NSW Gambling Survey 2024 Technical Report

Commissioned by the NSW Responsible Gambling Fund

NSW Gambling Survey 2024 Technical Report

Prepared by:
Steven Pukallus[1], Andrew Ross[1], Alex Simmons[1], Shannon Coughlin[1], Prof Matthew Browne[2], A/Prof Alex M T Russell[2], Georgia Dellosa[2], Prof Matthew Rockloff[2], Prof Nerilee Hing[2]

Name of institution:
[1] Ipsos Australia
[2] Experimental Gambling Research Laboratory, Central Queensland University

October 2024

Contents

List of Tables

Introduction

Background

This technical report accompanies the main report, NSW Gambling Survey 2024, which presents the findings from the NSW Gambling Survey 2024, commissioned by the NSW Responsible Gambling Fund.

Gambling prevalence surveys have been undertaken in NSW since 1996. The NSW Government undertakes prevalence studies to assess and monitor changing trends in participation, emerging technologies and the extent of different levels of problem gambling, as well as the demographic and geographic profile of gamblers. Recent prevalence surveys were conducted in 2019 (10,012 participants, Browne et al., 2019), 2011 (10,000 participants, Sproston et al., 2012) and 2006 (5,029 participants, AC Nielsen, 2007). The NSW Gambling Survey 2024 includes a sample of 10,000 participants and aims to provide a current snapshot of gambling participation, related behaviours and impacts from gambling, as well as some insights on how participation, behaviour and gambling harm has changed since 2019.

In 2024, the survey added validated measures of gambling harm experienced by people from their own gambling (the Gambling Harms Scale [GHS-10]), as well as gambling harm experienced by people other than the person who is gambling (the Gambling Harms Scale for Affected Others [GHS-10-AO]), to measure the negative impacts of gambling in the community. One motivation for this expanded focus is a growing recognition that gambling harm is conceptually distinct from problem or pathological gambling (Browne et al., 2017). A second motivating factor is to provide for a population-level understanding of impact. Gambling harm instruments employed in the present survey (Browne et al., 2023) are grounded in Health-Related Quality of Life (HRQoL) and provide for an assessment of aggregate impact to different segments of the population, which goes beyond categorising and estimating the percentage of individuals who qualify as 'problem gamblers'.

Research objectives

The purpose of this study was to collect data on gambling participation and gambling related harm in NSW, building and maintaining comparability with previous prevalence surveys where possible.

Specifically, the objectives were:
- to measure participation in gambling activities in the NSW population, and to compare levels of participation with previous NSW gambling surveys
- to measure the prevalence of different levels of problem gambling using the Problem Gambling Severity Index

- to measure the amount of gambling harm in NSW, including to affected others, reporting on both specific harm indicators as well as global impact to health-related quality of life
- to determine the degree to which different gambling forms are associated with gambling harm and problems, and which socio-demographic risk factors are associated with problems and harm, including to affected others
- to examine the socio-demographic characteristics associated with gambling and different levels of problem gambling risk severity, overall and for each activity
- to examine the gambling behaviours, including frequency and expenditure, and beliefs of gamblers across the continuum from non-problem gambling to different levels of problem gambling
- to assess help-seeking behaviour among different levels of problem gamblers
- to assess attitudes towards gambling, and beliefs about gambling, among gamblers and non-gamblers

This report

The purpose of this methodological report is to explain in detail the approach taken for sample design, questionnaire design, data collection procedures, data cleaning and data processing calculations (including weighting and margins of error).

The project was carried out in compliance with ISO 20252 and membership requirements for Australian Data and Insights Association (ADIA) and The Research Society (TRS).

Sample design

IPND sample frame

The target population for the NSW Gambling Survey 2024 was residents of NSW aged 18 years or over.

The Computer Assisted Telephone Interview (CATI) survey was conducted using a single sampling frame approach, using the Integrated Public Number Database (IPND). Ipsos submitted their application to the Australian Communications and Media Authority (the ACMA) to access the IPND for use in this project on 7 November 2023. Access was authorised by the ACMA on 20 December 2023.

The IPND is a centralised database that contains the record of each telephone number issued by Carriage Service Providers to their customers in Australia. It therefore contains a record of most Australian phone numbers and owner details. The main advantage of using it as a sample frame is the availability of postcode information, which enables the sample to be restricted to defined geographic areas (in this case the state of NSW), without the need for extensive (and expensive) screening. The latter would have been the case if random digit dial (RDD) mobile sample was used, where no geographic details would be available or ascertainable from the mobile number prefix.

The IPND has listed and unlisted phone numbers. A listed number is one a person has agreed can be shown in phone number directories and related services. An unlisted (or 'silent') number is one a person does not want to make available. Telephone providers must give their customers a choice of a listed or unlisted number.

Researchers can apply to use unlisted mobile phone numbers and related postcodes from the IPND. This must be research that is not commercial and relates to:

- Public health
- Federal, state and local government electoral matters
- Commonwealth government public policy.

Ipsos recommended the exclusion of listed numbers for the NSW Gambling Survey 2024 based on the significant quality issues associated with the listed mobile IPND numbers. The listed mobile IPND numbers that can be provided are deficient in that they do not include silent numbers or numbers on the Do Not Call (DNC) Register. In addition to this, listed numbers are not regularly updated, meaning that they contain a significant proportion of disconnected and invalid numbers. Furthermore, it is worth noting that owners of listed mobile numbers need to opt in to have a listed number (unlike landline where people are automatically listed and need to opt out to be unlisted). This means that owners of listed mobile numbers tend to be people who

want their number to be included in lists and directories for marketing, business purposes. It would be expected that many of these owners would also have unlisted numbers and are thus still represented in the IPND sample being extracted.

It is not possible to obtain a representative sample by combining listed and unlisted numbers. This is because Telstra maintains these lists on two separate databases and will only provide a fixed sample from these databases (e.g. X thousand listed numbers and Y thousand unlisted numbers). Telstra is unable to provide accurate counts of the listed and unlisted numbers for NSW, which means it is not possible to draw a sample with the same selection probabilities in an approach when fixed sample sizes (not sample fractions) need to be specified. A possible solution to this requires requesting that the same sampling fraction be applied to both databases when being drawn by Telstra (e.g. a 1 in X sample from both databases) but such a request was previously rejected for another project.

Following authorisation from the ACMA, the sample comprising n=400,000 randomly selected unlisted mobile numbers with related postcode was provided to Ipsos by the IPND Manager at Telstra on 29 February 2024. Ipsos provided the specifications (agreed with the project team at Central Queensland University) to Telstra on the selection of the numbers.

Two categories of Unlisted mobile phone numbers were requested from Telstra:

- Unlisted Residential mobile phone numbers; and
- Unlisted Not Captured mobile phone numbers.

Business, Charity and Government were not requested.

Telstra took a random sample of the required size (n=400,000) by combining the Unlisted Residential mobile phone numbers and the Unlisted Not captured mobile phone numbers deemed to be in-scope (NSW) based on their postcode. From this combined group the random sample was obtained by firstly randomly sorting the mobile phone numbers in that group then taking the first n=400,000 records as the sample.

