

Gambling Survey for Great Britain Webinar: Exploring the impact of methodological change on estimates of gambling behaviours

Pre-submitted questions

Q. Are you doing any research to assess the impact of changing the list of gambling activities presented to participants? The incentives offered to participants are sub industry standards. Have you looked at diversifying the incentives offered to match similar survey and see if that impacts the uptake of the survey among non-gamblers? Happy to share knowledge on this from past experiences.

Yes, experiment 1 will assess the impact of updating the gambling participation list in the GSGB.

We offer a £10 incentive to anyone taking part in the GSGB. This was recommended by NatCen and is in line with incentives offered for other similar social research surveys. Increasing the incentive would considerably increase the cost of the project, given the number of respondents per annum.

Q. How can the significant variances to GSGB reported participation levels and operator reported participation levels be reconciled. Bearing in mind that operators need to keep auditable, accurate records of customer activity - and that this data is made available to the Commission via regulatory returns

This question is not directly linked to the content of the webinar, which was about experimental research to understand the impact of methodological change.

We encourage triangulation of the GSGB data with other sources where comparable and would invite you to share comparable data with us.

However, we would expect some differences between the sources you mention. The GSGB is a population level survey across the GB adult population and uses self-report methods to estimate participation in all types of gambling. In contrast, the data that is submitted to via Regulatory Returns is financial and operational data, aggregated by operator. It does not provide information at a customer level, and because it is submitted at the operator level it does not provide a single customer view i.e. the same person choosing to gamble with several different operators. Data submitted via regulatory returns is also based solely on licensed activities, whereas a consumer's definition of gambling is likely to be much broader than this.

Both are valuable sources of data in our evidence base. The GSGB provides insight into gambling trends, demographics and consequences of gambling that aren't all captured by operator records. Whereas data made available to us via Regulatory Returns provides evidence about the size and shape of the gambling market.

Q. Are you concerned about the increasing misuse of the GSGB data in the media? • Do you think this has the potential to skew the public policy debate on gambling? • What steps are you taking to correct the misuse of GSGB data? • How many organisations have been contacted? • How many examples of misuse have been corrected?

This question is not directly linked to the content of the webinar, which was about experimental research to understand the impact of methodological change.

Summary of Comments on Webinar Q and A.pdf

This page contains no comments

However for information, we monitor the use of the GSGB statistics and request corrections where we spot inaccuracies – as we do with all of our official statistics. A log of requested corrections to official statistics will be made available on our website by the end of April and updated quarterly.

Q. Can you explain why the survey was released on the general public and been so widely either mis reported or misunderstood Surely you understood the survey would be extrapolate by those opposing the industry to mean 2.5% of the population as PG, would be used to negatively impact policy?

This question is not directly linked to the content of the webinar, which was about experimental research to understand the impact of methodological change.

The development of the GSGB and the extensive work that went into its development can be tracked on our website [here](#). You may also like to read the [paper we published outlining our decision to move from ‘experimental statistics or official statistics in development’ to ‘official statistics’](#).

You can also read [an independent review of the GSGB](#), written by Professor Sturgis which endorsed our move to a push to web approach.

Finally, given the official statistics from the GSGB we have published [guidance](#) alongside the statistics explaining how they should and shouldn’t be used.

Q. What KPIs of the GSGB do the panel each consider to be the most important?

This question is not directly linked to the content of the webinar, which was about experimental research to understand the impact of methodological change.

Questions included in the GSGB all contribute to our understanding of the extent and impact of gambling behaviours in Great Britain, and enhance the evidence-base we use for decision making.

One area of questioning we have spent a lot of time developing is around the consequences of gambling. Recognising that the PGSI has its own limitations, we developed a suite of questions for understanding other consequences from gambling – both for someone who gambles and for affected others. This was previously a gap in our understanding about the more holistic consequences of gambling. You can read more about this work [here](#).

We have also updated the way we ask about gambling participation – to make sure the activities we ask about reflect the gambling landscape today. These help us to estimate how many people experience gambling in Great Britain and on which type of activities.

Q. Have you had any feedback to suggest that some people are unable to take part in the survey due to reading and/or writing difficulties? e.g. is there an increase in education level among participants compared to surveys that included f2f support from an interviewer if needed (health surveys etc)?

This question is not directly linked to the content of the webinar, which was about experimental research to understand the impact of methodological change.

We haven’t received any feedback of this nature.

This page contains no comments

We are careful to balance the length of the questionnaire and complexity of the questions to ensure people aren't put off from taking part. To mitigate the risk we cognitively test the questions on to the survey to check understanding, participants can choose to complete the survey either online or on paper, questions can be left blank if a respondent does not want to answer a specific question and a helpline is provided for anyone who has questions about the survey.

Q&A from the webinar

Q.I appreciate this work will inform future sweeps of GSGB - will it also allow you to (re)review previous estimates, and draw conclusions about changes over time, looking back?

The experimental work that Professor Sturgis is undertaking for us will help us to understand the impact of the methodological change on estimates of gambling behaviours more clearly. It is unlikely previous estimates will be refined, but findings will be taken into consideration when interpreting both the Year 1 GSGB data (published July 2024) and future publications.

Q.How are Natcen participants recruited?

- Natcen Panel members are recruited through established studies such as the British Social Attitudes survey, for which participants are selected at random.
- Random sampling techniques help minimise bias, and have been found to be more accurate than surveys which use non-random sampling approaches.
- You can find more information here [What makes the NatCen Panel unique? | National Centre for Social Research](#)

Q. Hi can clarify how people are selected to take part?

Participants will be selected from the NatCen online panel (see details in previous question).

For experiment 1 (in which we plan to compare gambling estimates when 'gambling' is salient in the survey invite compared when it's less salient), invitations will be issued to 6,000 NatCen panel members in total.

A response rate of approximately 50% is expected, aiming for a final sample size of 3,000.

Participants who respond to invites in experiment 1, will be randomly assigned to take part either via telephone interview or online (experiment 2). For experiment 3, the same participants will also be randomly assigned to one of two gambling list conditions: approximately half the sample will be administered the standard list of gambling activities (similar to lists used in previous Health Surveys), and the other half will be administered the updated list of gambling activities used in the GSGB.

Q.The panel surely would be primed to gambling. Was there an independent panel consulted?

The NatCen panel is recruited through established studies such as the British Social Attitudes Survey so they will not be primed to gambling.

Number: 1 Author: [REDACTED] Date: 09/04/2025 12:13:00 +01'00'
(taken from their website: What makes the NatCen Panel unique? | National Centre for Social Research)

Number: 2 Author: [REDACTED] Date: 09/04/2025 12:15:00 +01'00'
Are we still using stratified sampling to recruit people with PGSI 8+ ?? It's in the original plan but can't see it in the revised plan and I can't remember whether there's a reason for this

Number: 3 Author: [REDACTED] Date: 09/04/2025 12:28:00 +01'00'
I don't think they will be! Have suggested a response but can NatCen add to it?

Number: 4 Author: [REDACTED] Date: 09/04/2025 12:16:00 +01'00'
Not sure I understand the question ... why would they be primed to gambling??