November 2018

Young People & Gambling 2018

A research study among 11-16 year olds on behalf of the Gambling Commission

Young People Omnibus 2018, Technical Report

GAMBLING
COMMISSION

Contents

Technical Details

1 Technical Details

Ipsos MORI, on behalf of the Gambling Commission, conducted research among 11-16 year olds to identify the prevalence of gambling, and to explore gambling behaviour and attitudes among young people.

The study included research into gambling behaviours, such as where young people gamble and with whom, perceptions of gambling and awareness of gambling advertising. The survey also asked a series of questions relating to potential issues associated with gambling and utilised the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screen to define typologies of gamblers[1].

The findings are based on data from a representative sample of 2,865 11-16 year olds in Great Britain, comprising 2,679 11-16 year olds attending academies[2] and maintained[3] schools in England and Wales and 186 young people attending maintained schools in Scotland. The research was conducted in schools, with pupils filling out either paper self-completion questionnaires under supervision by Ipsos MORI's interviewers or online self-completion surveys in class.

1.1   Objectives

The overall aim of this research study was to explore gambling behaviours and attitudes. The survey covered the following key issues:

- Young people's rates of gambling on different types of games;

- Behaviour patterns of young people in relation to gambling, for example where and when they gamble and who they are with at the time;

- Perceptions and awareness of gambling advertisements;

- Attitudes and awareness of risky behaviour; and,

- Gauging problem gambling among young people, in order to draw comparisons with earlier studies.

1.2   Research design

1.2.1   Sampling

The Young People's Omnibus (YPO) aims to represent pupils in curriculum years 7 to 11 (S1 to S5 Scotland) attending academies and maintained secondary and middle schools in England, Wales and Scotland.

A three-stage sampling method was used:

i.   In England and Wales, a sample of schools was selected from DfE's 'Get Information About Schools' database (a comprehensive listing of secondary schools in England and Wales). Special schools and sixth form colleges were

---

[1] A revised version of the adult DSM-IV screening instrument as developed by Dr S. Fisher, 2000.

[2] Academies (including free schools) are public funded, independent schools, held accountable through a legally binding 'funding agreement'.

[3] Maintained schools are overseen, or 'maintained' by the Local Authority.

excluded from the sampling frame. The frame was stratified by Government Office Region (GOR) and, within each stratum, schools were selected proportional to the number of pupils attending the school. In total 491 schools were selected to participate in the survey. In Scotland, a sample of 35 schools was selected from the Scottish Government's school contacts database. The sample was stratified by LA, deprivation and school size.

ii.   One or two curriculum year groups (Year 7-Year 11[4]) were selected at random for each school. Interviewers were instructed to select only mixed ability class groups for interview.

iii.   All members of a randomly-selected class group within the nominated curriculum year(s) were selected to fill out the self-completion survey.

1.2.2   Response rate

Introductory letters were sent to all selected schools, providing them with information regarding the survey background and methodology.

Of the 491 schools approached in England and Wales, 80 schools participated, giving an unadjusted school response rate of 16%. Overall, fully completed questionnaires were obtained from 2,679 pupils aged 11-16 years across 111 class groups; an average of 24 pupils per class.

In Scotland, from a sample of 35 schools, 6 agreed to participate, giving an unadjusted response rate of 17%. In total, 191 pupils from 9 classes participated in Scotland. Five respondents were excluded from the data as they were outside of the eligible age range (11-16 years old), giving a total sample of 186 pupils, an average of 21 pupils per class.

1.2.3   Fieldwork

Fieldwork for the study was conducted from 5th February to 2nd July 2018.

The survey was administered in one of two ways:

1.   **Self-completion paper questionnaires** with the whole class in one class period. An Ipsos MORI interviewer was present to explain the survey to pupils, reassure them about the confidentiality of the survey, assist them in completing the questionnaire, and to collect completed questionnaires. Interviewers attempted to secure interviews from all pupils in selected classes. If more than four pupils were absent on the day of interview, interviewers returned to the class to conduct 'mop up' sessions at a later date.

2.   **Online survey** with the whole class in one class period. Ipsos MORI recruiters provided a contact in schools with a unique link for their school, a short introductory presentation to use at the start of the session, and a short survey for the contact to provide details about the class group completing the survey.

The self-completion paper questionnaire and the online questionnaire were identical, apart from a small number of questions which were only asked of those pupils completing the online survey. These questions related to in-game items, awareness of charitable/ advisory bodies and attitudes to gambling.

