



January 2020

Gambling-related harms to children and young people

An analysis of the Young People's Omnibus pilot findings

Contents

- 1 Executive summary 1**
 - 1.1 Overview..... 1**
 - 1.2 Demographic differences in harm measures..... 1**
 - 1.3 Key technical pilot findings 2**
 - 1.4 Recommendations for further research..... 3**
- 2 Introduction 5**
 - 2.1 Background 5**
 - 2.2 Defining gambling-related harm 6**
 - 2.3 The pilot 7**
 - 2.4 Report structure..... 7**
- 3 Analysis..... 9**
 - 3.1 Response patterns: general findings..... 9**
 - 3.2 Response patterns: question specific findings..... 11**
 - 3.3 Item reduction 40**
 - PCA 1: Self-efficacy, adult support and quality of sleep for all young people, regardless of gambling behaviour..... 42
 - PCA 2: Impact of gambling behaviour on life in general and school life..... 44
 - PCA 3: Impact of gambling behaviour on feelings and relationships 46
 - PCA 4: Impact of family gambling behaviour on finances, and relationships..... 48
 - PCA 5: Impacts on life attitudes 49
 - 3.4 Overall harms measure..... 50**
- Conclusions and recommendations..... 51**
- Annex A: Final questions 53**
- Annex B: Overall Harms measure 60**
 - Introduction..... 60**
 - Correlation with other established measures 62**
 - Demographic differences in harm measures 64**

List of tables

Table 3.1: GA SELF: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?	12
Table 3.2: GA ADULT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that at home, there is an adult who...?	14
Table 3.2 continued GA ADULT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that at home, there is an adult who...?	15
Table 3.3: GA SLEEP: Over the past year, how often, if at all, have you lost sleep at night because... ..	17
Table 3.3 continued GA SLEEP: Over the past year, how often, if at all, have you lost sleep at night because... ..	18
Table 3.4: GAMBIMP: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led to any of the following things? Gamblers in last 12 months only.....	20
Table 3.4 continued GAMBIMP: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led to any of the following things? Gamblers in last 12 months only	21
Table 3.5: GA HARD: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling... Gamblers in last 12 months only	23
Table 3.5 continued: GA HARD: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling... Gamblers in last 12 months only.....	24
Table 3.6: GA EXP Thinking about your experiences of gambling, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Gamblers in last 12 months only	26
Table 3.6 continued GA EXP Thinking about your experiences of gambling, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Gamblers in last 12 months only	27
Table 3.7: GA GAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led you to... Gamblers in last 12 months only	29
Table 3.7 continued GA GAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led you to... Gamblers in last 12 months only.....	30
Table 3.7 continued GA GAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led you to... Gamblers in last 12 months only.....	31
Table 3.8: GA FAMILYGAM: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your family's gambling led to any of the following things? Family has gambled in the last 12 months.....	33
Table 3.8 continued GA FAMILYGAM: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your family's gambling led to any of the following things? Family has gambled in the last 12 months	34
Table 3.8 continued GA FAMILYGAM: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your family's gambling led to any of the following things? Family has gambled in the last 12 months	35
Table 3.9: GA FAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all have you felt that your family's gambling has led to... (Family has gambled in the last 12 months)	37
Table 3.9 continued GA FAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all have you felt that your family's gambling has led to... (Family has gambled in the last 12 months)	38
Table 3.9 continued GA FAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all have you felt that your family's gambling has led to.....	39
Table 3.10: Principle Components Analysis 1	43
Table 3.11: Principle Components Analysis 2	45
Table 3.12: Principle Components Analysis 3	47
Table 3.13: Principle Components Analysis 4	49
Table 3.14: Principle Components Analysis 5	50
Table A2.1: Summary of harms scoring approach	61
Table A2.2: Mean harms measure scores by gambling behaviour and problem gambling	63
Table A2.3 Mean harms measure scores by demographics.....	65

1 Executive summary

1.1 Overview

GambleAware commissioned Ipsos MORI to carry out a piece of research into the harms experienced by children and young people resulting from their own gambling and from the gambling of others. This piece of research involved:

- Generating a working definition of gambling-related harms among children and young people;
- Establishing a framework that aids the organisation of these terms;
- Using the framework to develop questions to facilitate the collection data on children's experiences of these harms;
- A workshop with experts and focus groups with young people to develop the framework;¹
- Designing questions to cover the key domains in the framework;
- Cognitive testing of the questions in a series of interviews with children and young people and their parents.