Stratification of the sample

Ipsos recommended that the NSW IPND sample was not stratified by geography, but rather the achieved sample was allowed to fall-out randomly. The rationale for this was as follows:

- Firstly, it is not possible to stratify the sample by Greater Sydney Capital City Statistical Area (GCCSA)/rest of NSW since there is not an accurate measure of each record's geographic location (due to postcode inaccuracy). The sample could have been stratified by this variable if an accurate measure of location existed.
- Secondly, the selected sample (by Telstra) is expected to be exactly proportional to the population of Sydney GCCSA/rest of NSW (or for any regional disaggregation). This is because the sampling is random. Differential response rates across Sydney GCCSA/rest of NSW will, however, lead to a disproportional sample, with the expected higher response rates leading to an over-sampling of the rest of NSW and under-sampling of Sydney GCCSA. The resulting disproportional sample is fully accounted for by the weighting. This does result, however, in a small reduction in the effective sample size through increased variabilities in the weights.

Respondent selection and sample size

The mobile phone user contacted was selected if that person was a NSW resident and aged 18 years or over, otherwise, they were screened out. No other demographic or geographic quota was imposed on the sample.

A total sample of 10,000 randomly selected NSW residents aged 18 years or over completed the survey between 7 March 2024 and 27 May 2024, as follows (Table 1):

TABLE 1 SAMPLE BREAKDOWN ACHIEVED

Location	Total completes (n)	Total completes (%)	In-scope ERP share^
Sydney GCCSA	6,591	65.9%	65.6%
Rest of NSW	3,409	34.1%	34.4%
Total	**10,000**	**100%**	**100%**

^*Estimated Resident Population (ERP) share of Greater Sydney and the Rest of NSW*

As can be seen from the above table, the random share of completes by part of state location reflects closely the in-scope Estimated Resident Population (ERP) share of Greater Sydney and the rest of NSW as used in weighting the data.

Sub-sampling

Sub-sampling was used for the 2024 survey (as was also the case in 2019). Two versions of the questionnaire were programmed - a long and short version; and respondents were allocated to one of the two based on their gambling status and Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) (Ferris & Wynne, 2001) score.

Respondents were classified as regular gamblers, non-regular gamblers, or non-gamblers, depending on their responses to detailed questions on a list of gambling activities (as provided in the main report, Q6). Regular gamblers were those who participated at least once a week in any type of gambling other than lottery products or scratch tickets. Non-regular gamblers were those who participated in any type of gambling but were not classified as regular gamblers. Non-gamblers were respondents who had not participated in any gambling activities in the last 12 months.

The PGSI score was also taken into consideration (see the NSW Gambling Survey, 2024 report for details on PGSI results).

All regular gamblers and non-regular gamblers with PGSI scores greater than zero were routed through to the long version of the questionnaire, along with one in two randomly selected non-regular gamblers with PGSI scores of zero, and one in four randomly selected non-gamblers. Respondents selected for the longer version of the questionnaire are referred to as the sub-sample.

Table 2 summarises the sampling strategy and the resultant sample size for the sub-sampling for the different groups.

TABLE 2 OVERALL SUB-SAMPLING BY GAMBLER STATUS (BASED ON UNWEIGHTED COUNTS)

Sub-sampled	Overall (n=10,000)	Regular Gambler (n=551)	Non-Regular Gambler (n=4,819)		Non-Gambler (n=4,630)
			PGSI > 0	PGSI = 0	
Sub-sampled	45%	100%	100%	50%	25%
Not sub-sampled	55%	-	-	50%	75%

Base: All respondents (n=10,000)

Questionnaire design

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed by Central Queensland University (CQU) in consultation with the NSW Government steering committee members. To allow for comparability with previous prevalence surveys, the questions asked were kept the same where possible. The content of the 2024 survey - in terms of changes from the 2019 questionnaire - are described briefly below. The final 2024 questionnaire is provided in the main report.

- Details about the IPND being the sample source were included.
- Additional postcode screening questions to capture cross-border areas.
- The list of gambling activities was modified with 'lotteries or keno via services such as Lottoland or Planet Lottery' being replaced with 'bought overseas lottery tickets via online services'.
- Modifying the question about 'knowing someone who has experienced problems with their gambling' to 'having a close relationship with someone who has gambled'. A close relationship being defined as often a family member, where you know each other well, care about each other and depend on each other.
- A list of gambling harms to self (GHS-10) and others (GHS-10-AO) being included.
- Addition of a question about the negative effects of gambling (with impacts being felt from gambling that happened more than 12 months ago).
- Reframing question about awareness of Gambling Help to GambleAware.
- Asking the main sample to think about their own life and personal circumstances, and to rate how satisfied they are with their life as a whole, on a scale from zero to 10 (where zero means they feel no satisfaction at all and 10 means they feel completely satisfied).
- Asking Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin and main language spoken in the household of the main sample (previously these questions were asked of the sub-sample).
- Changing gender from an interviewer-recorded question to one that was asked.

Ethics considerations and approval

Ethics approval for the study was obtained from the Central Queensland University Human Research Ethics Committee (Application Reference #24616). Specific approaches used to manage respondent sensitivities included:

1. Being mindful when speaking with respondents, as issues associated with problem gambling can often be traumatic, not only for gamblers themselves but also for their friends and family members.

2. Immediate termination of the survey if respondents became distressed allowing the respondent to stop participating in the survey.
3. Availability of support service numbers (i.e. GambleAware Helpline, Lifeline, NSW's Domestic Violence Line and 1800RESPECT). These were included on the introduction page and throughout the survey as pop-up menus. This was a CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewer) administered survey and interviewers were able to access support numbers at any point during the interview.
4. All respondents being asked at the initial introduction whether it was a safe time for them to take the call on their mobile phone.
5. Asking respondents if they wanted to go somewhere private to talk before commencing the survey.

Harm to interviewers was minimised through a personal briefing that clearly explained the content of the survey before assigning work, and through using specially selected, experienced interviewers. Ipsos also put in place a 'buddy' system where interviewers had a contact (a supervisor or another interviewer) who they were encouraged to talk to if they were finding the interviews distressing. They were also encouraged to take breaks after difficult interviews before proceeding to the next.

The final draft questionnaire, CATI programming and operational procedures were tested prior to the main fieldwork through a pilot survey (n=598) between 7 – 26 March 2024. A detailed debrief with interviewers was conducted at the completion of the pilot and feedback was provided on the questionnaire length, content and sequential order. The pilot feedback is provided in Appendix A. Note that the pilot survey involved a relatively high number of participants in order to check every possible survey path, including low prevalence paths.

All interviewing was conducted from Ipsos's dedicated CATI facility in Melbourne. After the pilot, the questionnaire and operational procedures were finalised. The main fieldwork was launched on 27 March 2024. All interviewers were closely monitored on their first shifts and a strong floor presence was maintained. The fieldwork period was from 7 March to 27 May 2024.

The required sample size was n=10,000, and this this target was met. The eligible respondent was a NSW resident aged 18 years or over who answered the mobile phone and agreed to be interviewed.

Data collection

Field team briefing

Ipsos implemented a comprehensive briefing and training program for all interviewers and supervisors who worked on the project. The team of interviewers selected were briefed by the Ipsos project team prior to the commencement of the fieldwork, and the briefing covered the following:

1. Project background, objectives and procedures;
2. All aspects of administering the survey questionnaire, including specific data quality issues;
3. Overview of respondent liaison issues, including refusal avoidance techniques; and
4. Special procedures for calling mobile phone numbers such as ensuring safety and offering to call back.

A total of 89 interviewers were briefed on the survey.

Following the briefing, the selected interviewers conducted a full practice 'dummy' interview using the CATI terminal to ensure that they were comfortable with the interview before commencing fieldwork. Supervisors closely monitored each interviewer. Interviewers who appeared to require additional instruction on any point were further briefed individually where necessary.