---

[4] Years S1 to S5 in Scotland.

In total of 818 pupils completed the survey on paper, and 2047 completed the online survey.

1.2.4 Weighting

Data are weighted by gender, age and region. The sample of respondents answering via each mode were weighted to the national population profile initially, and as a second stage of weighting the aggregate sample weighted to the population. This means that the data for each mode, as well as the aggregate sample, can be analysed separately and compared.

The weights were derived from data supplied by the Department for Education, StatsWales and Scottish Government's school contacts database. The effect of weighting is shown in the sample profile.

1.3 Presentation and interpretation of data

When interpreting the findings, it is important to remember that results are based on a sample of the maintained school population, and not the entire population. Consequently, results are subject to sampling tolerances, and not all differences between sub-groups are statistically significant. A guide to statistical significance is included in section 1.5 of this technical report.

In tables and charts, where percentages do not add up to 100%, this is due to multiple answers, to computer rounding, or to the exclusion of 'Don't know' or 'No response' categories. Throughout the tables an asterisk (*) denotes a value greater than zero, but less than 0.5%.

1.4 Sample profile

Table 1 outlines the details of the sample profile for the 2018 study; covering all 11-16 year olds who participated in the Young People Omnibus. This is the second year in which Ipsos MORI approached schools in Scotland as part of the study. *Table 2* compares the sample profile for the current project with the previous five studies (2017, 2016, 2015, 2014 and 2013).

Table 1: Sample profile 2018

Sample profile - 2018		Number	Unweighted (%)	Weighted (%)
Total[5]		2,865	100	100
Gender of Pupils				
Male		1,328	47	50
Female		1,512	53	49
Age of Pupils				
11		168	6	5
12		709	25	22
13		779	27	22
14		720	25	20
15		422	15	20
16		67	2	11
Year of Pupils[6]				
7		687	24	21
8		716	25	21
9		783	27	20
10		574	20	19
11		105	4	19
Ethnic Origin				
White		2,109	74	77
BME		734	26	23
Region				
London		547	19	13
South East		248	9	16
South West		215	8	6
North		454	16	16
East of England		387	14	10
East Midlands		205	7	8
West Midlands		199	7	11
Yorkshire & Humberside		141	5	9
Scotland		186	6	7
Wales		283	10	4

---

[5] Where responses do not sum to 100% this is due to rounding or some children selecting 'not stated'

[6] For Scotland year groups S1 = Year 7, S2 = Year 8, S3 = Year 9, S4 = Year 10 and S5 = Year 11

Table 2: Sample profile 2013-2018

Sample profile – 2013-2018	2013 Weighted %	2014 Weighted %	2015 Weighted %	2016 Weighted %	2017 Weighted %	2018 Weighted %
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100
Gender of Pupils						
Male	50	50	50	51	50	50
Female	49	49	49	49	49	49
Age of Pupils[7]						
11	9	8	9	10	7	5
12	20	19	19	20	21	22
13	20	20	19	20	20	22
14	20	21	21	19	21	20
15	19	20	21	21	18	20
16	12	11	11	10	13	11
Year of Pupils						
7	19	19	19	20	21	21
8	20	20	20	20	21	21
9	20	20	20	20	20	20
10	21	20	20	20	20	19
11	20	21	21	20	19	19
Region						
London	13	14	14	14	14	13
South East	15	15	15	15	14	16
South West	9	9	9	9	9	6
North East	5	5	5	5	4	-
North West	13	12	12	12	12	-
North	-	-	-	-	-	16
East of England	11	11	11	11	10	10
East Midlands	8	9	9	8	8	8
West Midlands	10	11	11	11	10	11
Yorkshire & Humberside	10	10	10	10	9	9
Wales	7	6	6	5	4	4
Scotland	-	-	-	-	7	7

The number of Year 11 class groups participating in the 2018 wave of the YPO was smaller than is typical. This was due to delays to fieldwork which were related to the change in the survey mode in 2018 from paper to a mixed paper/online approach. It is difficult to secure the participation of Year 11 classes as the academic year progresses, as many students will have left school and/or their time is increasingly dedicated to exam preparation. The survey weights adjust the population profile to account for the smaller number of Year 11 respondents participating, but this means that some of the Year 11 students have relatively large weights in the final dataset.

