	0.5
Racing (horses, dogs)	7	1.2	10	1.7	10	1.7	0	0	8	1.3	4	0.7
Sports (not including dog- or horse races)	4	0.7	12	2.0	7	1.2	2	0.3	2	0.3	6	1.0
Tattslotto	4	0.7	4	0.7	3	0.5	4	0.7	1	0.2	1	0.2
Keno	16	2.6	27	4.5	17	2.8	3	0.5	2	0.3	1	0.2
Scratch tickets	21	3.5	31	5.1	12	2.0	4	0.7	3	0.5	3	0.5
Bingo	3	0.5	4	0.7	2	0.3	0	0	1	0.2	2	0.3
Internet gambling	9	1.5	6	1.0	4	0.7	1	0.2	2	0.3	5	0.8
Mobile phone gambling	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.2	2	0.3

While card games for money (n=88, 15%), scratch tickets (n=85, 14%), and keno (n=71, 12%) were most popular with the participants, card games for money, along with three less popular activities—racing (horses, dogs) (n=45, 7%), internet gambling (n=48, 8%) and mobile phone gambling (the least popular of the listed activities, n=16, 3%)—attracted a higher proportion of spending at the top end, that is, participants who spent more than \$15 each time they gambled.

A closer look at the highest spending card players reveals the following:

- Three of the 10 participants who spent more than \$20 each time they gambled on

card games indicated they played cards weekly or more often, four indicated they played between three times per year up to once per month, and one indicated playing cards once or twice per year.

- One of the 12 participants who spent between \$15.05 and \$20 on card games indicated playing card games weekly or more often, two indicated that they played cards two to three times per month, three indicated they played between three times per year up to once per month, and five indicated playing card games once or twice per year.
- Thus, of the 22 highest spending card players, four spent more than \$15 on at least a weekly basis.

These data were analysed using the STATA software and significant results are presented.

**TESTS: Region in which participants lived, gender and gambling experiences.
Cross-tabulated region with playing scratch tickets and gender with playing bingo**

'Region north-west' and 'region not north-west' with whether, or not, has played scratch tickets

The test results ($c^2=5.6133$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether or not the participants live in the north-western region and whether or not they have played scratch tickets is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the participants who live in the north-west are more likely to have played scratch tickets than have participants who live outside the north-western region.

Gender: Cross-tabulated with gambling experience, specifically, playing bingo

'Gender female' with frequency of playing bingo

The test results ($c^2=8.0536$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether female participants are likely to play bingo more or

less frequently than male participants is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that female participants are more likely to play bingo more frequently than are male participants.

Specifically, while both female participants and male participants played bingo, female participants were most likely to have played bingo once weekly or more often. Participants from the north-western region were most likely to have gambled using scratch tickets.

TESTS: Views of gambling and gambling experiences. 'A good way to hang out with friends', 'fun' and risky cross-tabulated with gambling experiences, that is, playing cards for money, scratch tickets, and bingo

Item 15, sub-item – 'gambling is a good way to hang out with friends' and frequency of playing cards for money

The test results ($c^2=4.3569$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in their view of the statement that gambling is a good way to socialise and spend time with friends and whether or not the participants play cards for money is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the social role of gambling with respect to gambling being a good way to socialise and spend time with friends corresponds with the frequency with which the participants play cards for money.

Specifically, those participants who played cards for money more frequently were more likely to be of the view that gambling is a good way to socialise and spend time with friends than were participants who played cards for money less frequently.

Item 15, sub-item – 'gambling is fun' and frequency of playing scratch tickets

The test results ($c^2=13.8738$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in their view of the statement that gambling is fun and whether or not participants play scratch tickets is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the aspect of fun when gambling correspond with whether or not the participants play

scratch tickets.

Specifically those participants who held the view that gambling is fun played scratch tickets more frequently.

Item 15, sub-item – 'gambling is risky' and frequency of playing scratch tickets

The test results ($\chi^2=6.8659$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in the view of the statement that gambling is risky and whether or not participants play scratch tickets is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the aspect of risk when gambling correspond with whether or not the participants play scratch tickets.

Specifically while many participants held the view that gambling is risky, those participants who held the view that gambling is not risky were more likely to play scratch tickets more frequently.

Item 15, sub-item – gambling is risky and frequency of playing bingo

The test results ($\chi^2=6.9810$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in the view of the statement that gambling is risky and whether or not participants play bingo is rejected. That is, there is evidence to conclude that the views of participants about the aspect of risk when gambling correspond with whether or not the participants play bingo.

Specifically, while many participants held the view that gambling is risky, those participants who held the view that gambling is not risky were more likely to play bingo more frequently.

Item 21a: How often do you play video/computer or arcade games? If you play, how many hours do you usually play?

Questionnaire Item 21a sought information about: first, the frequency with which participants played a variety of games (see Table 15); and second, the amount of time (in hours) they typically played any of these games (see Table 16). The games listed

were: TV games, phone games, hand-held games, computer games and arcade games. Not all these games necessitate outlaying money.

Table 15. Frequency of playing a variety of games (Item 21a - How often do you play video / computer or arcade games?)

Sub-item	Never		Once per week		2-6 times per week		Daily	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
TV games	164	27.1	167	27.6	114	18.8	92	15.2
Phone games	261	43.1	170	28.1	58	9.6	45	7.4
Hand-held games	357	58.9	91	15.0	44	7.3	31	5.1
Computer games	147	24.3	149	24.6	134	22.1	98	16.2
Arcade games	435	71.8	53	8.7	6	1.0	19	3.1

Computer games (played daily by 98 participants or 16%; played 2 to 6 times per week by 134 participants or 22%) and TV games (played daily by 92 participants or 15%; played 2 to 6 times per week by 114 participants or 19%) were most popular. Arcade games were the least popular games of the five games listed in Item 21a (played daily by 19 participants or 3%; played 2 to 6 times per week by 6 participants or 1%). Daily playing of phone games and hand-held games attracted around 40 participants (5% to 7%) while around 50 participants (around 8%) played these two game types twice up to six times per week.

Table 16. Frequency of playing a variety of games (Item 21a - If you play, how many hours do you usually play?)

Hours	1		2		3-5		6-10		11-15		16-20		21-30		31-40		41-50		>50	
Sub-item	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
TV games	50	8.3	44	7.3	35	5.8	12	2.0	2	0.3	1	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.3
Phone games	75	12.4	8	1.3	3	0.5	0	0	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hand-held games	51	8.5	36	6.0	38	6.3	14	2.3	3	0.5	0	0	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
Computer games	22	3.6	4	0.7	2	0.3	1	0.2	2	0.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

More than one in five participants played TV games (n=129 or 21%) or hand-held games (n=125 or 21%) for between one and five hours during one session. The numbers of participants who played for greater amounts of time were considerably fewer: for six to ten hours (TV games, n=12 or 2%; hand-held games, n=14 or 2%); and for more than ten hours (TV games, n=5 or 1%; hand-held games, n=6 or 1%). Phone games and computer games were played for one hour sessions most frequently (n=75 or 12%) with considerable drop-off in the numbers of participants who played for periods longer than one hour: specifically the results for phone games showed that 75 participants (12%) played phone games for one hour; the remainder who played for two or more hours amounted to 13 (2%); for computer games the data showed that 22 participants (4%) played for one hour; the remainder, that is nine (<2%) played for two or more hours.