Call times and call back procedures

The fieldwork calling times were 2:30pm to 8:30pm Monday to Friday, and 11:00am to 5:00pm on weekends. Appointments were made for any time within the hours of operation of the call centre.

The CATI call-back protocols were as follows:
1. From the frame, calls were made to new or 'virgin' numbers. If no contact was made for a particular number the CATI telephone management system (using a customised algorithm) re-allocated that number for the next day at a different time. This meant interviewers were able to work on both 'virgin' sample as well as call-backs and non-contacts.
2. A maximum of five call attempts were made to 'no answers', 'answering machines' and 'busy' numbers. Additional calls were made if call backs or appointments were scheduled through the life of the record.
3. All appointments for call-backs were presented to the interviewer who made the appointment, at least one minute before the appointment time. If the interviewer who made the original appointment was not available, it was presented to the next available interviewer.
4. Engaged numbers were rescheduled to be recalled in 30 minutes. If still engaged the number was again rescheduled in another 30 minutes.

5. Numbers that were not answered were rescheduled to be called back in eight hours' time and then on another day.

Once fieldwork was finished, all phone numbers that were used for the survey were coded to one of the following final call outcome categories shown in Table 3:

TABLE 3 CALL OUTCOMES

Call outcomes	Description
Voicemail	Contact not made at all – voicemail on all required contact attempts made
Business	Out of scope - business phone number
Complete	Interview completed
Final language/not available	Contact made, call-back arranged with respondent but language/availability issues on final call
Final non-contact	Contact made, call-back arranged with respondent but non-contact on final call
Invalid/disconnected	Invalid or disconnected phone number
Language/not available	Contact made – no interview (language barrier, not available during fieldwork period, other)
Non-contact	Contact not made at all – no answer on all required contact attempts made
Not NSW/Under 18	Contact made – mobile sample not in New South Wales and/or aged 17 or younger
Refusal	Contact made – refusal

Interviews other than English

Non-English interviewing was available in 7 languages (Arabic, Cantonese, Greek, Hindi, Mandarin, Spanish, and Vietnamese). The questionnaire was translated by the interviewer conducting the Language other than English (LOTE) interviewing.
Once the preferred language of a sample member was identified, these records were stockpiled until a reasonable workload for a bi-lingual interviewer was available.
A total of 80 interviews were conducted in a language other than English (45 Mandarin, 17 Arabic, 10 Spanish, 3 Cantonese, 3 Greek, 1 Hindi, 1 Vietnamese).

Results and data processing

Response Rates and Cooperation Rates

The response rates and cooperation rates were calculated based on the internationally recognised American Association for Population Opinion Research (AAPOR) standards. The cooperation rate for the IPND frame was 84.4%. The response rate for the IPND frame was 7.9% (Table 5).

TABLE 4 RESPONSE CATEGORIES, CALL OUTCOMES, RESPONSE RATE AND COOPERATION RATE FOR THE IPND FRAME

Call outcomes (IPND sample)	Count	% of total
A. Contact Not Made - Eligibility Unknown	**102,261**	**46.02%**
Non-contact	33615	15.13%
Voicemail	67294	30.28%
Final non-contact	3	0.00%
Invalid/disconnected	1349	0.61%
B. Contact not made - Not eligible	**56,680**	**25.51%**
Non-contact	227	0.10%
Not NSW/Under 18	9542	4.29%
Invalid/disconnected	46911	21.11%
C. Contact made - Eligibility Unknown	**47,876**	**21.54%**
Non-contact	3809	1.71%
Voicemail	9115	4.10%
Final non-contact	5	0.00%
Final language/not available	519	0.23%
Invalid/disconnected	125	0.06%
Refusal	34303	15.44%
D. Contact made - Not eligible	**3,558**	**1.60%**
Business - out of scope	929	0.42%
Not NSW/Under 18	2629	1.18%
E. Contact made - Eligible (non-complete)	**1,852**	**0.83%**
Non-contact	191	0.09%
Voicemail	135	0.06%
Final non-contact	1507	0.68%
Final language/not available	1	0.00%
Invalid/disconnected	12	0.01%
Refusal	6	0.00%
F. Contact made - Eligible (completed interview)	**10,000**	**4.50%**
Complete	10,000	4.50%
Grand Total	**222,227**	**100.00%**

TABLE 5 CALCULATIONS FOR COOPERATION RATE AND RESPONSE RATE

Calculation	Outcome
Eligible sample contacted (K=E+F)	11,852
Cooperation rate (F/K)	**84.4%**
Eligibility rate (G=(E+F)/(D+E+F))	76.9%
Estimated eligible of contacts/non-contacts with unknown eligibility (H=(G x (A+C)))	150,137
Estimated total eligible (J=(H+E+F))	127,324
Response rate (F/J)	**7.9%**

The low response rates observed in this survey are consistent with a global decline in response rates from telephone surveys. A 2017 AAPOR task force on this very topic[1] reported that:

> "The survey that the Task Force conducted of recent cell phone RDD and landline RDD response rate trends for survey organizations in the United States suggests that DFRDD surveys are continuing to see response rate declines. Landline rates declined from an average of 15.7 percent in 2008 to an average of 9.3 percent in 2015 (a relative decline of 41 percent), and cell phone response rates declined at the same rate, from an average of 11.7 percent to an average of 7.0 percent (a relative decline of 40 percent).

Sample profile

The sample profile tables in this section show the proportion of respondents who completed the survey (based on unweighted and weighted counts), by age, sex, location: NSW districts, identification as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, and language spoken at home.

TABLE 6 GENDER

Gender	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Male or man	52.2%	48.7%
Female or woman	46.9%	50.5%
Other	0.4%	0.3%
Refused or don't know	0.5%	0.5%

Base: Respondents (n=10,000)

---

[1] (Lavrakas et al., 2017)

TABLE 7 AGE GROUP

Age group	Unweighted %	Weighted %
18 to 24 years	14.4%	11.3%
25 to 34 years	19.1%	18.4%
35 to 44 years	16.7%	17.8%
45 to 54 years	15.3%	15.5%
55 to 64 years	13.5%	14.4%
65 or over	21.0%	22.6%

Base: Respondents (n=10,000)

TABLE 8 LOCATION: NSW DISTRICTS

NSW district	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Metropolitan NSW districts		
Central Coast	4.9%	5.1%
Illawarra Shoalhaven	6.7%	6.9%
Nepean Blue Mountains	6.2%	6.2%
Northern Sydney	12.7%	13.0%
South Eastern Sydney	12.7%	12.7%
South Western Sydney	10.2%	9.8%
Sydney	9.8%	9.7%
Western Sydney	9.0%	8.7%
Rural and regional NSW districts		
Far West	0.3%	0.3%
Hunter New England	12.2%	12.2%
Mid North Coast	1.0%	1.0%
Murrumbidgee	4.2%	4.3%
Northern NSW	3.1%	3.1%
Southern NSW	1.2%	1.2%
Western NSW	2.1%	2.1%
Unknown[2]	3.7%	3.7%

Base: Respondents (n=10,000)

---

[2] Postcode and suburb were not provided. Only part of state was provided.