The definition of harm resulting from the first stage of the work and used for the research is as follows:

"Gambling-related harms are the adverse impacts from gambling on the health and wellbeing of individuals, families, communities and societies. Gambling-related harms affect young people in the present and may also affect their future potential. The harms may be a result of their own gambling or the gambling of others around them e.g. parents, family, friends or other people in their networks."

It should be noted that harm is not the same as disordered and problem gambling. A key principle underpinning this research project is a perspective that harms can result from gambling even where the person gambling is not displaying disordered or problem gambling behaviour.

The questions about harm which resulted from the cognitive testing and discussion with the steering group were then piloted on the 2019 Young People's Omnibus (YPO)², alongside existing questions about gambling included in that survey on behalf of the Gambling Commission. This report focuses on the analysis of the pilot results.

The questions were refined based on the pilot findings before their inclusion on future waves of the omnibus survey. The questions proposed for the 2020 Young People's Omnibus (YPO) are shown in Annex 1. Their inclusion on the omnibus survey will enable regular collection of data and the ability to conduct trend analysis about harm.

1.2 Demographic differences in harm measures

Although the focus of this pilot was on how the new questions performed statistically, we did explore demographic differences in order to understand the questions better. There were some gender differences with boys who gamble being more likely than girls to report impacts from their own gambling and boys whose family gamble being more likely than girls to report impacts from their family's gambling. This was found particularly in the financial, relationship and

¹ The framework was published in May 2019, in a report which described the work which had been carried out up to that point: Blake, M., Pye, J., Mollitor, C., Morris, L., Wardle, H., Reith, G. (2019) Measuring gambling-related harms among children and young people. A Framework for Action. Ipsos MORI. <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Measuring-GRH-in-CYP-A-framework-for-action.pdf> (last accessed 4.9.2019)

² The pilot was carried out between 12th February and 19th June 2019 with 11-16 year olds in secondary schools (excluding special schools, fee-paying schools and sixth form colleges).

emotion domains and includes both positive and negative impacts. There was also some indication that family gambling had a greater impact on BME³ participants than white participants in the area of relationships.

The data also showed that less affluent young people and young people who felt they were lower on the social ladder were more likely to experience financial harm and impacts on relationships from their families' gambling.

1.3 Key technical pilot findings

1.3.1 Response patterns

A low percentage of young people gave 'prefer not to say' answers and complete drop out from the survey (stopping without answering any further questions) is also low which suggests that the questions are acceptable to young people. However, when 'prefer not to say' answers are combined with answers such as 'don't know', 'neither agree nor disagree' and 'not applicable', for many of the statements a quarter to a third of young people did not give a meaningful response which can be used to assess whether they are experiencing gambling-related harm. However, these patterns are in line with questions in the main module about gambling on the survey. The potential reasons for this high level of young people giving these types of response include the subject being sensitive and young people not feeling comfortable with giving their 'true' answer (despite the survey being an online self-completion), young people finding the questions difficult to answer, or young people feeling that in some circumstances they would agree and in others they would disagree.

Across the statements in many questions, there were very similar response patterns. This suggests *either* that young people have similar experiences across all the statements asked about, leading to consistent answers, *or* that young people are satisficing⁴ and giving the same answer to each statement without fully thinking through their answer. Whatever the cause, this pattern suggests that consideration should be given to reducing the number of statements to reduce burden because the same conclusion could be drawn from far fewer statements. A detailed analysis of some of the sets of statements suggests that there is discrimination and that similar percentages do not reflect most young people giving the same answer to every statement.

Overall, for most questions the answers which would indicate a harm (e.g. disagreeing they have adult support, always or often not being able to buy things because of their gambling) were selected by a small proportion of young people. For those questions which were asked for all young people (e.g. to their sleep, feelings of self-efficacy and support from their family), when comparing all young people who had gambled in the last 12 months with young people who had not gambled, young people who gambled did not show higher levels of harm compared with young people who don't gamble. However, when the group who gamble were split by frequency and type of gambling it showed that those who gambled more frequently gambling (in the last 4 weeks) and those who were at-risk or problem gamblers experienced higher levels of harm.