Item 21c: If you play video/computer or arcade games, how many hours would you usually play?

Item 21c sought information about the amount of time (in hours) spent on video, computer or arcade games by the young people who played any of these games daily (refer Table 17).

Table 17. Participants' experiences with gambling during the previous 12 months (Item 21c - How many dollars do you usually spend each time?)

No. of hours played	<i>n</i>	%
1	55	9.1
2	52	8.6
3	40	6.6
4	11	1.8
5	7	1.2
6	8	1.3
7	4	.7
7+	23	3.8

Two hundred participants (33%) played video, computer or arcade games on a daily basis. Many of these participants played for one hour (n=55 or 9%), two hours (n=52 or 9%) or three hours (n=40 or 7%). Fewer participants played for greater periods; however, of the 53 participants (9%) who played for more than three hours, 23 (4 % of the sample) had played sessions of more than seven hours.

Examination of the data gathered from participants' responses to Items 20a, 21a and 21c revealed no statistical significance in the split between the young Tasmanians who played video, computer and/or arcade games for at least one hour daily and those who did not report this gaming activity when considered in the light of participants who reported one or more of the listed problems (Item 20a). Table 18 illustrates this examination of the data. For example, of the participants who reported experiencing two of the listed problems during the year prior to completing the survey, two reported they had not gamed daily and five reported at least one hour a day gaming.

Table 18. Problems with gambling grouped according to responses of no gaming* and at least one hour gaming

Problems reported concurrently by each participant	No gaming*	At least 1 hr gaming
0	112	122
1	7	5
2	2	5
3	1	1
4	1	0
5	2	3
6	1	0

7	0	1
8	0	2
10	1	1
12	0	1
13	0	1
Total	127	142

Note: *Gaming=daily playing of computer, video and/or arcade games

Item 9: Have you ever done any of the following? If so, how did you do it?

Item 9 sought information about whether or not participants had gambled either at a casino, the TAB, with lottery or keno tickets, or played on poker machines before they had turned 16 years old.

Information was sought from the participants who had gambled in any of the four methods listed about how they had gambled: by themselves; by using a fake ID, with help from adults, with friends, or another method. Provision was made in this item for participants to indicate more than one method of engaging with any of the types of gambling (refer Table 19).

Table 19. Participants' experiences of gambling (Item 9 - Have your ever done any of the following? If so, how did you do it?)

Sub-item	By myself (no one noticed)		By myself using a fake ID		With the help of adults		With friends		Other	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Casino - 1 st method	16	2.6	4	0.7	8	1.3	8	1.3	2	0.3
Casino - 2 nd method	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.2
TAB - 1 st method	10	1.7	4	0.7	19	3.1	3	0.5	1	0.2
TAB - 2 nd method	0	.0	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
Lotteries or keno before I turned 16 - 1 st method	19	3.1	3	0.5	75	12.4	5	0.8	2	0.3
Lotteries or keno before I turned 16 -2 nd method	0	0	1	0.2	5	0.8	5	0.8	2	0.3
Lotteries or keno before I turned 16 - 3 rd method	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0.3	0	0

Table 19. Participants' experiences of gambling (Item 9 - Have your ever done any of the following? If so, how did you do it?)

Sub-item	By myself (no one noticed)		By myself using a fake ID		With the help of adults		With friends		Other	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Poker Machines – 1 st method	15	2.5	6	1.0	11	1.8	9	1.5	3	0.5
Poker Machines – 2 nd method	0	0	1	0.2	2	0.3	2	0.3	0	0

Note: 1st, 2nd, 3rd = at least one person reported each type of gambling in more than one of the 5 ways (i.e., by myself, using a fake ID, and so on). That is, one person reported gambling on lotteries or keno in three different ways.

Playing lottery tickets or on poker machines were the two most popular gambling activities reported by the participants ($n=104$ or 17%) who had gambled, either at a casino, the TAB, with lottery or keno tickets or on poker machines. That is, more than one in six young people reported gambling using lottery tickets or played keno before they had turned 16 years old. The majority of these 104 participants ($n=75$, or 12% of the total number of study participants) had undertaken this type of gambling with the help of adults. The role of parents in introducing minors to gambling has been canvassed in the literature (Gupta & Derevensky, 1998; Relationships Australia, 2004; Winters et al., 1995), and the more than likely problem gambling faced by young people who commence gambling prior to their teenage years (Gupta & Derevensky, 1998). Thirty-eight (6%) young people had gambled at a casino; 37 (6%) had gambled at the TAB; and, 44 (7%) had played poker machines.

Item 10: At what age did you first gamble on any of the activities listed in Item 9?

The participants who had gambled on one or more of the activities or at one of the locations listed in Item 9 were asked to indicate the age at which they first gambled (refer Table 20).

Table 20. Participants' experiences of gambling (Item 10 - At what age did you first gamble on any of the activities listed in Item 9?)

Sub-item	<i>n</i>	%
----------	----------	---

Under 10 years old	32	5.3
Under 16 years old	69	11.4
Under 18 years old	13	2.1
Don't remember	1	0.2

Most commonly, the participants who responded to Item 10 gambled for the first time sometime between when they turned 10 years of age until they reached their mid teens (n=69 or 11%, and 60% of the 115 participants who completed Item 10); however, the data showed that 32 participants (5% of the sample, and 28% in terms of the 115 participants who completed this item) reported gambling for the first time before they turned 10 years of age. Only five participants who gambled prior to turning 10 years of age, and who indicated they had gambled at casino or TAB activities, revealed the source of help they received to introduce them to gambling.

Item 11: Did you have a big win when you first tried gambling?

The participants who had gambled on one or more of the activities or at one of the locations listed in Item 9 were asked to indicate whether they considered they had a 'big win' the first time they tried gambling (refer Table 21).

Table 21. Participants' experiences of gambling (Item 11 - Did you have a big win when you first tried gambling?)

Sub-item	<i>n</i>	%
Yes	54	8.9
No	151	24.9

Of the 205 participants who responded to Item 11, 54 (9% of the 606 participants who participated in the study, or 34% of those participants who completed this item) considered they had experienced a big win the first time they gambled.

The decision about the dollar-amount that constituted a big win was left to the individual participants; a variety of individual circumstances could influence this decision, for example, family income, or employment undertaken by the young person.

Item 14a: If you have obtained cigarettes, scratch tickets and/or alcohol, how easy was it?

Item 14a was presented to participants in order to explore their experiences obtaining scratch tickets and to compare these results with the ease or difficulty they experienced participating in other risky behaviour, in this case, obtaining cigarettes and/or alcohol (refer Table 22). Responses from which participants could choose were: 'very hard', 'hard,' 'I have not tried', 'easy' and 'very easy'.