TABLE 9 ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER

Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander status	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Aboriginal	3.2%	3.1%
Torres Strait Islander	0.2%	0.2%
Both	0.1%	0.1%
Neither	95.6%	95.7%
Refused or don't know	*0.9%*	*0.9%*

Base: Respondents (n=10,000)

TABLE 10 ENGLISH THE MAIN LANGUAGE SPOKEN AT HOME

Main language spoken at home	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Yes - English	84.1%	85.1%
No	15.6%	14.6%
Refused or don't know	*0.3%*	*0.3%*

Base: Respondents (n=10,000)

TABLE 11 MAIN LANGUAGE OTHER THAN ENGLISH

Main language other than English	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Mandarin	16.5%	16.5%
Arabic	5.4%	5.3%
Hindi	7.2%	7.4%
Cantonese	4.0%	3.7%
Spanish	4.7%	4.9%
Chinese	3.0%	2.8%
Greek	1.0%	1.2%
Vietnamese	4.4%	4.4%
German	0.4%	0.3%
Italian	1.4%	1.5%
Korean	1.2%	1.2%
Macedonian	0.3%	0.4%
Tagalog	4.0%	4.1%
French	1.3%	1.4%
Polish	0.5%	0.5%
Portuguese	2.5%	2.8%
Serbian	0.4%	0.4%
Turkish	0.5%	0.5%
Croatian	0.4%	0.3%
Russian	1.0%	1.0%
Indonesian	1.2%	1.2%
Dutch	0.5%	0.5%
Other	36.5%	36.2%
Refused or Don't know	*1.5%*	*1.7%*

What is the main language spoken in your household? Base: Asked of those who spoke a language other than English (n=1,560)

Respondents selected for the longer version of the questionnaire were referred to as the sub-sample. marital status, household composition, work status, education and personal income were only completed by sub-sampled respondents.

TABLE 12 MARITAL STATUS

Marital status	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Married or living with partner	54.3%	56.9%
Single	32.9%	29.5%
Separated or divorced	7.3%	7.3%
Widowed	3.9%	4.6%
Refused or Don't know	*1.6%*	*1.7%*

What is your current marital status? Base: Asked of sub-sampled (n=4,374)

TABLE 13 HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION

household composition	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Couple with children	36.0%	36.5%
Couple with no children	22.7%	23.9%
Single person	17.0%	17.3%
Group household	13.4%	11.9%
One parent family with children	7.8%	7.4%
Other	1.6%	1.5%
Refused or Don't know	*1.4%*	*1.6%*

Which of the following best describes your household? Base: Asked of sub-sampled (n=4,374)

TABLE 14 WORK STATUS

Work status	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Working full-time	49.9%	47.1%
Working part-time	15.6%	16.2%
Home duties	2.0%	2.5%
Full-time student	5.4%	5.1%
Retired	13.4%	14.9%
Pensioner	7.2%	7.6%
Unemployed	4.1%	4.3%
Other	1.4%	1.3%
Refused or Don't know	*0.9%*	*0.9%*

Which of the following best describes your current work status? Base: Asked of sub-sampled (n=4,374)

TABLE 15 EDUCATION

Education	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Post graduate qualifications	16.1%	19.0%
A university or college degree	28.7%	30.8%
A trade, technical certificate or diploma	24.6%	23.1%
Completed senior high school (Year 12)	16.1%	14.0%
Completed junior high school (Year 10)	9.5%	8.2%
Completed primary school	1.8%	1.7%
Did not complete primary school	0.0%	0.1%
No schooling	0.1%	0.1%
Other	1.9%	1.6%
Refused or Don't know	*1.2%*	*1.3%*

What is the highest education qualification you have received? Base: Asked of sub-sampled (n=4,374)

TABLE 16 PERSONAL INCOME

Income	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Nil or negative income	2.0%	2.0%
Less than $30,000	11.8%	11.8%
$30,000 - $49,999	9.9%	9.7%
$50,000 - $69,999	11.0%	10.5%
$70,000 - $99,999	14.3%	13.9%
$100,000 - $149,999	14.7%	14.2%
More than $150,000	13.9%	13.0%
Refused	14.3%	16.1%
Refused or Don't know	*8.0%*	*8.7%*

Could you please tell me your personal annual income from all sources before tax – including any government payments? Base: Asked of sub-sampled (n=4,374)

Data cleaning

During data processing, some recoding of the data was undertaken.

1. For 3 surveys, Gambler Status was recoded from 3 (non-gamblers) to 1 (regular gamblers or PGSI >1) given form endorsement at Q6 and PGSI = 1+

TABLE 17 RECODING TO REGULAR GAMBLERS

ID	Gambler status	Recoded
25875	3	1
6859	3	1
43314	3	1

2. For 17 surveys, Gambler Status was recoded from 3 (non-gamblers) to 2 (non-regular gamblers) given form endorsement at Q6 and PGSI =0

TABLE 18 RECODING

ID	Gambler status	Recoded
3093	3	2
531	3	2
766	3	2
585	3	2
425	3	2
3566	3	2
6514	3	2
22268	3	2
43786	3	2
40365	3	2
17895	3	2
45440	3	2
41938	3	2
43804	3	2
43844	3	2
29730	3	2
48542	3	2
47644	3	2
53026	3	2

3. There was no change to all other variables including any other source/ recoded survey input or sub-sampling status.

Imputation

As part of the agreed approach to weighting between Ipsos and CQU, key variables were identified for use in the creation of the survey weights. For the weights to work correctly, it was important to first check that all key variables had values that could be used in the weighting scheme. The variables of interest are listed below:

- **Age** - As an 11-category grouping (derived from S1 or collected at S2)
- **Sex** - As 2 categories, derived from S3 using gender as proxy for binary sex, with hot deck imputation of all other responses[3]
- **Location** - As 2 categories, derived from S4, S5, or collected at S6
- **Total Mobile Phones** - As continuous, collected at D18
- **Total Business / Other Mobile Phones** - As continuous, collected at D18a

Weighting requires data for each variable included in the weighting calculations. In small numbers of cases, there were missing data (e.g., when participants refused or said "don't know"). In these instances, imputation was employed.

Hot Deck imputation is a method of handling missing data by replacing each missing value with an observed response from a similar unit within the same data set used for analysis. This method is often used in surveys and social science research. The respondent providing the data is called the donor, and the respondent with the missing value is called the recipient. The Hot Deck imputation was conducted to create a binary sex variable and on the missing mobile phone data using the VIM (6.2.2) package in R.

Weighting

The survey data were weighted to the NSW population to provide estimates of the NSW adult population rather than a description of the acquired sample.

Sections A and B, the first two sections of the questionnaire, were asked of all respondents. Additionally, the weighting questions in Section G (S3, D1/D2, D3/D4, D11, and D18/D18a) were asked of all respondents. Sections C, D, E, F were asked only of the sub-sampled respondents. The non-weighting questions in section G (marital status, household structure, work status, industry, education and income) were only asked of sub-sampled respondent. While Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander origin and speaking a language other than English (LOTE) were not weighting questions, they were asked of the full sample. The final questionnaire can be referred to in the main report**.**

---

[3] Importantly, people who identified as a gender other than men and women, or who refused or did not know, were allocated to men and women categories purely for weighting purposes. This is because they could not be included in any analysis without a weight, and no weights can be calculated for other responses. For all gender analyses in this report, these respondents are treated as an "other" gender group (combining responses across small cells), or are not included in gender analysis if they refused or did not know.

All variables based on responses to questions in sections A and B, which were asked of the full sample, are called "main variables". All other variables, based on responses to questions from sections C, D, E, F that were asked only of the sub-sample, are called "sub-sampled variables".

The use of sub-sampling required the use of two weights: one weight for all records that were used to weight the main data and a subsample weight to weight the sub-sampled variables (obtained from the sub-sampled respondents).