---

[7] For Scotland year groups S1 = Year 7, S2 = Year 8, S3 = Year 9, S4 = Year 10 and S5 = Year 11

1.5   Statistical reliability

The respondents to the questionnaire are only samples of the total population, so we cannot be certain that the figures obtained are exactly those we would have if everybody had been interviewed (the true values). We can, however, predict the variation between the sample results and the true values from knowledge of the size of the samples on which the results are based and the number of times that a particular answer is given. The confidence with which we can make this prediction is usually chosen to be 95% - that is, the chances are 95 in 100 that the true value will fall within a specified range. *Table 3* below illustrates the predicted ranges for different sample sizes and percentage results at the 95% confidence interval.

Table 3: Approximate sampling tolerances by sample size

Size of sample on which survey results is based	Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	±	±	±
100 interviews	6	9	10
500 interviews	3	4	4
1,000 interviews	2	3	3
2,865 interviews (Young People Omnibus children aged 11-16)	1	2	2

Source: Ipsos MORI

For example, with a sample of 2,865 where 30% give a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the "true" value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 2 percentage points from the sample result.

Strictly speaking the tolerances shown here apply only to random samples, although they offer an approximation for the complex design used by the current study.

When results are compared between separate groups within a sample, different results may be obtained. The difference may be "real", or it may occur by chance (because not everyone in the population has been interviewed). To test if the difference is a real one - i.e. if it is "statistically significant", we again have to know the size of the samples, the percentage giving a certain answer and the degree of confidence chosen. If we assume the "95% confidence interval", the differences between the two sample results must be greater than the values given in the *Table 4* below:

Table 4: Differences required for significance

Size of sample compared	Differences required for significance at or near these percentage levels		
	10% or 90%	**30% or 70%**	**50%**
	±	±	±
100 and 100	8	13	14
250 and 100	7	11	12
500 and 250	5	7	8
500 and 500	4	6	6
1,000 and 500	3	5	5
1,000 and 1,000	3	4	4
1,500 and 1,000	2	4	4

Source: Ipsos MORI

1.6   Acknowledgements

It is clear that schools are increasingly working under great pressure from a number of different sources and that they receive numerous requests to participate in surveys such as this. We would like to thank the many schools that took part and we are indebted to all pupils and staff who made this survey possible.

1.7   Publication of data

As with all our studies, these results are subject to our Standard Terms and Conditions of Contract. Any publication of results requires the prior approval of Ipsos MORI. Such approval will only be refused on the grounds of inaccuracy and misrepresentation.

2 The impact of moving the survey online

In previous years, the study has been run using pen and paper questionnaires, administered during interviewer-supervised classroom sessions. For the first time in 2018, Ipsos also offered schools the option for pupils to complete the survey online (see section 1.2.3). Most schools preferred online surveying sessions rather than pen and paper administration, with the result that around 70% of responding pupils completed online and 30% on paper in 2018.

The online option was introduced for a number of reasons. First, because schools are increasingly able to accommodate online surveying sessions and evidence from other studies suggested that they may actually find it more convenient to take part online than schedule an Ipsos interviewer to administer a pen and paper surveying session.[8] Second, the online option would also improve data quality, particularly for modules such as those run by the Gambling Commission, which involve fairly complex routing.

The research team compared a large number of questions asked on behalf of the Gambling Commission and a number of other clients who had subscribed to the study, to investigate whether responses were different among young people responding via paper versus online. The team compared responses among 2018 respondents across the two modes, and compared the aggregate 2018 responses (paper+online) to historical trends where questions had been tracked over time. For example, 14% of respondents had gambled in the past 7 days in 2018 which is similar to the 12% in 2017 who had gambled in the past 7 days; 5% in 2018 had played National Lottery games in the past week compared with 4% in 2017; and 6% gambled in commercial premises in the past week in both 2017 and 2018. Very few systematic differences were found that could not be explained by the fact that a different sample of young people took part via each mode.

There were a few cases where online and paper responses appeared to be systematically different. At open-ended questions respondents answering on paper were more likely than those responding online to provide an answer; those responding online were more likely not to state a response at these questions. Although there were a few questions where responses differed by mode, we did not find any consistent differences in responses between different question formats (such as pre-coded list questions, Likert scale questions, or questions using grids), and no consistent differences in respondents in one mode being more likely to report sensitive behaviours. Where trend questions were asked that had been used on previous waves of the study, findings were generally comparable with previous waves.