1.3.2 Item reduction

Levels of agreement across the harms statements were very similar and therefore the results for the statements on each question were highly correlated. This could indicate *either* that the statements measure the same concept and therefore not all of them are needed, *or* it could indicate satisficing in the way the questionnaires are completed with young people

³ BME stands for Black and Minority Ethnic Group. This includes young people who identify as Black, Asian, mixed or other ethnicity. Those who identify as being white British, white Irish, white European or other white background are included as white.

⁴ Satisficing is a decision-making strategy that aims for a satisfactory or adequate result, rather than the optimal solution. In the context of responding to a questionnaire, it involves participant giving plausible answers which may not be strictly wrong, but which are not optimal. For example, answering agree on every question, rather than discriminating and answering strongly agree on some and agree on others.

'straight-lining' or selecting the same answer for all statements within a question, or a combination of these. Whatever the explanation for this high level of correlation between statements, it suggests that a substantial reduction in the number of statements being asked about harms would be desirable. A principle components analysis was used to suggest the items which should be retained based on their statistical properties, but with additional judgements made based on the balance of the questionnaire and interest in particular aspects of harm. As a result, we have suggested reducing the statements or questions from 63 to 24. We have demonstrated that this would not affect the correlation with life satisfaction.

1.3.3 Overall harms measure

We have carried out exploratory analysis to create an overall harms measure from the suggested statements for retention. The results of this are shown in Annex B. The missing data through 'prefer not to say' and 'don't know' answers, and inconsistency in the direction of harm in relation to the answer category values on many questions, means that creating a score is not necessary or desirable in the main analysis of the data. We recommend that it is better to analyse each of the statements separately and comment on the meaning and implication of results for that particular statement. Creating a score is a potential future development once the revised list of statements has been used and the data explored.

1.3.4 Correlation with other established measures

Using the exploratory overall harms measure we found that there is no significant difference in overall harms measure values or general harms not directly attributed to gambling or for harms related to family gambling, according to whether or not the young person has gambled in the last 12 months (see Annex B). Looking at harms related to gambling, there is very little difference in the harm scores related to the frequency of gambling. Looking at the scores for non-problem gamblers compared with those who are at-risk and problem gamblers⁵, the harm scores are consistently higher for at-risk and problem gamblers on all scores.

When individual statements are compared between at-risk and problem gamblers and non-problem gamblers there is a consistent pattern that at-risk and problem gamblers experience greater impacts from their gambling. It is notable that this includes both negative and positive impacts. It should be emphasised that this research is intended to explore harms experienced by all young people affected by gambling, including those who do not gamble themselves and those who would not be classified as at-risk or problem gamblers. However, there will inevitably be an overlap and so in assessing the robustness of the new questions, it is of value to find that at-risk and problem gamblers experience greater levels of harm than non-problem gamblers when using the proposed statements to measure harm.

1.4 Recommendations for further research

We recommend that further research is carried out to supplement the findings from the YPO pilot and to improve understanding around gambling-related harm among children and young people. We suggest three key ways of doing this:

- Utilising other sources of available data e.g. on attainment, offending or health inequalities. There are some aspects of harm which cannot be measured by asking young people to report on them such as objective measurement of their attainment at school, or behaviours where the incidence is so low they could not be captured in a sample survey (for example, youth offending). We therefore recommend that administrative data is used to explore these. Attainment data, which is available through the National Pupil Database, could potentially

⁵ The World Health Organisation refers to disordered gamblers rather than problem gamblers but we have used terminology consistent with the main YPO report. The main YPO report with the findings from the 2019 study is: Ipsos MORI (2019) 'Young People and Gambling Survey 2019: A research study among 11-16 year olds in Great Britain'. Gambling Commission.

be linked to the survey data, if appropriate permissions are obtained. This would allow analysis of the relationship between gambling behaviour and attainment. To look at low prevalence issues such as the link between youth offending and gambling, a different approach would be needed, perhaps starting with data about youth offending and looking into whether follow up or other data about youth offenders could be linked together to understand the prevalence of gambling and problem gambling among this group and the ways in which they are related.