The use of sub-sampling meant that two sets of weights were required. All records have a main weight. Records for sub-sampled respondents also have a second weight. Records that were not sub-sampled have no sub-sampled data and have no sub-sample weight.

Sub-sampling rules

The decision on whether or not a respondent was to be sub-sampled was made at the end of Section B. The rules for sub-sampling were based on two classifications that were determined in section B: (1) Gambler status and (2) PGSI.

For the Gambler status, depending on earlier responses, respondents were classified as either:

1. Non-gamblers
2. Non-regular gamblers
3. Regular gamblers

The PGSI of non-regular gamblers and regular gamblers was also determined at this point. Based on these two classifications respondents were randomly selected for sub-sampling using the rules shown in Table 19.

TABLE 19 SUB-SAMPLING RULES

Gambler status	PGSI	Group	Sampled proportion
Non-gambler	0	Group 1: Non-gambler	25%
Non-regular gambler	0	Group 2: Non-regular gambler **AND** PGSI = 0	50%
Non-regular gambler	1+	Group 3: Regular gambler **OR** PGSI SCORE > 0	100% (no subsampling)
Regular gambler	0	Group 3: Regular gambler **OR** PGSI SCORE > 0	100% (no subsampling)
Regular gambler	1+	Group 3: Regular gambler **OR** PGSI SCORE > 0	100% (no subsampling)

Full and Short questionnaire

The sub-sampling design described above can be considered to be equivalent to having a full questionnaire and a short questionnaire, with the short questionnaire being administered to the full sample and the full questionnaire being administered to the sub-samples. The table below shows the variables on the two questionnaires (Table 20).

TABLE 20 VARIABLES ON FULL AND SHORT QUESTIONNAIRE

Questionnaire sections	RMOE (Core data)	RMOE (Sub-sampled data)
A, B, G (*Non-sampled*)	Short questionnaire	Full questionnaire
C, D, E, F, G (*Sampled*)		Full questionnaire

Table 21 below shows the probability of selection for the full questionnaire for the three groups.

TABLE 21 PROBABILITY OF SELECTION FOR FULL QUESTIONNAIRE

Variables from sections	Group 1 (Non-gambler)	Group 2 (Non-regular gambler <u>AND</u> PGSI = 0)	Group 3 (Regular gambler <u>OR</u> PGSI > 0)
Probability of selection for full questionnaire	25%	50%	100%

Weight calculations

The full sample provides responses to the short questionnaire but only the subsamples provide responses to the full questionnaire. The differential selection probabilities of the three groups for the full questionnaire will require the calculation of full questionnaire weights that take into account the varying selection probabilities of the sub-sampled groups. Before considering the full questionnaire weights it is necessary to calculate the short questionnaire weights based on the full sample.

Short questionnaire weight calculations
Step 1: Calculate the initial short questionnaire weights (for the full sample)

1. For each record in the full sample, i, calculate the number of non-business mobile phones, $NBMP_i$, as the D18 value (total mobile phones) less the D18a value (business mobile phones).

2. Calculate the capped non-business mobile phone $NBMP\_capped_i$ as the as the minimum of 2 and the $NBMP_i$, that is $NBMP\_capped_i = Min(NBMP_i, 2)$

3. Calculate the initial short questionnaire weight, $SQWt(1)_i$, as the inverse of $NBMP\_capped_i$, that is $SQWt(1)_i = 1/NBMP\_capped_i$

Note the initial weight is un-scaled (and hence will not sum to the population size) but this issue will be cancelled out at the next stage.

Step 2: Calculate the final short questionnaire weights.

The final short questionnaire weights are calculated by a process of calibration, calibrating the initial short questionnaire weights so that the sum of short questionnaire final weights, across the full sample, for each weighting cell level equals the population value for that cell.

1. Set up weighting cells classified by Age (using the questionnaire classifications) x Sex x Region (Sydney GCCSA/Rest of NSW).

2. Determine the sample size, across the full sample, for each weighting cell.

3. For cells with sample sizes less than 5 collapse across age within Sex and Region, collapsing across adjacent age groups.

4. For each cell, h, calculate the weighted estimated total, $X(1)_h$ by aggregating across the full sample, the initial weights of all records in cell h.

5. For each cell, h, calculate a calibration factor C_h as the ratio of the population value for that cell (N_h) divided by $X(1)h$, that is $C_h = N_h/X(1)_h$

6. For each record, i, in the full sample the final short questionnaire weight $SQWt_i$ is then calculated as the initial short questionnaire weight $SQWt(1)_i$ multiplied by the calibration factor C_h for the cell to which that record belongs.

Important note: At the completion of the calculation of short questionnaire weights, every sample record will have a short questionnaire weight. These short questionnaire weights are independent of whether or not each record was selected for the full questionnaire.

Calculating the Full questionnaire weights

Full questionnaire weights need to be calculated separately for groups 1, 2, and 3 to reflect their different probabilities of selection for completing the full questionnaire.

Calculating the full questionnaire weights for group 1

1. Using the short questionnaire weights <u>and the full sample</u>, calculate the weighted estimates of Group 1 (Non-gamblers) classified by Age x Sex x Region, using the same classifications as used for the weighting cells. These values are the Non-gambler population values and are used to determine the full questionnaire weights for Group 1. For each cell h, label these weighted aggregates as $G1_h$.

2. Using the short questionnaire weights, <u>and just the sub-sampled group 1 sample</u>, aggregate the short questionnaire weights to the Age x Sex x Region level, using the same classifications as used for the weighting cells. For each cell h, label these weighted aggregates G1h'.

3. For each cell h, determine a group 1 sub-sampling calibration factor as C1h = G1h/ G1h'

4. For each record in group 1 in cell h, the full questionnaire weight is calculated as the short questionnaire weight multiplied by the $C1_h$ calibration factor applying to cell h. Given the 25% sampling fraction applied to this group the full questionnaire weights for group 1 should be approximately 4 times the size of the short questionnaire weights.

Calculating the full questionnaire weights for group 2

The full questionnaire weights for group 2 are calculated, using the group 2 sample, using the same approach as was used for the full questionnaire weights for group 1, as set out below.

1. Using the short questionnaire weights <u>and the full sample</u>, calculate the weighted estimates of Group 2 classified by Age x Sex x Region, using the same classifications as used for the weighting cells. These values are the Group 2 population values will be used to determine the full questionnaire weights for Group 2. For each cell h, label these weighted aggregates as G2h.

2. Using the short questionnaire weights, and <u>just the sub-sampled group 2 sample</u>, aggregate the short questionnaire weights to the Age x Sex x Region level, using the same classifications as used for the weighting cells. For each cell h, label these weighted aggregates are G2h'.

3. For each cell h, determine a group 2 sub-sampling calibration factor as C2h = G2h/ G2h'

4. For each record in group 2 in cell h, the full questionnaire weight is calculated as the short questionnaire weight multiplied by the $C2_h$ calibration factor applying to cell h. Given the 50% sampling fraction applied to this group the full questionnaire weights for group 2 should be approximately 2 times the size of the short questionnaire weights.

Calculating the full questionnaire weights for group 3

Given the 100% sampling fraction applied to the group 3 sample, the full questionnaire weights for the records in group 3 be equal to their short questionnaire weights.