One of the key metrics captured in the Gambling Commission's study is the proportion of young people who are 'problem' or 'at risk' gamblers, as measured by the DSM-MR-IV-J, a screen consisting of 9 domains (see Chapter 3 for more about the screen). Responses across these domains are aggregated to form an overall score; respondents scoring 4 or more are classified as 'problem gamblers' and those scoring 2-3 are 'at risk' gamblers. The problem gambling rate among those answering on paper is in line with rates in 2017, while the aggregate 2018 rate (including the online and paper samples) is higher than 2017. Respondents to the online survey were more likely than respondents completing the paper survey to indicate they had problematic behaviour on 7 of the 9 domains (see Table 6 below). While the absolute differences between the paper and online responses are small (an average of 0.6 percentage points unweighted and 1.3 percentage points weighted across the 9 domains) the differences are statistically significant.

---

[8] For example, evidence from Ipsos' studies for the Welsh Government and Sport England suggested schools prefer online methods.

One potential explanation is that respondents are more likely to give responses indicating problematic or socially undesirable behaviour when answering a survey online rather than on paper. There is some support in the literature for this position (see Aquilino et al). However, we did not find a consistent pattern across the YPO survey questions to suggest that the sample responding online was more likely to admit to socially undesirable behaviours than those responding on paper on the YPO. For example, rates of past-week and past-month underage drinking, illegal drug use and smoking were not different by mode. Furthermore, where there are differences in reports of socially undesirable behaviours in the DSM, these differences are typically small (as noted above, the average difference across the 9 DSM domains is 1.3 percentage points).

Another potential explanation for the increased rate of problem gambling observed this wave is that the format of the questions was altered in 2018, to bring the way the problem gambling screen was asked into line with the Gambling Commission's survey of adults. Respondents were asked directly about their gambling in the past 12 months at the start of the 2018 survey; in the past, respondents were asked only about past-week gambling. Responses at the past-year gambling question were used to filter respondents at the DSM screen: online respondents were only asked the DSM screen if they had indicated they had gambled in the past year; written instructions on the paper questionnaire directed those respondents to follow the same routing. In previous years, the DSM screen questions were answered by the whole sample of respondents, and each question had an option stating 'I have not gambled in the past 12 months'. During the analysis stage, respondents who indicated they had not gambled in the past 12 months at any of the 9 questions in the screen were classified as 'non-gamblers' and did not score (unless they had also indicated they had gambled in the past 7 days and had scored one or more points on the screen). The result of this change to the filtering of respondents to the DSM screen is that around twice as many respondents were screened in 2018 as in 2017: 34% of the total sample was screened in 2018 compared with 18% in 2017. In other words, a much larger proportion of respondents in 2018 than 2017 were identified as past-year gamblers and therefore included in the DSM screen (*Table 5*).

Table 5: Changes in the proportion of the sample classified into the four DSM screen outcomes, 2017-18

DSM screen outcome	2017 (2,803)	2018 (2,619)
Non-gambler (not gambled in past 12 months)	82.2	63.6
DSM score 0-1 (Non-problem gambler)	15.5	32.5
DSM score 2-3 (At risk gambler)	1.3	2.2
DSM score 4+ (Problem gambler)	0.9	1.7

Among those screened – i.e. those answering the screen and not indicating that they had *not* gambled in the past 12 months – the problem gambling rate is similar each year (4.6% in 2018 compared with 4.3% in 2017). Because twice the proportion of respondents were screened in 2018 as in 2017, the overall problem gambling rate is around twice as high, because the number of problem gamblers is divided by the full sample of respondents, giving an overall problem gambling rate of 1.7% in 2018 compared with 0.9% in 2017.

It's worth noting that, while the higher screening rate in 2018 helps to explain the higher proportion of the population classified as a problem gambler, there are differences by mode: the proportion of those screened who were classified as problem gamblers was higher among those responding online (5.6%) than on paper (1.6%), despite similar screening rates (35% and 34%, respectively). This is because online respondents were more likely to indicate problematic behaviour at 7 of the 9 domains on the screen. As such, it appears that differences by mode as well as the improved screening rate are factors in the increased problem gambling rate seen in 2018.

Table 6: Comparison of responses to the 9 DSM domains and problem gambling rates for 2018 and 2017 responses. Yellow shading indicates statistically significant differences (95% confidence level). See Chapter 3 for more on the problem gambling domain definitions.