- Conducting qualitative research with children and young people, as well as other professionals in schools e.g. designated safeguarding leads. Particularly in the area of emotional impacts from gambling, the online survey findings leave unanswered questions. For example, there are higher levels of 'don't know' responses for the questions about emotional impact and young people were more likely to agree with the statements about positive emotional impacts from gambling than negative ones. This area of emotional impact needs further exploration in an interview which allows for greater nuances of understanding than an online survey with closed questions. It would be important to explore whether young people would regard high levels of emotional impact as harmful, even if some of those feelings are positive. It would also be helpful to understand more about the impacts of gambling on those who might report 'don't know' in a closed question.
- Conducting key informant interviews with experts in child and young people psychology about how young people experience and report on emotions and the associated harms and benefits of experiencing and expressing emotions.

2 Introduction

2.1 Background

The impacts of gambling can be wide-ranging. As with other risk behaviours (e.g. drinking or drug taking), those who gamble can experience harms, as can their immediate and extended network, including friends, family and society at large. Gambling is increasingly being considered a public health issue.⁶

In July 2018, the Gambling Commission, the Advisory Board for Safer Gambling (ABSG)⁷ and GambleAware published a report entitled “Measuring gambling-related harms: A framework for action”. The report aims to provide a working definition of gambling-related harms and outline a range of metrics that could be used to identify and measure gambling-related harms to adults.⁸ Given that the experiences of children and young people are in various ways distinct from those of adults, there was a need to create a similar framework of harms specifically for this group.

GambleAware commissioned Ipsos MORI to carry out a piece of research into the harms experienced by children and young people resulting from their own gambling and from the gambling of others. This piece of research involved generating a working definition of gambling-related harms among children and young people, establishing a framework that aids the organisation of these terms and using the framework to develop questions which can be used to collect data on children's experiences of these harms. A workshop with experts and focus groups with young people were carried out in order to develop the framework and questions were designed to cover the key domains in the framework. The questions were then cognitively tested in a series of interviews with children and young people and their parents. The framework was published in May 2019, in a report which described the work which had been carried out up to that point⁹. The questions about harm which resulted from the cognitive testing and discussion with the steering group have now been piloted on the 2019 Young People's Omnibus (YPO), alongside existing questions about gambling included in that survey on behalf of the Gambling Commission. This report focuses on the analysis of the pilot results.

The questions were refined based on the pilot findings before their inclusion on future waves of the omnibus survey. The questions proposed for the 2020 Young People's Omnibus (YPO) are shown in Annex 1. Their inclusion on the omnibus survey will enable regular collection of data and the ability to conduct trend analysis about harm.

⁶ Gambling Commission (2018). Gambling-related harm as a public health issue. Briefing paper for Local Authorities and local Public Health, <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Gambling-related-harm-as-a-public-health-issue.pdf> [last accessed 22.02.2019].

⁷ The ASGB was previously known as the RGSB (Responsible Gambling Strategy Board)

⁸ Wardle, H., Reith, G., Best, D., McDaid, D., Platt, S. (2018). Measuring gambling-related harms. A framework for action, Gambling Commission, <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Measuring-gambling-related-harms.pdf> [last accessed 22.02.2019].

⁹ Blake, M., Pye, J., Mollitor, C., Morris, L., Wardle, H., Reith, G. (2019) Measuring gambling-related harms among children and young people. A Framework for Action. Ipsos MORI. <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Measuring-GRH-in-CYP-A-framework-for-action.pdf> (last accessed 4.9.2019)

2.2 Defining gambling-related harm

The definition of harm used for this work is as follows:

"Gambling-related harms are the adverse impacts from gambling on the health and wellbeing of individuals, families, communities and societies. Gambling-related harms affect young people in the present and may also affect their future potential. The harms may be a result of their own gambling or the gambling of others around them e.g. parents, family, friends or other people in their networks."

Potential harms are currently divided into four main domains:

- (a) Financial: living standards of family, attitudes to and concerns about money
- (b) Development: education, social and emotional functioning
- (c) Relationships: family, friends and the community, behaviour
- (d) Health: physical, mental, emotional wellbeing

In exploring gambling-related harms for young people two issues are important, in contrast to harms for adults. These are that:

- young people are usually dependent on adults and vulnerable to harms from the gambling of others; and that
- adolescence is a key period of development and so harms can affect young people now and in the future.

A key principle underpinning this research project is a perspective that harms can result from gambling even where the person gambling is not displaying disordered or problem gambling behaviour. Disordered gambling is measured according to the DSM-IV and the PGSI (for adults) and DSM-IV-MR-J (for children)¹⁰ and indicates a behavioural addiction. However, non-problem or non-disordered gambling is far more prevalent than problem or disordered gambling and its potential impact can be far reaching, for the individual, their family and community. The questions included are designed to measure the impacts of all gambling behaviour from a public health perspective, considering the consequences of gambling even where the gambling behaviour would not be regarded as disordered. The YPO questionnaire included the youth version of the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling questions asked on behalf of the Gambling Commission.