Important note: At the completion of the calculation of full questionnaire weights <u>every sub-sampled record</u> has a full questionnaire weight, but records which were not sub-sampled will have no full questionnaire weights. These full questionnaire weights will be approximately four times the short questionnaire weights for group 1 sub-sampled records, two times the short questionnaire weights for group 2 sub-sampled records, and equal to the short questionnaire weights for group 3.

In calculating the main weights, it was necessary to account for the differential non-response rates by age, gender and part-of state (Greater Sydney/Rest of NSW).

This process ensured that the weighted estimates provided were consistent with the ABS Estimated Resident Population (ERP) data for New South Wales, classified by age, gender and part-of-state (Greater Sydney, Rest of NSW). In calculating the sub-sample weights, adjustments were also made for the disproportionate sub-sampling of regular gamblers, non-regular gamblers and non-gamblers.

Normalising weights

Once the weights were successfully applied and validated as final, a secondary version of them was created to normalise the values (centering them around 1) for use in analysis when being used in survey analysis tools . The normalisation of weights involved dividing every case into the mean of the weight, making it relative +/- to the mean value of the original weight.

Margin of error of totals

The survey results are based on a sample of the population and are therefore subject to sampling error. Sampling error is measured by the standard error (SE) and the margin of error (MOE). Knowledge of the SE, and hence the MOE, enables the 95% confidence intervals to be constructed around survey results and also enables statistical significance testing to be carried out.

The 95% confidence interval for a (weighted) survey result is calculated as the survey result plus or minus 1.96 x the SE. For example, if a weighted survey result of 100,000 had a SE of 10,000 then the 95% confidence interval is 100,000 +/- 1.96 x10,000 = 100,000 +/- 19,600 = (80,400 – 119,6000).

The value of 1.96 x the SE is called the MOE. It can be seen from the previous paragraph that knowledge of the MOE is sufficient to calculate the 95% confidence intervals. For this reason, the sampling error values are presented as MOE values not SE values. SE values can be calculated by dividing the MOE values by 1.96.

Another way of summarising the sampling error is to calculate the relative margin of error (RMOE) which is the MOE divided by the weighted survey result, expressed as a percentage.

The MOE and the RMOE of survey results are summarised in Tables 22 and 23. These tables set out the RMOE and MOE for a range of possible weighted estimates in the range 15,000 to 6,000,000

The following example demonstrates the use of these tables. Consider a weighted survey result of 200,000. Table 21 below shows that the MOE for this result is

24,600. This means the 95% confidence interval for the survey result is 200,000 +/-
24,600 = (175,400 – 224,600).

TABLE 22 MOE OF ESTIMATES OF TOTAL

Weighted survey estimate	MOE (Core data)	MOE (Sub-sampled data)
15,000	6,700	11,500
25,000	8,700	14,800
50,000	12,300	21,000
100,000	17,400	29,600
150,000	21,300	36,300
200,000	24,600	41,900
250,000	27,500	46,900
300,000	30,100	51,300
400,000	34,700	59,300
500,000	38,800	66,300
750,000	47,500	81,200
1,000,000	54,900	93,700
1,500,000	67,200	114,800
2,000,000	77,600	132,500
2,500,000	86,800	148,200
3,000,000	95,100	162,300
3,500,000	102,700	175,300
4,000,000	109,800	187,400
4,500,000	116,500	198,800
5,000,000	122,800	209,600
5,500,000	128,800	219,800
6,000,000	134,500	229,600

TABLE 23 RMOE OF ESTIMATES OF TOTAL

Weighted survey estimate	RMOE (Core data)	RMOE (Sub-sampled data)
15,000	44.8%	76.5%
25,000	34.7%	59.3%
50,000	24.6%	41.9%
100,000	17.4%	29.6%
150,000	14.2%	24.2%
200,000	12.3%	21.0%
250,000	11.0%	18.7%
300,000	10.0%	17.1%
400,000	8.7%	14.8%
500,000	7.8%	13.3%
750,000	6.3%	10.8%
1,000,000	5.5%	9.4%
1,500,000	4.5%	7.7%
2,000,000	3.9%	6.6%
2,500,000	3.5%	5.9%
3,000,000	3.2%	5.4%
3,500,000	2.9%	5.0%
4,000,000	2.7%	4.7%
4,500,000	2.6%	4.4%
5,000,000	2.5%	4.2%
5,500,000	2.3%	4.0%
6,000,000	2.2%	3.8%

Margin of error of proportions

The above MOE tables enable the MOE to be calculated for weighted estimates of total (e.g. 200,000 people have participated in a particular form of gambling) for both the core data and the sub-sampled data. These tables may also be used to calculate MOE values for estimates of proportions (e.g. 18% of people have participated in a particular form of gambling). To calculate the MOE of survey proportions the steps needed to be taken are shown by means of an (imaginary) example.

Consider an example in which an estimated that, from the main data, 10% of people in a particular category have participated in a particular form of gambling:

1. Step 1 – determine the numerator and denominator values which give rise to the estimate of proportion. For example, if there are an estimated 250,000 people in the category of interest and of those 25,000 (10%) have participated in the particular form of gambling.

2. Use Table 23 above to determine the relative MOEs (RMOEs) of the numerator and denominator totals. From Table 23 it can be seen that the RMOE of the numerator (25,000) is 34.7% and for the denominator (250,000) is 11.0%

3. The relative MOE of the proportion (10%) is then calculated by squaring the two relative RMOE values ($34.7\%^2$= 0.120586187 and $11.0\%^2$ =0.0102058619) and subtracting the squared value for the denominator from the squared value of the numerator to get 0.108527568 (0.120586187- 0.0102058619).

4. Finally, the RMOE of the proportion is the square root of this final figure obtained (0.108527568) which is 0.329435226 or 32.9%. This figure is the RMOE of the estimate of 10%. The MOE of the estimate of 10% is then 32.9% x 10% = 3.2% (since the MOE is the RMOE divided by the estimate).

5. From the above we can then conclude that the 95% confidence interval for the estimate of 10% is 10% +/- 3.2% = (6.8% -13.2%).

References

AC Nielsen. (2007). *Prevalence of gambling and problem gambling in NSW - A community survey 2006*. NSW Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing.

Browne, M., Goodwin, B. C., & Rockloff, M. J. (2017). Validation of the Short Gambling Harm Screen (SGHS): A Tool for Assessment of Harms from Gambling. *J. Gambl. Stud.* https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-017-9698-y

Browne, M., Newall, P., Rawat, V., Tulloch, C., Rockoff, M., Li, E., Hing, N., Russell, A. M. T., & Begg, S. (2023). *The Gambling Harms Scales: Instruments to assess impact to gamblers and affected others that are benchmarked to health utility*. Victorian Responsible Gambling Foundation. https://responsiblegambling.vic.gov.au/resources/publications/the-gambling-harms-scales-instruments-to-assess-impact-to-gamblers-and-affected-others-that-are-benchmarked-to-health-utility-1206/

Browne, M., Rockloff, M., Hing, N., Russell, A., Murray Boyle, C., Rawat, V., Tran, K., Brook, K., & Sproston, K. (2019). *NSW Gambling Survey 2019*. NSW Responsible Gambling Fund.

Ferris, J. A., & Wynne, H. J. (2001). *The Canadian Problem Gambling Index: Final Report*. Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse.

Lavrakas, P. J., Benson, G., Blumberg, S., Buskirk, T., Cervantes, I. F., Christian, L., Dutwin, D., Fahimi, M., Fienberg, H., Guterbock, T., Keeter, S., Kelly, J., Kennedy, C., Peytchev, A., Piekarski, L., & Shuttles, C. (2017). *The future of U.S. general population telephone survey research*. AAPOR Task Force.