Table 22. Participants' experiences of risky behaviours (Item 14a - If you have obtained cigarettes, scratchies and / or alcohol, how easy was it?)

Sub-item	Very hard		Hard		I have not tried		Easy		Very easy	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Cigarettes	17	2.8	7	1.2	331	54.6	56	9.2	88	14.5
Scratchies	16	2.6	14	2.3	279	46.0	102	16.8	90	14.9
Alcohol	17	2.8	16	2.6	195	32.2	137	22.6	144	23.8

Overall, the participants reported that it was easy to obtain cigarettes (n=144 or 14%), scratch tickets (n=192 or 32%) and alcohol (n=281 or 46%); and that it was difficult, at

considerably lower levels, to obtain cigarettes (n=24 or 4%), scratch tickets (n=30 or 5%) and alcohol (n=33 or 5%). Most of the participants had not obtained cigarettes (n=331 or 55%); more participants had not tried (n=279 or 46%) to obtain scratch tickets as the number of participants that had done so (n=222 or 37%); and finally, alcohol was obtained by more participants (n=281 or 46%) than the numbers of participants who had either not tried (n=195 or 32%) or than those who found alcohol difficult to obtain (n=33 or 5%).

For each participant who found obtaining alcohol was hard, a little over eight times as many participants found it 'easy', or 'very easy'. With respect to cigarettes and scratch tickets, for each participant who found it hard to obtain cigarettes or scratch tickets, six participants found it easy to obtain them.

These data were analysed using the STATA software and significant results are presented.

TEST: Ease of difficulty of access and age. Ease or difficulty of access to all of cigarettes, scratch tickets and alcohol with age

Ease or difficulty of access to cigarettes, scratch tickets and alcohol with 'age 14'

The test results ($\chi^2=5.0898$, $df=1$, $p<0.05$) show that the null hypothesis of no difference in whether 14-year-old participants were able to access easily all three items—cigarettes, scratch tickets and alcohol—as opposed to only one or two of the three items is rejected.

Specifically, 14-year-old participants were the group most likely accessing all three of cigarettes, scratch tickets and alcohol.

Item 22: Have you taken part in any 'responsible gambling' school/college activities last year or this year?

Questionnaire Item 22 sought information about the educational experiences participants had been exposed during their schooling within an approximately two-year period. While Item 22 did not specify the *What's the Real Deal* curriculum kit materials, this study provided an opportunity to investigate the possible extent of dissemination of

these materials in Tasmanian schools. Some of the participants who took part in this study were in the target year groups (Year 7 & 8) or they would have passed through these year groups in the last one or two years.

Fewer than one in ten participants (n=54 or 9%) reported having taken part in any 'responsible' gambling activities at school/college. Further investigation of participants' involvement in education programs and their perceptions of the value of these programs could provide valuable information. While research points to successful use of cognitive therapy to reduce problematic gambling in adults (Derevensky et al., 2007), there remains debate as to the effectiveness of educational and support strategies with respect to enhancing young people's capacity to approach gambling in a responsible manner (Gardner & Williamson, 2006; Monaghan & Blaszczynski, 2008; Williams et al., 2006; Winters et al., 1995).

Vignette

Responses to questions in Questionnaire Item 20a that attracted higher response rates for the option 'almost always', while only one per cent to three per cent of responses recorded, nonetheless can be drawn on to develop a possible vignette that may illustrate problems similar to those experienced by several participants as a result of gambling. This vignette draws on responses to Items 20a, 8 and 14. In addition responses, from the two participants who were interviewed, provided data that was used to add detail to the vignette.

A young Tasmanian's experiences of difficulties when gambling

Sam has turned 15 years old. He lives 35 km north of Hobart. His first encounters with gambling four years ago with keno tickets and with scratch tickets were by way of his immediate and extended family. He continues to receive these as birthday and Christmas presents from two of his relatives⁵ who find it more convenient to send tickets than cash in the mail.

Sam generally plays cards for money with other boys. He had a big win during

⁵ Interview 2 (male, aged 17)

the first game of cards and thought "this is easy...I can do this again."⁶ He developed the beliefs that he had a real skill for playing card games and that this newly found skill outweighed any risk involved in gambling. He began thinking he had discovered a "get-rich-quick" strategy⁷.

The next day Sam was back playing cards. Things turned out badly and he ended up owing money after the last hand. Sam says he gambles because of the adrenaline, or in his words, "it's such a rush"⁸.

He stole money from his girlfriend's bag to try to win more to pay his debt. When his girlfriend realised what Sam had done she confronted him about this theft. Sam borrowed from his sister to pay back his girlfriend. Later his sister said she wanted her money back; however, Sam had not won enough to be able to pay. Sam began stealing and selling things. Spending around \$20 a week most weeks his gambling continued to cost him money he could not afford.

The costs of Sam's gambling behaviour while initially financial were now emerging as lack of trust: the relationships between Sam and his sister and Sam and his girlfriend were worsening. ⁹.

Sam's plan for winning back losses was not working and he continued stealing and gambling. He paid a man to obtain scratch tickets for him¹⁰. Typically Sam was losing but occasionally he won. Sam's worsening situation now results in him frequently lying to and arguing with his family and his girlfriend who has threatened to stop seeing him. In this situation Sam's life does not reflect in any way the TV advertisement where "people are dancing around and looking happy."¹¹

Sam realises that he needs a lot more money to keep trying to win back losses. In his involvement in card games and scratch tickets Sam's initial plan for recouping losses is not working.

Sam has disclosed to a couple of close friends that he is gambling sometimes; however, they told Sam that he has a problem. Sam denies this.

⁶ Interview 2

⁷ Interview 1 (female, aged 17)

⁸ Interview 1

⁹ Interview 1

¹⁰ Interview 2

¹¹ Interview 1

Summary

In summary, many participants reported not being interested in gambling now or in the future. Fewer than one in ten participants reported anticipation of turning 18 years old so they could go to adult gambling venues and/or so that they could gamble more frequently. Around double the number of participants (1 in 5) reported that they would like to gamble at some time in the future.

Half of the participants did not report they had gambled in the twelve months prior to completing the questionnaire. Participants reported that their friends and families approved of gambling (around 1 in 7 for each sub-item) and that most of their friends gambled (around 1 in 15). Around one in five participants reported that at least one person in their family gambled at least weekly.

Participants reported that toy gambling games, friends and advertising were more likely to influence them to gamble. Family and teachers were reported more often as influencing participants against gambling.

The element of fun stood out when compared with other perceived benefits for participants of their participation in gambling activities.

Some gender and age differences became evident in the analysis of participants' responses about the element of fun in gambling and the role gambling plays in socialising with friends. Some gender differences were evident in the participants' preferred gambling activities.

Variations with respect to questionnaire items about perceptions of risk in gambling, impressing friends by gambling, gambling being a good way to socialise and use of scratch tickets were evident in responses from participants in the three Tasmanian regions and between participants residing in city, town and rural locations.