¹⁰ Ipsos MORI (2018) Young People and Gambling 2018: A research study among 11-16 year olds on behalf of the Gambling Commission. Young People Omnibus 2018, Technical report. <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Young-People-and-Gambling-2018-Technical-Note.pdf> (last accessed 6.12.2019). This screen leads to identifying young people as problem gamblers, at-risk gamblers and non-problem gamblers. Gamblers categorised as 'at-risk' are currently experiencing low or moderate level problems with their gambling.

2.3 The pilot

The pilot was carried out on the YPO between 12th February and 19th June 2019 by adding questions related to harm at the end of an existing module about gambling¹¹. Participants included 11-16 year olds in secondary schools (excluding special schools, fee-paying schools and sixth form colleges). The pilot has generated 2,693 cases which have data for at least one of the relevant questions on gambling-related harm¹². We have included partial responses in the analysis as it allows us to look at drop-outs at each question.

The pilot survey included:

- Existing Gambling Commission questions which relate to harms¹³
- New proposed questions which were included after cognitive testing
 - These are a series of questions with multiple statements. It is not a set of questions which forms a single scale, however most of the statements are measured by 5 point scales which have been included in the same analysis.
 - Some can be asked of all young people, others are specifically for young people who gamble or whose family gambles
- Existing measures of gambling prevalence and problem gambling
- General demographic and other background questions shared with Gambling Commission

Since the intention was to pilot questions on this survey as well as potentially include them on the survey long term, decisions about the design of questions was influenced by existing gambling questions on that survey. A pragmatic approach was taken to use existing content which related to harms and to follow the question formats on that survey (e.g. particular scale formats). The questions were also designed to fit in with Ipsos MORI's best practice in design and GDPR¹⁴ requirements (e.g. to offer a 'prefer not to say' option on sensitive personal questions). Although the research team from this project had some input into discussions between the Gambling Commission and the Young Person's Omnibus team about content and design of the main module, it should be noted that the definition of gambling used as the basis of the harms question had to be based on the questions available in the YPO and the agreed definitions used for youth gambling, which have been included for many years. For this report, where we refer to a gambler, this is someone who has gambled in the last 12 months. A non-gambler is someone who has not gambled in the last 12 months.

2.4 Report structure

The analysis section of the report contains two main sections. The first explores the responses to each statement, comparing gamblers and non-gamblers as well as looking at demographic comparisons and patterns by type of gambling behaviour. As this is pilot report focussing on how the questions performed and which statements should be retained there is a greater focus on responses such as 'prefer not to say' and 'don't know' than would be found in a substantive

¹¹ The findings for the main questions about gambling asked in the same survey have been published here: Ipsos MORI (2019) 'Young People and Gambling Survey 2019: A research study among 11-16 year olds in Great Britain'. Gambling Commission. Commission (last accessed 6.12.19)

¹² The overall number responding to the YPO was 2,943 but in our analysis we have included only those who answered at least one question in the module about gambling-related harm (2,693)

¹³ Since 2011, the Gambling Commission have included a suite of questions on the Young Person's Omnibus (YPO) run by Ipsos MORI. The Gambling Commission questions measure gambling behaviour among 11-16 year olds. Since 2014, the questions have also included a measure of problem gambling.

¹⁴ GDPR: General Data Protection Regulation

report. The second analysis section presents the results of a principal components analysis to understand which statements could be removed (item reduction) while still covering the key themes found in the full set of statements.

Annex A shows the resulting questions which are being included in the YPO in 2020. Annex B includes some analysis to explore the possibility of creating an overall harms measure.

3 Analysis

This section presents the findings from the analysis conducted on the data gathered from the YPO. The first section shows response patterns and the percentages giving non-valid answers to questions and what the distribution of valid answers is. The second section presents the findings of a factor analysis used to propose item reduction, to reduce burden on participants by removing statements which do not add any additional analytical value. Annex B includes some analysis which explores a way of creating a harm score to identify which, if any groups seem to experience greater levels of gambling-related harm. This is then analysed for young people according to the gambling behaviour as well as some key demographics. After reviewing this analysis it was decided that a better approach would be to reduce the number of statements and analyse those separately rather than trying to create an overall measure at this stage. One key reason for this is that once 'don't know', 'prefer not to say' and 'neither agree nor disagree' statements are removed, a substantial number of young people would not be assigned a value because they had not given an scoreable answer on all relevant questions.