	Unweighted				Weighted			
	2018 Paper	**2018 Online**	**2018 (total)**	**2017 total (all paper)**	**2018 Paper**	**2018 Online**	**2018 total**	**2017 total (all paper)**
Preoccupation - often	1.5%	1.4%	1.4%	0.9%	1.5%	2.5%	2.3%	1.1%
Escape - often, sometimes	1.6%	1.4%	1.5%	1.3%	1.1%	2.5%	2.1%	1.4%
Withdrawal - sometimes, often	1.3%	1.5%	1.4%	0.6%	1.2%	2.0%	1.8%	0.5%
Tolerance - sometimes, often	1.4%	2.0%	1.8%	1.2%	1.1%	2.3%	2.0%	1.3%
Loss control -often	0.5%	0.9%	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	1.5%	1.2%	0.6%
Illegal - if any done	2.3%	4.3%	3.8%	2.8%	1.5%	4.7%	3.9%	2.9%
Arguments or missed school	2.6%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.7%	2.6%	2.7%	2.5%
Lies -at least once	1.6%	2.5%	2.3%	2.0%	1.6%	2.7%	2.4%	1.8%
Chasing - if more than half the time/most of the time	1.1%	1.8%	1.6%	1.0%	0.7%	2.3%	1.9%	0.9%
Problem gambling prevalence								
Problem gambling rate (as a % of total sample excluding those not stating an answer to past year gambling/ to any DSM screen question)	0.9%	1.6%	1.4%	0.9%	0.6%	2.1%	1.7%	0.9%
Problem gambling rate (as a % of those screened*)	2.6%	4.6%	4.1%	5.0%	1.6%	5.6%	4.6%	4.3%
% of total sample screened on DSM	34%	35%	34%	17%	36%	36%	36%	18%

Base for 'Preoccupation' to 'Chasing': all those who answered each DSM screen question or hadn't gambled in the past 12 months (excluding Not stated responses to each DSM question, and those who didn't state whether they'd gambled at QH1)
*Based on 901 who were screened, excludes not stated responses and excludes those who had not gambled in the past 12 months

There is one other question where relatively large differences have been noted between the online and paper surveys: a grid question asking about the frequency of respondents seeing advertising via different media (see *Table 10*). Again, there is no consistent pattern in these differences but there does appear to be a trend whereby respondents in the online sample are more likely than those responding on paper to say they 'don't know' whether they have seen advertising, or that they have not seen advertising 'at all' for several of the media channels asked about. This grid appeared towards the end of the survey, and respondent fatigue could have led to satisficing at this question[9]. Responses at questions using similar layouts – including findings from a large grid at the first question, as shown in *Table 7* below – were not associated with systematic differences in the proportion of 'don't know' or 'not stated' responses by mode.

Table 7: Rates of past-week gambling in 2018 (by mode) and in 2017

	2018 Paper %	2018 Online %	2018 Aggregate %	2017 %
Lotto (the main National Lottery draw)	1	2	2	2
National Lottery Scratchcards which you bought in a shop (not free Scratchcards)	1	5	4	3
National Lottery instant win games on the internet (e.g. National Lottery Gamestore)	1	1	1	1
Any other National Lottery games (e.g. EuroMillions, Thunderball, Hotpicks)	1	1	1	1
Fruit or slot machines (e.g. at an arcade, pub or club)	2	4	3	4
Personally visiting a betting shop to play gaming machines	1	2	2	1
Playing other gambling machines	1	2	2	1
Personally placing a bet at a betting shop (e.g. on football or horseracing)	1	1	1	1
Bingo at a bingo club	1	1	1	1

---

[9] Satisficing describes the phenomenon by which survey respondents take cognitive short-cuts to answer questions rather than providing an optimal response. At its most extreme this could involve respondents selecting answers at random from those offered, or selecting the same option all the way through a grid question. Less extreme forms of satisficing could involve selecting the first answer respondents see that seems to fit their views/experiences, rather than reading the full list of options to make an informed judgement about which best fits them.