Between one and nine per cent of participants reported experiencing one of the listed problems as a result of their gambling 'most of the time' or 'almost always'. Around six

per cent of participants reported experiencing two or more of the listed problems. Financial problems, stealing, arguments with family and/or friends and health problems were some of these.

One in 20 participants reported gambling for the first time before they turned 10 years of age and one in 10 reported gambling before they turned 16 years of age.

Anywhere between one half and one third of participants misunderstood the "House Edge" and knowledge of probability, for example, results of a two-coin toss or independence of each game's results from previous game results.

Around one in eight participants reported high odds for winning substantial money at a casino, or for winning more than \$10,000 one day playing Tattsлото, or they thought they might have the power to make their numbers come up in gambling games. One in five participants reported that they would "strike it lucky" while gambling".

Fewer than one in ten participants reported undertaking any "responsible" gambling activities at school, for example, *What the Real Deal?*

Analysis of the demographic data and the data relating to this study's participants' views, knowledge, and beliefs about their current and future participation, or lack of participation, in gambling has revealed some significant results that may provide useful information to assist targeting Tasmanians, in the main 14 – 17-year-olds as a whole and/or sub-groups of this population.

One issue that emerged and that is not so clearly defined is the matter of transference of articulated beliefs, knowledge and understandings into attitudes towards gambling and resultant behaviour.

A second issue derives from research conducted by Derevensky et al. (2007) and Fisher (1991). These works have indicated that conducting research with children and adolescents younger than 14 years of age is another area that is deserving of attention.

References

- Amberlight. (n.d.). *Gambling Online: A psychological approach to engineering interactive gaming systems*. Retrieved July 17, 2009, from http://www.amber-light.co.uk/resources/whitepapers/gambling_whitepaper_amberlight.pdf
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2003a). *2001.6 - Census of Population and Housing: Selected Education and Labour Force Characteristics for Statistical Local Areas, Tasmania, 2001*. Retrieved July 17, 2009, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/productsbytitle/7404FE38CC50527FCA256D0100802193?OpenDocument>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2003b). *Census of population and housing, 2001*. Retrieved June 17, 2009, from [http://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/subscriber.nsf/Lookup/D9379A6FFA24473CCA256D470005CC1C/\\$File/20350_2001.pdf](http://www.ausstats.abs.gov.au/Ausstats/subscriber.nsf/Lookup/D9379A6FFA24473CCA256D470005CC1C/$File/20350_2001.pdf)
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2007a). *1362.6 - Regional Statistics, Tasmania, 2007 - Population composition*. Retrieved July 17, 2009, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/2f762f95845417aeca25706c00834efa/1ABA4BFD2B058F00CA257264000CB0FA?opendocument>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2007b). *1362.6 - Regional Statistics, Tasmania, 2006 - Population size*. Retrieved June 17, 2009, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/0/B292E2DDE733ECE7CA25710A001A87A3?opendocument>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2007c). *3235.0 - Population by Age and Sex, Regions of Australia, 2007*. Retrieved December 30, 2009, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/ausstats/abs@.nsf/Products/3235.0~2007~Main+Features~Tasmania?OpenDocument>
- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2007d). *2006 Census Tables: Tasmania*. Retrieved December 30, 2009 from <http://www.censusdata.abs.gov.au/ABSNavigation/prenav/ViewData?breadcrumb=LPTD&method=Place%20of%20Usual%20Residence&subaction=-1&issue=2006&producttype=Census%20Tables&documentproductno=6&textversion=false&documenttype>

=Details&collection=Census&javascript=true&topic=Language&action=404&productlabel=Language%20Spoken%20at%20Home%20(full%20classification%20list)%20by%20Sex&order=1&period=2006&tabname=Details&areacode=6&navmapdisplayed=true&

- Australian Bureau of Statistics. (2008). *1384.6 - Statistics - Tasmania*. Retrieved June 17, 2009, from <http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/0/86F60AF5E773C7A3CA2573C5000DA2C2?opendocument>
- Berenson, M., Levine, D. M., & Krehbiel, T. C. (2006). *Basic business statistics: Concepts and applications* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Blaszczynski, A. (2008). Commentary: A response to "Problems with the concept of video game 'addiction': Some case study examples". *International Journal of Mental Health Addiction, 6*, 179-181.
- Burns, R. B. (2000). *Introduction of research methods* (4th ed.). Frenchs Forest, Australia: Pearson Education.
- Chantal, Y., & Vallerand, R. J. (1996). Skill versus luck: A motivational analysis of gambling involvement. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 12*(4), 407-418.
- Delfabbro, P., King, D., Lambos, C., & Puglies, S. (2009). Is video-game playing a risk factor for pathological gambling in Australian adolescents? *Journal of Gambling Studies, 25*(3), 391-405.
- Delfabbro, P., Lambos, C., King, D., & Puglies, S. (2009). Knowledge and beliefs about gambling in Australian secondary school students and their implications for education strategies. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 25*(4), 523-539.
- Delfabbro, P., & Thrupp, L. (2003). The social determinants of youth gambling in South Australian adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence, 26*, 313-330.
- Demographic Change Advisory Council Tasmania (DCAC). (n.d.). *Local government area population profiles*. Retrieved March 31, 2010 from <http://www.dcac.tas.gov.au>
- Department of Education. (2008). *Annual report 2007-08*. Retrieved July 17, 2009, from <http://www.education.tas.gov.au/annualreport/07-08/complete.pdf>
- Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). (2007). *What the real deal? Sorting out the luck, loss, myths and realities of gambling, A teaching kit for Tasmanian high schools Year levels 7/8*. Retrieved April 12, 2010 from

www.dhhs.tas.gov.au/gambling

- Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC). (2009a). *Education*. Retrieved July 17, 2009, from
http://www.dpac.tas.gov.au/divisions/cdd/ocya/children_and_young_people_in_tasmania_snapshot/education
- Department of Premier and Cabinet (DPAC). (2009b). *Tasmania Together benchmark information system*. Retrieved March 31, 2010 from
<http://dev.ttbis.dpac.tas.gov.au/report/detailedmop/ID/77>
- Derevensky, J. L., & Gupta, R. (2007). Internet gambling amongst adolescents: A growing concern. *International Journal of Mental Health Addiction, 5*, 93-101.
- Derevensky, J., Gupta, R., & Baboushkin, H. (2007). Underlying cognitions in children's gambling behavior: Can they be modified? *International Gambling Studies, 7*(3), 281-298.
- Dickson, L. M. (2002). A developmental perspective of youth gambling attitudes: Implications for prevention. Retrieved April 12, 2010 from
http://digitool.library.mcgill.ca:8881/R/?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=29499&local_base=GEN01-MCG02
- Dowling, N., Clarke, D., Memery, L., & Corney, T. (2005). Australian apprentices and gambling. *Youth Studies Australia, 24*(3), 17-23.
- Fisher, S. (1991). Governmental response to juvenile fruit machine gambling in the UK: Where do we go from here? *Journal of Gambling Studies, 7*(3), 217-247.
- Frank, M. L., & Smith, C. (1989). Illusion of control and gambling in children. *Journal of Gambling Behavior, 5*(2), 127-136.
- Gardner, C., & Williamson, J. (2006). *An evaluation of the 'What's the real deal? Teaching kit (draft) for Tasmanian high schools*. Report commissioned for the Department of Health and Human Services, Tasmania. Faculty of Education, University of Tasmania.
- Goodie, A. S. (2005). The role of perceived control and overconfidence in pathological gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 21*(4), 481-502.
- Govoni, R., Rupich, N., & Frisch, G. R. (1996). Gambling behavior of adolescent gamblers. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 12*(3), 305-317.
- Gupta, R., & Derevensky, J.L. (1996). The relationship between gambling and video-game playing behaviour in children and adolescents, *Journal of Gambling*