Analysis has been carried out using statistical weights. Data are weighted by gender, age and region. The sample of participants 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 in the main report about Young People and Gambling¹⁵.

The questions about harm followed a section of the questionnaire (for the Gambling Commission) which looked at the types and frequency of gambling and the incidence of problem gambling. The analysis of the harms questions explored levels of harm according to some of the gambling measures in the main part of the questionnaire. In the survey 36% of young people had spent their own money on gambling in the last 12 months, 20% in the last four weeks and 11% in the last 7 days¹⁶. The data showed that '1.7% of 11-16 year olds are classified as problem gamblers, 2.7% as at-risk gamblers and 31.5% as non-problem gamblers'¹⁷ and that prevalence of at-risk and problem gambling is higher among boys than girls.

3.1 Response patterns: general findings

For all the questions designed to measure harm we have conducted a response analysis to look at 'don't know' and 'prefer not to say' for each question. This helps us to understand whether there are questions which are more difficult to answer, or which may be more sensitive. It is possible that 'don't know', 'prefer not to say' answers either indicate a 'poor' question or is indicative of an issue the participant is reluctant to reveal. We have also looked at how the answers to questions relate to key demographics. This helps to establish whether there may be other factors contributing to the level

¹⁵ Ipsos MORI (2019) 'Young People and Gambling Survey 2019: A research study among 11-16 year olds in Great Britain'. Gambling Commission (last accessed 6.12.19)

¹⁶ Ipsos MORI (2019) 'Young People and Gambling Survey 2019: A research study among 11-16 year olds in Great Britain'. Gambling Commission. Commission (last accessed 6.12.19)

¹⁷ For more detail see Page 44 of Ipsos MORI (2019) 'Young People and Gambling Survey 2019: A research study among 11-16 year olds in Great Britain'. Gambling Commission. Commission (last accessed 6.12.19). At-risk and problem gambling is measured using youth version of the DSM-IV-MR-J. The gamblers categorised as 'at-risk' are currently experiencing low or moderate level problems with their gambling.

of harm, or to identify whether there are certain demographic groups for which the harms questions seem to work less well.

The results for each statement are shown and described below in detail. However, some general points which applied across all the questions are worth pulling out here. A low percentage of young people gave 'prefer not to say' answers and complete drop out from the survey (stopping without answering any further questions) is also low in this section of questions, which suggest that the questions are acceptable to young people. However, when 'prefer not to say' answers are combined with answers such as 'don't know', 'neither agree nor disagree' and 'not applicable', for many of the statements a quarter to a third of young people did not give a meaningful response which can be used to assess whether they are experiencing gambling-related harm. The report of the YPO gambling-related questions from the 2019 survey shows that questions in the main gambling module have similar high levels of 'don't know' answers.¹⁸ This may reflect that this is a challenging subject matter for some young people. For those who are involved in gambling the topic may be sensitive and for those who have no experience of gambling, the questions may be difficult to answer. We have looked at the data for a selection of statements and found that while there are participants who answered 'prefer not to say' or 'don't know' to one statement and then give a substantive answer to another statement, most who use 'don't know' or 'prefer not to say' give the same answer across statements. For example, on the question about self-efficacy, 391 of the 2,693 who answered the question said 'don't know' or, 'prefer not to say' to at least one of the three statements and of them 247 said 'don't know' or 'prefer not to say' to all three of them.

The statements were grouped into questions and the results show that across the statements in each question there were very similar response patterns (for example, for the statements about self-efficacy the percentage agreeing ranged from 62% to 67%). This suggests that young people have similar experiences across all the statements, leading to consistent answers, or that young people are satisficing and giving the same answer to each statement without fully thinking through their answer, or that on average answers are similar but that the different individuals agree on each statement. An important question is whether individuals are answering each statement the same way. Looking at the three statements about self-efficacy we found that of the 2,693 who answered this question, 337 (12.5%) strongly agreed to all three, 634 (23.5%) agreed to all three, 108 (4%) neither agreed nor disagreed to all three, 44 (1.6%) disagreed with all three and 73 (2.7%) strongly disagreed with all the statements. After including the 247 (9.1%) who said 'don't know' or 'prefer not to say' to all three, this means 59% gave the same answer (or a non-answer) across the three statements. This means that 41% did vary their answer. Given that in this case there are only three statements and five substantive answer options on the same theme, this suggests that on the whole young people are not 'straight-lining' as many give a different answer to the statements, and for some people the same answer for all three would be a genuine answer.