Bingo at somewhere other than a bingo club (e.g. social club, holiday park, etc.)	2	2	2	2
Personally visiting a casino to play casino games	*	1	1	*
Placing a private bet for money (e.g. with friends)	4	6	6	3
Playing cards for money with friends	3	3	3	2
Gambling websites/apps where you can win real money (e.g. poker, casinos, bingo, betting on sport or racing)	*	2	1	1
Other Lotteries (e.g. The Health Lottery, People's Postcode Lottery, or other smaller lotteries available in shops)	*	2	2	*
Any other gambling	2	3	3	1

Table 8: Attitudinal question comparison, 2017-18

		2018 Paper %	2018 Online %	2018 Aggregate %	2017 %
Most people my age gamble	Strongly agree	*	2	2	1
	Agree	5	6	5	2
	Neither agree nor disagree	14	15	15	10
	Disagree	33	23	26	21
	Strongly disagree	25	26	26	33
	Don't know	22	29	27	32

		2018 Paper %	2018 Online %	2018 Aggregate %	2017 %
Gambling is dangerous	Strongly agree	23	23	23	33
	Agree	38	35	36	29
	Neither agree nor disagree	22	21	21	14
	Disagree	5	5	5	4
	Strongly disagree	4	3	3	6
	Don't know	9	13	12	14

Table 9: Short pre-coded list question comparison, 2017-18

	2018 Paper %	2018 Online %	2018 Aggregate %	2017 %
I have played National Lottery games online using my parents' / guardians' account <u>with</u> their permission	3	4	4	5
I have played National Lottery games online using my parents' / guardians' account <u>without</u> their permission	*	1	1	1
I have played on other gambling websites (not National Lottery) online using my parents' / guardians' account <u>with</u> their permission	3	2	2	2
I have played on other gambling websites/apps (not National Lottery) online using my parents' / guardians' account <u>without</u> their permission	1	2	1	1
None of these sentences are true about me	94	94	94	93

Table 10: Grid question comparison, 2017-18 (only two statements from grid shown)

		2018 Paper %	2018 Online %	2018 Aggregate %	2017 %
Gambling adverts on the TV	More than once a week	36	28	30	39
	Once a week	16	11	13	16
	A few times a month	14	13	13	15
	Once a month or less often	11	9	10	11
	Not at all	11	18	6	10
	Don't know	11	20	18	9
Gambling adverts on the radio	More than once a week	7	8	8	n/a
	Once a week	7	6	6	n/a
	A few times a month	12	9	10	n/a
	Once a month or less often	15	10	12	n/a
	Not at all	35	36	36	n/a
	Don't know	24	30	28	n/a

3 Problem Gambling Overview

3.1 Problem gambling screen definitions

The DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screen was administered as part of the module of questions asked about gambling, and the outputs used to define typologies of gamblers[10]. *Table 11* indicates how the questions asked in 2018 mapped onto the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screen components and the percentage of children who gave the required answers to each question when the scoring system was applied to the data.

Table 11: Problem and social gambler criteria from the DSM-IV-MR-J screen

2018 Question No.	DSM-IV criteria	Question wording: '*In the past 12 months ...*'	If any of the following answer criteria are ticked, that qualifies as 1 point	% children scoring
QH12	Preoccupation	How often have you found yourself thinking about gambling or planning to gamble	'Often'	2.3%
QH13	Escape	How often have you gambled to help you escape from problems or when you were feeling bad	'Sometimes' or 'often'	2.1%
QH14	Withdrawal	Have you felt bad or fed up when trying to cut down on gambling	'Sometimes' or 'often'	1.8%
QH15	Tolerance	Have you needed to gamble with more and more money to get the amount of excitement you want	'Sometimes' or 'often'	2.0%
QH16	Loss of control	Have you ever spent much more than you planned to on gambling	'Sometimes' or 'often'	1.2%
QH17	Illegal acts	Have you ever taken money from any of the following without permission to spend on gambling: Dinner money or fare money Money from family Money from things you've sold Money from outside the family Somewhere else	If any one or more of these options are ticked, then qualifies for one point in total	3.9%
QH18	Risked relationships	Has your gambling ever led to the following: a) Arguments with family/friends or others d) Missing school	If any of the following are ticked, then qualifies for one point in total: 'once or twice', 'sometimes' or 'often'	2.7%
QH18b	Lying	Has your gambling ever led to the following: b) Telling lies to family/friends or others	'Once or twice' 'sometimes' or 'often'	2.4%
QH19	Chasing	After losing money by gambling, have you returned another day to try to win back the money you lost	'More than half the time' or 'every time'	1.9%

Source: Ipsos MORI
Base: (2,619) all answering each screen question or specifying they had not gambled in the past 12 months (excluding those not stating whether they had gambled in the past 12 months and those not answering each screen question)

---

[10] A revised version of the adult DSM-IV screening instrument as developed by Dr S. Fisher, 2000.