- Studies*, 12(4), 375–94.
- Gupta, R., & Derevensky, J. L. (1998). Adolescent gambling behaviour: A prevalence study and examination of the correlates associated with problem gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 14(4), 319-345.
- Herbert, B. (2009, August 21). Study links video games with gambling. Retrieved August 21, 2009 from <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2009/s2663222.htm>
- Ladouceur, R., Boudreault, N., Jacques, C., & Vitaro, F. (1999). Pathological gambling and related problems among adolescents. *Journal of Child & Adolescent Substance Abuse*, 8(4), 55-68.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2004). Gambling, depression, and suicidality in adolescents. In J. Derevensky & R. Gupta (Eds.). *Gambling problems in youth: Theoretical and applied perspectives*, pp. 41-56. New York: Kluwer Academic/ Plenum Publishers.
- Messerlian, C., Gillespie, M., & Derevensky, J. L. (2007). Beyond drugs and alcohol: Including gambling in a high-risk behavioural framework. *Paediatrics and Child Health*, 12(3), 199–204. Retrieved August 21, 2009 from <http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=2528700>
- Monaghan, S., & Blaszczynski, A. (2009). Consequences of winning: The role of gambling outcomes in the development of irrational beliefs. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 37, 49-59.
- Ólason, D. T., Sigurdardottir, K. J., & Smari, J. (2006). Prevalence estimates of gambling participation and problem gambling among 16-18-year-old students in Iceland: A comparison of the SOGS-RA and DSM-IV-MR-J. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 16(2/3), 113-114.
- Ólason, D. T., Skarphedinsson, G. A., Jonsdottir, J. E., Mikaelsson, M., & Gretarsson, S. J. (2006). Prevalence estimates of gambling and problem gambling among 13- to 15-year-old adolescents in Reykjavik: An examination of correlates of problem gambling and different accessibility to electronic gambling machines in Iceland. *Journal of Gambling Issues* 18, 39-55. Retrieved April 12, 2010 from <http://www.camh.net/egambling/Issue18/pdfs/olason.pdf>
- Relationships Australia (South Australia). (2004). *Young people and gambling: Final report* [unpublished].
- Shaffer, H. J., & Bethune, W. (2000). Introduction: Youth gambling. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 22(1), 23-39.

- Smith, W. G. (2008). *Does gender influence online survey participation? A record-linkage analysis of university faculty online survey response behavior*. Eric Document ED501717. Retrieved December 31, 2009, from http://www.eric.ed.gov:80/ERICWebPortal/custom/portlets/recordDetails/detailmini.jsp?_nfpb=true&_ERICExtSearch_SearchValue_0=ED501717&ERICExtSearch_SearchType_0=no&accno=ED501717
- South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. (2005). *Problem gambling and harm: Towards a national definition*. Report commissioned for the Ministerial Council on Gambling. Melbourne, VIC: Office of Gaming and Racing, Victorian Government Department of Justice.
- South Australian Centre for Economic Studies. (2008). *Social and economic impact study into gambling in Tasmania*. Report commissioned by Department of Treasury and Finance Tasmania. Adelaide, SA: Author.
- StataCorp (1996-2010). STATA Data analysis and statistical software. Retrieved April, 21, 2010 from <http://www.stata.com/>
- Tattersalls. (2009). Retrieved July 17, 2009, from <http://www.tattersalls.com.au>
- Verbeke, E. M., & Dittrick-Nathan, K. (2007). Gambling in Childhood and Adolescence: Information for School Personnel. *NASP Communiqué*, 35(7). Retrieved July 29, 2009, from <http://www.nasponline.org/publications/cq/cq357gambling.aspx>
- Vitaro, F., Arseneault, L., & Tremblay, R.E. (1999). Impulsivity predicts problem gambling in low SES adolescent males. *Addiction*, 94(4), 565-575.
- Vitaro, F., Brengden, M., Ladouceur, R., & Tremblay, R. E. (2001). Gambling, delinquency, and drug use during adolescence: Mutual influences and common risk factors. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 17(3), 171-190.
- Williams, R., Connolly, D., Wood, R., & Nowatzki, N. (2006). Gambling and problem gambling in a sample of university students. *Journal of Gambling Issues*, 16. Retrieved December 14, 2009, from <http://www.camh.net/egambling/issue16/index.html>
- Winters, K. C., Stichfield, R. D., & Kim, L. G. (1995). Monitoring adolescent gambling in Minnesota. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 11(2), 165-183.
- Wolfgang, A. K. (1988). Gambling as a function of gender and sensation seeking. *Journal of Gambling Behavior*, 4(2), 71-77.

Appendices

List of Appendices:

Appendix A: Demographic data

Appendix B1: Information Sheet (full version)

Appendix B2: Information Sheet (condensed version)

Appendix C: The Questionnaire

Appendix D: The Interview Schedule

Appendix A: Demographic data and Item 22

The young Tasmanians who participated in this study and their participation in “responsible gambling” activities at school/college

Please note: In some tables, percentages do not total 100 per cent. There are two possible reasons for this discrepancy: (1) some participants chose not to provide some of the demographic data and/or (2) those participants aged 13 or 18 may have been omitted from one or more tables.

List of Tables

Table 23: Age (in years) of participants (Item 2b)

Table 24: Gender of participants (Item 2a)

Table 25: Intention to complete Year 12 (Item 1d)

Table 26: Father studied at university (Item 3a)

Table 27: Mother studied at university (Item 3b)

Table 28: Identified as Aboriginal / TSI (Item 5)

Table 29: Location of participants’ homes – city, town or rural (Item 1b)

Table 30: Location of participants’ home – by region (Item 1b)

Table 31: Language other than English spoken at home (Item 6a)

Table 32: Have you taken part in any “responsible gambling” school or college activities this year? (Item 22)