Sproston, K., Hing, N., & Palankay, C. (2012). *Prevalence of Gambling and Problem Gambling in New South Wales*. NSW Office of Liquor, Gaming and Racing. https://www.responsiblegambling.nsw.gov.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0018/138123/Prevalence-of-gambling-and-problem-gambling-in-NSW.pdf

Appendix A: Pilot debrief notes

Project Name	NSW Gambling Prevalence Survey	Project No	23-081796-01
Client	Central Queensland University	Consultants	Steven Pukallus
Field Start	07/03/2024	Field End	27/05/2024

Feedback on the introduction

- It is difficult navigating the introduction without mentioning the topic of discussion
- The introduction is a bit wordy and could be more concise
- Gender is assumed by interviewer instead of what gender the respondent actively identifies as
- Ok to interview on hands free?

Section A – Gambling participation/products

- Some respondents questioned the relevancy if they had only taken part in a scratchie once recently and were asked extensive questions about gambling
- Q9: should bonus bets count as non-monetary?

Section B – Gambling status

- Minor gambling activities led to larger questions that may be irrelevant e.g. sub-sampled people buying one lotto ticket in the last 12 months were being asked if they have a problem with gambling/felt depressed etc

Section C – Potential issues due to gambling

Q12,14a, 21 – modes of betting

- Update code "Online" to "Online *including apps*"

Section D – Gambling behaviours

Q72. What time of the day do you normally gamble?

- Add a "Varies" option

Section E – Formal self-exclusion + Gambling help

- Some respondents questioned the relevancy if they had only taken part in a scratchie once recently and were asked extensive questions about gambling

Section F – Attitudes towards gambling

Q117 - list of gambling issues

- List of issues that may stem from gambling doesn't read out nicely, some interviewers had to adlib to avoid being interrupted by respondents. E.g. respondents would say they had no issues before hearing the list, so interviewers would say 'just so you know, I have a list to read out later'.

Section G – Demographics

- Gender question should be asked here instead of in Intro

Appendix B: Don't know and refused responses per question

Tables 24 and 25 show who was asked each question in the full sample and subsample, the valid number of responses, missing data, and the number of refused and don't know responses for each. Note that missing data refers to people who were not asked the question, for example because it did not apply to them. Table 24 shows these figures for the short version of the survey, completed by the full sample, while Table 25 shows figures for the long version of the survey, completed by the subsample.

TABLE 24 NUMBER OF VALID RESPONSES, MISSING, REFUSED AND DON'T KNOW BY QUESTION – FULL SAMPLE, SHORT VERSION OF SURVEY

Variable	Q	Who is asked	Valid	Missing	Refused	Don't know
Screeners						
Age	S1	All	10,000	0	0	0
Gender	S3	All	10,000	0	39	11
Location	S4	All	10,000	0	0	0
A - Gambling participation						
Gambling engagement (15 forms)	Q6	All	10,000	0	0	0
Freq of "other" forms	Q8	If said "other" in Q6	121	9,879	0	0
Virtual credits	Q9	All	10,000	0	2	15
Frequency - Pokies	Q10	If pokies in Q6	1,499	8,501	2	9
Frequency - Race betting	Q11	If racing in Q6	1,007	8,993	3	4
Venue or online - Race betting	Q12	If racing in Q6	1,007	8,993	2	1
Frequency **online** - Race betting	Q13	If Q12 includes online	668	9,332	2	1
Frequency - Lottery	Q14	If lotteries in Q6	4,024	5,976	5	19
Venue or online - Lottery	Q14a	If lotteries in Q6	4,024	5,976	2	7
Frequency **online** - Lottery or keno e.g., Lottoland	Q15	If lotteries or keno in Q6	147	9,853	3	8
Frequency - Scratchies	Q16	If scratchies in Q6	1,083	8,917	2	10
Frequency - Keno	Q17	If keno in Q6	771	9,229	0	9
Venue or online - Keno	Q17a	If keno in Q6	771	9,229	1	6

Frequency - Bingo	Q18	If bingo or housie in Q6	179	9,821	0	1
Frequency - Casino table game at venue	Q19	If casino table games in Q6	472	9,528	1	2
Frequency - Sports betting	Q20	If sports in Q6	825	9,175	2	8
Venue or online - Sports betting	Q21	If sports in Q6	825	9,175	2	7
Frequency **online** - Sports betting	Q22	If Q21 includes online	733	9,267	0	11
Frequency - Esports betting	Q23	If esports in Q6	78	9,922	0	3
Venue or online - Esports betting	Q24	If esports in Q6	78	9,922	2	5
Frequency - Fantasy sports	Q25	If fantasy sports for money in Q6	36	9,964	2	5
Frequency - Novelty event betting	Q26	If non-sporting event in Q6	96	9,904	0	2
Frequency **online**- Casino table games or poker machine games	Q27	If casino games online in Q6	89	9,911	2	4
Frequency - Poker **online**	Q28	If poker online in Q6	44	9,956	0	2
Frequency - Informal betting	Q29	If played private games in Q6	444	9,556	2	18
Frequency - Non-monetary gambling	Q30	If yes in Q9	116	9,884	1	6
Gambling any point in life	Q30a	Non-gamblers, gamblers auto-coded to yes	10,000	0	2	17
Gambling - age first	Q30b	If yes in Q30a, or if gambled in the last 12 months	7,737	2,263	14	266
B - PGSI						
9 PGSI items	Q31-39	Any gambling in Q6 or yes in Q9	~5,359	~4,641	1 to 5	0 to 6
G - Demographics and wellbeing						
Wellbeing	D0	All	9,873	127	0	0
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander status	D1	All	9,908	92	63	29
Main language	D3	All	9,969	31	28	3
Number of active mobiles (weighting)	D18	All	9,886	114	101	13

Note: Approximate numbers are shown for lines that capture multiple items, like PGSI.

TABLE 25 NUMBER OF VALID RESPONSES, MISSING, REFUSED AND DON'T KNOW BY QUESTION – SUBSAMPLE, LONG VERSION OF SURVEY

Variable	Q	Who is asked	Valid	Missing	Refused	Don't know
Screeners						
Age	S1	All	4,374	0	0	0
Gender	S3	All	4,374	0	22	4
Location	S4	All	4,374	0	0	0
A - Gambling participation						
Gambling engagement (15 forms)	Q6	All	4,374	0	0	0
Freq of "other" forms	Q8	If said "other" in Q6	4,374	0	0	0
Virtual credits	Q9	All	4,374	0	0	7
Frequency - Pokies	Q10	If pokies in Q6	1,165	3,269	1	9
Frequency - Race betting	Q11	If racing in Q6	744	3,630	3	3
Venue or online - Race betting	Q12	If racing in Q6	744	3,630	2	1
Frequency **online** - Race betting	Q13	If Q12 includes online	530	3,844	0	6
Frequency - Lottery	Q14	If lotteries in Q6	2,429	1,945	0	14
Venue or online - Lottery	Q14a	If lotteries in Q6	2,429	1,945	0	4
Frequency **online** - Lottery or keno e.g., Lottoland	Q15	If lotteries or keno in Q6	105	4,269	1	7
Frequency - Scratchies	Q16	If scratchies in Q6	718	3,656	2	7
Frequency - Keno	Q17	If keno in Q6	576	3,798	0	8
Venue or online - Keno	Q17a	If keno in Q6	576	3,798	1	6
Frequency - Bingo	Q18	If bingo or housie in Q6	139	4,235	0	1
Frequency - Casino table game at venue	Q19	If casino table games in Q6	359	4,015	1	1
Frequency - Sports betting	Q20	If sports in Q6	646	3,728	1	5
Venue or online - Sports betting	Q21	If sports in Q6	646	3,728	1	6
Frequency **online** - Sports betting	Q22	If Q21 includes online	570	3,804	0	8
Frequency - Esports betting	Q23	If esports in Q6	62	4,312	0	2