3.2   Problem gambling screen analysis

Using the DSM-IV-MR-J screen, a child who confirms that they had undertaken four or more of the behaviours / actions (from the overall screen of nine components outlined above) is considered a problem gambler, a score of two or three is used to identify an at-risk gambler and a score of zero or one indicated a non-problem gambler.

The following table presents results for 11-16 year olds, based on screening from the full dataset for 2018[11]. In total[12] the results indicate that amongst 11-16 year olds in 2018 32.5% of children were identified as non-problem gamblers (unweighted n=812), 2.2% as at-risk gamblers (n=52) and 1.7% as 'problem' gamblers (n=37). *Table 12* below outlines the proportions for each category by age and gender.

Table 12: Prevalence of non-problem, at risk or problem gambling (11-16 year olds) amongst key sub-groups (unweighted n, weighted % shown)

	Base size, 2018[13]	*Type of gambler*		
		Non-problem	*At risk*	*Problem*
Total	*2,619*	32.5% (n=812)	2.2% (n=52)	1.7% (n=37)
Gender				
Boys	*1,201*	36.2%	3.2% (n=34)	2.0% (n=25)
Girls	*1,397*	28.8%	1.2% (n=17)	1.3% (n=11)
Age				
11	*146*	29.8%	0.9% (n=2)	0.6% (n=1)
12	*649*	30.0%	2.5% (n=14)	1.2% (n=8)
13	*717*	30.2%	1.9% (n=13)	1.2% (n=7)
14	*661*	33.7%	2.0% (n=14)	1.7% (n=10)
15	*380*	34.7%	4.2% (n=9)	1.2% (n=9)
16	*66*	36.7%	0.0% (n=0)	4.6% (n=2)

Base: Children aged 11-16 who were eligible for screening

---

[11] Until 2017, previous iterations of the survey based problem gambling screen analysis on 12-15 year olds only
[12] Respondents classified irrespective of whether they completed all nine elements of screen.
[13] Note that base sizes are shown for respondents where the demographic information was available *and* who were screened (i.e. excludes those not giving gender, and those classified as ineligible for the DSM). As such, the sum of the categories is smaller than the total base size of 2,865.

3.3   Screening method applied

The DSM-IV-MR-J screen was applied in three key steps:

1) Respondents included in the screen were aged 11-16. Young people who did not answer any questions across QH12-QH19 (the DSM screen questions) were excluded, as were those who did not indicate they had gambled in the past 12 months at QH1 (246 respondents were excluded in 2018). Those remaining were all included in the screen (901 young people were included in the screen altogether; another 1,867 had been classified as not having gambled in the past 12 months). As discussed in detail in Section 2, the filtering was changed in 2018 compared with previous waves to reflect differences in the questions asked: in previous waves respondents could say 'I have not gambled' at each screening question, and those who indicated they had not gambled were excluded from the screen. In 2018, the use of an online mode meant that only respondents who indicated they had gambled in the past year were asked this question, and the option to say 'I have not gambled' was removed from these questions. We also found that respondents to the online survey were much less likely than those responding on paper to skip past these questions. The effect of these changes is that a much larger proportion of children have been screened this year than in past studies.

2) Points were then awarded to each respondent based on the answers they gave during the screening questions. A full list of the points awarded for each question is shown in the table above.

3) Young people included in the screener were then categorised into one of three categories: 'problem' gamblers (for anyone scoring 4 or more points); 'at risk' gamblers for anyone who scored 2-3 points and 'non-problem' gamblers (for anyone who scored 0-1 points).

Julia Pye
Research Director
Julia.Pye@ipsos.com

Emily Mason
Graduate Research Executive
Emily.Mason@ipsos.com

For more information

About Ipsos MORI's Social Research Institute
The Social Research Institute works closely with national governments, local public services and the not-for-profit sector. Its c.200 research staff focus on public service and policy issues. Each has expertise in a particular part of the public sector, ensuring we have a detailed understanding of specific sectors and policy challenges. This, combined with our methods and communications expertise, helps ensure that our research makes a difference for decision makers and communities.