Tables 23-32

Table 23: Age (in years) of participants (Item 2b)

	n	%
14	121	20.0
15	180	29.7
16	113	18.6
17	143	23.6

Table 24: Gender of participants (Item 2a)

	n	%
Female	312	51.5
Male	288	47.5

Table 25: Intention to complete Year 12 (Item 1d)

	n	%
Yes	408	67.3
No	181	29.9

Table 26: Father studied at university (Item 3a)

	n	%
Yes	145	23.9
No	434	71.6

Table 27: Mother studied at university (Item 3b)

	n	%
Yes	180	29.7
No	398	65.7

Table 28: Identified as Aboriginal /Torres Strait Islander (Item 5)

	n	%
Yes	57	9.4
No	535	88.3

Table 29: Location of participants' homes - city, town or rural (Item 1b)

	n	%
City	233	38.4
Town	263	43.4
Rural	91	15.0

Table 30: Location of participants' homes - by region (Item 1b)

	n	%
South	219	36.1
North/ North- East	162	26.7
North- West	207	34.2

Table 31: Language Other Than English spoken at home (Item 6a)

	n	%
Yes	50	8.3
No	552	91.1

Table 32: Have you taken part in any 'responsible gambling' school/college activities last year or this year? (Item 22)

	n	%
Yes	54	8.9
No	479	79.0

Appendices B1 & B2: The Information Sheets

B1. Full version

B2. Condensed version approved for use in approaching young people in public gatherings or similar, for example, college student's lounge or gig



INFORMATION SHEET (FOR YOUNG PERSON APPROACHED THROUGH SCHOOL)

Dear Young Person

We are asking you to be part of a project called Under 18s Gambling Study. The reason for doing this study is so that we are able to inform the Gambling Support Program, Department of Health and Human Services, Tasmania, about Tasmanian young people's (aged 14 to 17 years) knowledge of, attitudes to and experiences of gambling. We have been asked to find out what young people think about gambling. You do not have to have any experience of gambling to take part in this project.

We appreciate that any gambling behaviour by a person under the age of 18 is not allowed; however, we have been asked to find out about the gambling knowledge, attitudes and experiences of young people aged 14 to 17 years.

To assist you in reaching your decision, several sets of complete project information will be available for you to view at your school. These materials will also be available on-line at [website details to be provided] or you may wish to email christine.gardner@utas.edu.au or ask a parent or a staff member at your school to phone Christine on 6324 3792 to request a set to be sent to your home.

There are two parts to this research project. First, there is a survey that you may either complete at school, if your principal has given us approval to conduct surveys at school, or, on-line [website details to be finalised].

Second, if you agree to take part in an individual interview, for which we need to obtain

U
N
D
E
R
1
8
S
G
A
M
B
L
I
N
G
S
T
U
D
Y

the permission of your parents or guardians, we will ask you to answer some questions about what you think about gambling. At the interviews because we want to find out what young people think about gambling we will that you not to mention anything specific about personal or family matters. For example, we will explain that you can talk about "a family member" or "I know someone" or you can say "I have a friend" without describing who the person is or without using their name. If you take part in an interview, our priority is to maintain the anonymity and confidentiality of each participant in this study. Whatever you say will be kept confidential and will not be identifiable in the report or made known to anyone else.

We are also aware that there is a possibility that an interview participant may wish to seek support during or after participation in this study. A list of possible people or places from whom you may wish to seek support will be provided at each stage of the study (surveys and individual interviews).

There are two of us in this research team. Christine Gardner and John Williamson work at the University of Tasmania in Launceston. Christine will be the person who is in contact with students who take part in the project about Under 18s Gambling. Christine also will ask the questions at the interview. John Williamson is a Professor in Education.

John and Christine have written the questions to find out about what young people think about gambling. Christine and John will work together to write the report about what students think so they may give this feedback to the Department of Health. The Department of Health will not be given any student's name or details. Christine and John will not know the names of any young people who complete surveys. If you and your parents agree you may take part in an interview then Christine will know your name but she will keep your name on a list separate from the record of your interview. All students who provide information will give the Department of Health very useful information about what young people think of gambling.

If you agree to be interviewed please sign the Informed Consent form (attached to this letter) and tick (✓) what that you agree to do so. If you have any questions you would like answered before signing the form, please ask your parent/guardian or a teacher to assist you to contact Christine.

We will be very careful about what we do with anything you write or, if you do an interview, anything you say. On your survey, we will ask you for some information about yourself and your family; but this will not be the kind of information that will tell us who you are. You will not be asked to write any name or code on the survey.

When we are writing our report for the Health Department we will not use any names of people or schools. We won't know your names anyway if you complete the survey. We will not give any of your comments, written or spoken.

As we said at the beginning, you can choose to take part in this project; that is, to tell us what you think and know about gambling. If you say yes now and change your mind later, that's fine if we have not produced the report we have been asked to write. If you change your mind later about being in the project, then you can ask for answers you gave during the interview to be given back to you and not used in the report to the Health Department.

If you have any concerns or complaints about any aspect of the study, please talk with your parent/guardian or a teacher who can help you contact the Executive Officer of the Human Research Ethics Committee (Tasmania) Network from which ethical approval to conduct this study (reference # H9964) has been obtained:

Executive Officer: (Tel. 62 26 27 63).

We would like to repeat that if you have questions then please ask a parent/guardian or teacher to contact Christine.

The report we are writing is for the Department of Health. You will be able to ask Mr Ben Ross, Health Promotions Officer, Gambling Support Program, Department of Health and Human Services, [telephone contact details to be confirmed] for a copy to read or to talk about what is written in the report.


Thank you for taking the time to read this and for thinking about being part in the study.

Yours sincerely,

John Williamson.

Chief Investigator


 John.Williamson@utas.edu.au


 Locked Bag 1307,
University of Tasmania,
Launceston 7250

Christine Gardner

Chief Investigator

 Christine.Gardner@utas.edu.au

 Locked Bag 1307,
University of Tasmania,
Launceston 7250

 6324 3792

Locked Bag 1307 Launceston
Tasmania 7250 Australia
Facsimile (03) 6324 3048
www.utas.edu.au/educ



INFORMATION SHEET (FOR STUDENTS)

Dear Young Person

We are asking you to be part of a project called Knowledge, attitudes and experiences of 14 to 17 year old Tasmanians with respect to gambling and to complete a survey.

This survey is about what young Tasmanians 14 – 17 years old think about gambling. No matter how much or how little you think you know about gambling we will appreciate it if you would like to share your views.

The Tasmanian Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) want to find out what young people think so they can provide the right information to help you:

- (1) Know about the risks of gambling, and
- (2) Make informed choices.

The survey is anonymous and may take up to 15 minutes to complete. Your completion of the survey signifies your consent to participate in this study.

We will maintain the anonymity of each participant in this study. Whatever you say will be kept confidential and will not be identifiable in the report or made known to anyone else. We ask you not to mention anything personal or about your family or use anyone's name on your survey.

Dr Christine Gardner and Professor John Williamson from the School of Education, University of Tasmania are doing this work for the DHHS. For further information, contact:

✉ Christine.Gardner@utas.edu.au; ✉ Locked Bag 1307, Launceston, 7250; ☎ 6324

3792.

This project has been approved by the Tasmanian Social Sciences Human Research Ethics Committee (Ref: H9964). The committee may be reached either by telephoning 6226 7479 or by emailing human.ethics@utas.edu.au.

You may wish to refer to the phone numbers on the back of this sheet in case you have questions about gambling that you do not think about until after you have completed the survey.

We are looking for young people who may be interested in being interviewed. If you think you may like to do an interview, please ask for the interview information that you may take away and consider. You will need the permission of a parent or guardian to be interviewed.