Venue or online - Esports betting	Q24	If esports in Q6	62	4,312	2	3
Frequency - Fantasy sports	Q25	If fantasy sports for money in Q6	28	4,346	1	3
Frequency - Novelty event betting	Q26	If non-sporting event in Q6	70	4,304	0	0
Frequency **online**- Casino table games or poker machine games	Q27	If casino games online in Q6	81	4,293	2	2
Frequency - Poker **online**	Q28	If poker online in Q6	38	4,336	0	2
Frequency - Informal betting	Q29	If played private games in Q6	330	4,044	1	16
Frequency - Non-monetary gambling	Q30	If yes in Q9	97	4,277	0	5
Gambling any point in life	Q30a	Non-gamblers, gamblers auto-coded to yes	4,374	0	1	7
Gambling - age first	Q30b	If yes in Q30a, or if gambled in the last 12 months	3,802	572	7	120
B - PGSI						
9 PGSI items	Q31-39	Any gambling in Q6 or yes in Q9	~3,310	~1,064	0 to 3	0 to 6
C - Gambling details						
Pokies - Features	Q40	Subsamples 2 and 3, if pokies in Q6	1,105	3,269	4	156
Pokies - Venue	Q41	Subsamples 2 and 3, if pokies in Q6	1,093	3,269	3	9
Pokies - Amount of time in venue	Q42	Subsamples 2 and 3, if pokies in Q6 and if Q41 = a venue	1,093	3,281	1	20
Pokies - Loyalty scheme	Q43	Subsamples 2 and 3, if pokies in Q6 and if Q41 = a venue	1,096	3,269	0	9
Race betting - Restricted by operator	Q46	Subsamples 2 and 3, if racing in Q6	743	3,631	0	1
Race betting - Restricted by operator, why	Q47	Subsamples 2 and 3, if racing in Q6, if yes in Q46	29	4,345	0	0
Race betting - Restricted by operator, how	Q47a	Subsamples 2 and 3, if racing in Q6, if yes in Q46	29	4,345	0	0
Keno - Amount of time in venue	Q49	Subsamples 2 and 3, if keno at venue in Q6	576	3,798	2	23
Casino games - Amount of time in venue	Q50	Subsamples 2 and 3, if casino table games in Q6	359	4,015	0	9
Casino games - Loyalty scheme	Q51	Subsamples 2 and 3, if casino table games in Q6	354	4,020	0	5

Sports betting - Restricted by operator	Q52	Subsamples 2 and 3, if sports in Q6, and if not already asked Q46	645	3,729	0	2
Sports betting - Restricted by operator, why	Q53	Subsamples 2 and 3, if sports in Q6, if yes in Q52	15	4,359	1	0
Sports betting - Restricted by operator, how	Q53a	Subsamples 2 and 3, if sports in Q6, if yes in Q52	15	4,359	0	0
Fantasy sports - Daily or season long	Q58	Subsamples 2 and 3, if fantasy sports in Q6	28	4,346	2	0
Fantasy sports - How often for money	Q59	Subsamples 2 and 3, if fantasy sports in Q6	28	4,346	2	1
Online casinos/pokies - Amount of time spent playing	Q62	Subsamples 2 and 3, if online casino in Q6	81	4,293	1	8
Online poker - Amount of time spent playing	Q63	Subsamples 2 and 3, if online poker in Q6	38	4,336	3	2
D - Gambling Behaviour						
Gamble - which form most money	Q68	Subsamples 2 and 3. Autofill if only one form.	3,300	1,074	1	22
Gamble - Money spent last month	Q70	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	26	79
Gamble - where, near home or work	Q71	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	12	45
Gamble - time of day	Q72	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	31	197
Gamble - drinking while gambling, last 12 months	Q77	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	5	7
E - Gambling regulation						
Self-exclusion - venues - attempted	Q80	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	0	12
Self-exclusion - venues - how many venues	Q81	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q80	64	4,314	0	4
Self-exclusion - venues - attempt re-entry	Q82	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q80	64	4,310	0	1
Self-exclusion - venues - succeed with re-entry	Q83	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q80 and Q82	18	4,356	0	0
Self-exclusion - venues - go to other venues	Q84	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q80	64	4,310	0	1
Self-exclusion - online – attempted with BetStop	Q85	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	1	9
Self-exclusion - online – attempted with others	Q85a	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	1	9
Self-exclusion - online - how many providers	Q86	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q85a	55	4,319	0	3
Self-exclusion - online - attempt re-entry	Q87	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q85 or Q85a	47	4,327	0	0
Self-exclusion - online - succeed with re-entry	Q88	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q85 and Q87	8	4,366	0	0
Help-seeking - Any help	Q90	Subsamples 2 and 3	1,381	2,993	0	1

Help-seeking - What kind of help	Q91	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q90	72	4,302	0	0
Help-seeking - Professional help - how did you find service	Q94	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to Q90, if professional to Q91	26	4,348	0	0
Help-seeking - Why didn't seek help	Q96	Subsamples 2 and 3, if **no** to Q90	1,308	3,066	10	8
F - Attitudes, problems, help						
Attitudes - Individual responsibility	Q100	All subsamples	4,374	0	9	32
Attitudes - Gambling good vs harm to community	Q101	All subsamples, half given Q101, half Q102	2,190	2,184	4	16
Attitudes - Gambling harm vs good to community	Q102	All subsamples, half given Q101, half Q102	2,178	2,196	4	24
Problems (CSOs) - Know of someone	Q105	All subsamples	4,374	6	0	14
GHS-10-AO	Q105a	If Q105 is yes	1,544	2,830	0	13
Problems (self) - Lifetime	Q110	All subsamples	4,374	6	1	0
GHS-10	Q117a	Subsamples 2 and 3	3,300	1,074	4 to 5	2 to 8
Extended harms (19 items)	Q117	Subsamples 2 and 3, if yes to any Q117a	714	3,660	2 to 3	2 to 4
Legacy harms	Q117b	All subsamples	4,374	6	2	22
Help awareness of help services	Q118	All subsamples	4,374	6	0	32
G - Demographics and wellbeing						
Wellbeing	D0	All subsamples	4,374	53	27	26
ATSI	D1	All subsamples	4,374	0	29	8
Main language	D3	All subsamples	4,374	0	16	1
Marital status	D5	All subsamples	4,374	6	44	25
Number of adults in household	D6	All subsamples	4,374	6	48	15
Household type (e.g., couple with children)	D7	All subsamples	4,374	67	47	14
Number of children in household	D8	All subsamples, if any option with kids from D7	4,374	2,372	7	0
Work status	D9	All subsamples	4,374	6	36	3
Which industry	D11	All subsamples, if working in D9	4,374	1,545	20	6

Education	D13	All subsamples	4,374	6	37	17
Income (personal, pre tax, annual)	D14	All subsamples	4,374	6	828	729
Number of active mobiles (weighting)	D18	All subsamples	4,374	62	54	8

Note: Approximate numbers are shown for lines that capture multiple items, like PGSI.