Are you happy to proceed to the survey?

John Williamson.


Christine Gardner


Chief Investigator


Chief Investigator

 John.Williamson@utas.edu.au

 Christine.Gardner@utas.edu.au

 Locked Bag 1307, Launceston 7250

 Locked Bag 1307, Launceston 7250

 6324 3792

Project website: <http://www.educ.utas.edu.au/projectkaap/>

Appendix C: The Questionnaire

Appendix C: The Questionnaire

Tasmanian Study of Young People and Gambling (Ages 14-17)

INTRODUCTION TO THE SURVEY

Thank you for participating in this survey. In this study, we are interested in the views and experiences of a wide variety of young people from different cultural, social and family backgrounds. To make sure that we have been successful in selecting a wide range of people, we need to ask you a few questions about you and your family.

You do NOT need to gamble to participate in this survey.

Please accept our assurance that all this information will be kept strictly confidential and responses will not be identified by name. Once you have completed your survey, either submit on-line or place in an envelope and seal it for return to the researchers.

Please answer every question as truthfully and honestly as you can. Try to avoid comparing your answers with your friends, or those sitting close to you. Many of the responses only require a tick (✓). The survey will take 30 to 40 minutes to complete.

A. DEMOGRAPHICS - Items 1 to 6

Some questions about you

1a. Do you go to school or college?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
b. What is the postcode where you live?	
c. What year (grade) are you in?	8 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/> 10 <input type="checkbox"/> 11 <input type="checkbox"/> 12 <input type="checkbox"/>
d. At the present time are you intending to finish school at the end of Year 12/13?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
2a. Are you:	Female <input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/>
b. What is your age in years?	14 <input type="checkbox"/>	15 <input type="checkbox"/> 16 <input type="checkbox"/> 17 <input type="checkbox"/>
3a. Did your father study at university?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Did your mother study at university?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
4a. How many adults (people aged 18 or older) usually live with you at home?	1 <input type="checkbox"/>	2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more <input type="checkbox"/>
b. Do both your mother and father	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>

usually live with you?	
5. Do you identify yourself as Aboriginal or of Torres Strait Islander descent?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
6a. Is a language other than English spoken in your home?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
b. If Yes, what language is it?	
c. What is your mother's nationality, e.g., Australian, English, Chinese,.....?	
d. What is your father's nationality?	

B. GAMBLING Items 7 – 23

Some questions about your knowledge, attitudes and experiences with gambling

7a. How often have you gambled on any of the following during the last 12 months?

Please tick (✓) one response for each way of gambling.

	Never	1—2 times per year	From 3 times per year up to once per month	2—3 times per month	Weekly or more often
Card games, e.g., poker, blackjack for money					
Poker-machines					
Racing (horses, dogs)					
Sports (not including dog or horse-races)					
Tattslotto					
Keno					
Scratch tickets					
Bingo					
Internet gambling					
Mobile phone gambling					

Other (please state what)	
---------------------------	--

7b. If you have ever gambled using poker machines, how many times in the <u>last week</u> did you do this?	0 <input type="checkbox"/> 1 <input type="checkbox"/> 2 <input type="checkbox"/> 3 <input type="checkbox"/> 4 <input type="checkbox"/> 5 or more <input type="checkbox"/>
--	--

If you have never gambled go to Item 12.

8. For each of the activities (above) on which you gambled, please tick (✓) if you USUALLY used your OWN money to gamble? How much did you usually spend each time you gambled (in dollars)?

	Used your own money? <u>Please tick (✓)</u>	How many dollars did you usually spend each time?
Card games, e.g., poker, blackjack for money		
Poker-machines		
Racing (horses, dogs)		
Sports (not including dog or horse-races)		
Tattslotto		
Keno		
Scratch tickets		
Bingo		
Bet on a dare that someone else could do something		
Internet gambling		
Mobile phone gambling		
Other (please state what)		

--	--	--

9. Have you ever done any of the following? If so, how did you do it?

For each type of gambling, it is OK to tick more than one way (e.g., some people might play scratchies alone AND with friends, so they can tick [✓] both of these).

	Ways you gambled				
	By yourself (no-one noticed you go in)	By yourself using an ID card (fake)	With the help of other adults	With other friends?	Other (please give details)
Gambled at the Casino					
Gambled on TAB racing					
Played the lotteries or keno before you turned 16					
Played poker machines at a hotel or club					

10. At what age did you first gamble on any of the above activities (listed in Item 9)?

11. Did you have a big win when you first tried gambling? Yes No

12. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Tick (✓) one answer in each row.

	I strongly agree	I agree	I neither agree nor disagree	I disagree	I strongly disagree
Most of my friends gamble.					
Most of my friends approve of gambling.					
At least one person in my family gambles once a week or more.					
My family approves of gambling.					
I can't wait to turn 18 so I can go to adult gambling venues.					
When I turn 18, I will gamble a lot more than I do now.					
In the future, I would really like to gamble sometime.					

13a. How have the following influenced your attitude to gambling?

Tick (✓) one answer in each row.

	Strongly for	For	No influence	Against	Strongly against
Family					
Advertising on TV					
Friends					
Advertising – e.g., billboards, in the newsagent,...					
Teachers					
Toy gambling games					
Other? (please list)					

13b. If you think advertising has affected your attitude; can you name any of the ads that have influenced you?	
---	--

14 a. If you have obtained cigarettes, scratchies and/or alcohol how easy was it?

Tick (✓) one answer in each row.

	Very easy	Easy	I have not tried	Hard	Really hard
Cigarettes					
Scratchies					
Alcohol					

If you have not tried to obtain cigarettes, scratchies or alcohol please go to Item 15.

14 b If you have obtained cigarettes, scratchies and/or alcohol what kind of place was it easiest for you to get these?

Cigarettes	
Scratchies	
Alcohol	

15. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Tick (✓) one answer in each row.

	I strongly agree	I agree	I neither agree nor disagree	I disagree	I strongly disagree
Gambling is a risky activity.					
You can lose all your money gambling.					
Gambling is a waste of money.					
Gamblers usually lose in the long-run.					
To gamble is to throw away money.					
You can make a living from gambling.					

	I strongly agree	I agree	I neither agree nor disagree	I disagree	I strongly disagree
Gambling is a good way to get rich quickly.					
Gambling is a better way to make money than working.					
Gambling can give high returns.					
Gambling is fun.					
Gambling is a good way to impress friends.					
Gambling is a great way to hang out with friends.					

16. How much skill [rating out of 10] do you think is potentially involved in the activities listed below? (That is, do you think that knowledge, skill and practice can increase people's chance of winning?) Tick (✓) one answer in each row.

	No skill					Equal skill & chance					It's all skill
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Poker											
Blackjack											
Poker-machines											
Racing (horses, dogs)											
Sports (not including dog or horse-races)											
Lottery games (e.g., Keno, Lotto)											
Roulette											

17. The "House Edge" is the built-in advantage (profit) that the gambling venue has in every game. Percentages change from game to game.

Tick (✓) either 'true' or 'false' for each statement.

The House Edge doesn't matter if you are a lucky person.	True <input type="checkbox"/>	False <input type="checkbox"/>
The House Edge affects the gambler's wallet more during a few bets than over a lot of bets.	True <input type="checkbox"/>	False <input type="checkbox"/>
The House Edge equals the profit that the gambling venue takes when people gamble.	True <input type="checkbox"/>	False <input type="checkbox"/>

18. If two coins with tail (T) on one side and head (H) on the other are tossed, what is the chance of getting two tails? Tick (✓) one answer only

1 chance in 2 (or 50%)	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 chance in 3 (or 33%)	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 chance in 4 (or 25%)	<input type="checkbox"/>
1 chance in 5 (or 20%)	<input type="checkbox"/>

19. Imagine that two gamblers Bob and Sue are playing poker machines. If you look at the table below you can see how much they won each game. Who is most likely to get a big win on the next game?

Who will get a big win here?

Game	1 st	2 nd	3 rd	4 th	5 th	6 th	7 th	8 th	9 th	10 th	11 th	12 th	13 th	14 th	15 th	16 th	17 th	18 th	19 th
Bob	45	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	0	2	0	0	?
Sue	0	0	0	0	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	15	25	50	?

Tick (✓) one answer only

Bob is more likely to win next game	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sue is more likely to win next game	<input type="checkbox"/>
They have the same chance of winning the next game	<input type="checkbox"/>

20.a. Thinking about the last 12 months, please tick (✓) the extent to which these questions apply to your own gambling.

If you have NOT gambled in the last 12 months go to Item 21.

	Almost always	Most of the time	Some -times	Never	Don' t kno w
Have you bet more than you could really afford to lose?					
Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?					
When you gambled, did you go back another day to try and win back the money you lost?					
Have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble?					
Have you felt that you might have a problem with gambling?					
Has gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety?					
Have people criticised your betting or told you that you have a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true?					
Has your gambling caused you any financial problems for you or your family?					
Have you had arguments with your family or a friend about someone's gambling?					
Have you felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble?					
Have you lied to family members or others to hide your gambling?					
Have you bet or spent more money than you wanted to on gambling?					
Have you wanted to stop betting money or gambling, but didn't think you could?					
In the past year, have you spent your school lunch money or bus fares, on gambling activities?					

	Almost always	Most of the time	Some -times	Never	Don't know
Do you find you need to spend more and more money on gambling activities?					
Do you find you need to steal so that you have enough money either to spend on gambling activities or to pay gambling debts?					

20 b. Have you missed school to take part in gambling experiences?

Yes No

If Yes, how many times last week did you miss school?

0 1 2 3 or more

21 a. How often do you play video / computer or arcade games?

	Never	Once per week	2 – 6 times per week	Daily	If you play, how many hours do you usually play?
TV games (X-box, Game Cube, Play-station, and others)					
Phone games					
Hand-held games					
Games on computers					
Arcade games					
b. Which arcade games do you play and how often? List them below:					

	Never	Once per week	2 – 6 times per week	Daily	If you play, how many hours do you usually play?

b. If you play video / computer or arcade games daily, how many hours would you typically play?

hours

22. Have you personally taken part in any 'responsible gambling' school/college activities last year or this year? (E.g., What's the Real Deal, or any other class activity?)

Yes No

If Yes please name or describe the activities:

23. For each of the four (4) statements please tick (✓) to show whether you agree or disagree.

	Agree	Disagree
The chances of winning a substantial amount of money at the casino are quite high.		
I think I'll win a good prize in Tattslotto (over \$10,000) one day.		
One day I'm going to strike it lucky at gambling.		
Sometimes I think I might have the power to make my numbers come up in gambling games.		

Thank you very much for taking part in this study.

Once you have completed your survey, please place in an envelope and seal it for return to the researchers or submit on-line.

Appendix D: The Interview Schedule

Appendix D: The Interview Schedule

Knowledge, attitudes and experiences of 14 to 17 year old Tasmanians with respect to gambling

We want to find out what you think about gambling so we will ask you not to mention anything about friends or family (e.g., parents/step-parents/guardians, brothers, sisters, cousins, uncles, aunts) in ways that could be used to work out who you are talking about. Remember that you can talk about "a family member" or "I know someone" or you can say "I have a friend" without identifying who the person is or without using their name.

C. DEMOGRAPHICS - Items 1 to 6
Some questions about you

1	a. Do you go to school or college?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>			
	b. What is the postcode where you live?				
	c. What year (grade) are you in?	8 <input type="checkbox"/>	9 <input type="checkbox"/>	10 <input type="checkbox"/>	11 <input type="checkbox"/>	12 <input type="checkbox"/>
	d. At the present time are you intending to finish school at the end of Year 12/13?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>			

2	a. Are you:	Female <input type="checkbox"/>	Male <input type="checkbox"/>		
	b. What is your age in years?	14 <input type="checkbox"/>	15 <input type="checkbox"/>	16 <input type="checkbox"/>	17 <input type="checkbox"/>

Interview items

1. What types of gambling are you aware of?

2. Why do you think people gamble?
 3. How would you describe gambling that is OK?
 4. How would you describe gambling that is not OK?
 5. Why do you think some people can gamble safely while other people have gambling problems?
 6. Are you able to talk about a situation where someone under 18 has gambled? (Please do not identify the person). What kinds of problems do you think they've had? Who else have the problems affected? What do you know to be some of the effects? Do you know how old they were when they first gambled? Do you know how old they were when they had the first (maybe only) big win?
 7. What do you think influences your views of gambling?
 8. Do you have ideas about what influences other young people's views about gambling?
 9. What issues to do with gambling do you think young people (14-17) want to know about? Is 14 -17 the right age for this? Is school/college a good place to learn about gambling issues? What other suggestions do you have for helping young people to be more informed and to get information about gambling that will enable them to make informed decisions?
 10. Do you have any other comments you would like to make?
- + Do you have any questions about this interview?

Many thanks for your time and for sharing your views and perceptions.

Do you want to find out more about gambling or seek help for someone who may have a gambling problem?

You may wish to talk with a trusted adult, e.g., a parent or guardian or a teacher.

Here are some other people and places where you can go for information or help:

- Tasmanian Gambling Help Line – 1800 000 973

- Kids Help Line [1800 55 1800](tel:1800551800)
- [Reach out: www.reachout.com.au](http://www.reachout.com.au)- search for "gambling"
- Free and confidential Youth Health Services are located around Tasmania. You can ring or call in to talk to a youth health worker or nurse about any issue including gambling.

<p>In the North West Youth Health Team Parkside, Strahan St Burnie Ph 6440 7140 M 0409 361 014</p>	<p>In the South Pulse Youth Health Centre 2 Terry St Glenorchy Ph 62338900</p> <p>The Link Youth Health Centre 57 Liverpool St Hobart Ph 6231 2927</p>
<p>In the North headspace Northern Tasmania Corner of Brisbane and Wellington St Launceston Ph 6336 4480</p>	