Whatever the cause, this pattern suggests that consideration should be given to reducing the number of statements to reduce burden and because the same conclusion could be drawn from far fewer statements. The issue of item reduction is considered in more detail in the next section.

3.1.1 Conclusion

Overall, for most questions the answers which would indicate a harm (e.g. disagreeing they have adult support, always or often not being able to buy things because of their gambling) were selected by a small proportion of young people. For those questions which were asked for all young people, there was no evidence of any gambling having a negative impact

¹⁸ Ipsos MORI (2019) 'Young People and Gambling Survey 2019: A research study among 11-16 year olds in Great Britain'. Gambling Commission. Commission (last accessed 6.12.19)

compared to the experiences of those who don't gamble. However, there was some evidence of more frequent gambling (in the last 4 weeks) and problem gambling being associated with higher levels of harm.

3.2 Response patterns: question specific findings

3.2.1 Self-efficacy: all young people

Three statements were presented to young people, regardless of their gambling behaviour to explore their self-efficacy. In this and the following tables 'Gamblers' are those who have gambled in the last 12 months and non-gamblers are those who have not gambled in the last 12 months.

Table 3.1: GA SELF: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers (last 12 months)		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
I can work through my problems	Agree	1670	62%	61%	63%	63%	65%
	Neither agree nor disagree	362	13%	14%	14%	13%	14%
	Disagree	340	13%	14%	15%	12%	12%
	Don't know	218	8%	7%	7%	9%	9%
	Prefer not to say	103	4%	4%	-	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	950	1,701	1,642
I can do most things if I try	Agree	1792	67%	66%	68%	67%	69%
	Neither agree nor disagree	375	14%	15%	16%	13%	14%
	Disagree	238	9%	10%	10%	8%	9%
	Don't know	198	7%	6%	6%	8%	8%
	Prefer not to say	90	3%	3%	-	3%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	955	1,701	1,649
There are many things that I do well	Agree	1720	64%	64%	67%	64%	66%
	Neither agree nor disagree	370	14%	13%	14%	14%	15%
	Disagree	313	12%	13%	13%	11%	11%
	Don't know	198	7%	6%	7%	8%	8%
	Prefer not to say	91	3%	4%	-	3%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	953	1,701	1,648

'Prefer not to say' / satisficing

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these self-efficacy questions is very low (between 3% and 4%). This indicates that these questions are acceptable to young people and are not considered to be asking about particularly sensitive topics. The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is slightly higher (between 6% and 9%), which indicates that these questions might be difficult for a small minority of young people to understand what the question is asking or how to answer in relation to their own experiences. It is notable that 13-14% respond neither agree nor disagree on all three statements which is higher than the percentage disagreeing. This means that, for 'I can work through my problems', a quarter gave an answer which does not tell us whether they agree or disagree with this statement.

Distribution of answers

The distribution of answers is relatively consistent across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'agree' only ranges between 63% and 69%. All points on the full scale were used with 22% strongly agreeing and 5% strongly disagreeing, which suggests that the scale is well-suited for these questions and participants have an adequate number of options to choose from. The issue lies in young people using the variety of non-agree/disagree answers.

Key findings

- Boys are significantly more likely to 'agree' with each of these questions than girls. For example, seven in ten (67%) boys 'agree' that they can work through their problems, compared to six in ten (59%) girls.
- In addition, BME young people, and those living in high affluence families (Family Affluence Scale)¹⁹ are also significantly more likely to agree with each of these questions compared to young people of white ethnicity or less affluent families.
- Young people aged 16 are the least likely to agree with these questions compared to young people of other ages. It is notable that when comparing young people who have gambled in the last 12 months with those who have not there is no significant difference in the percentage agreeing with each statement.
- Young people who have gambled in the last 4 weeks are significantly less likely than those who have not to agree that they can work through their problems or do most things if they try, suggesting the impacts of gambling may be related to more frequent gambling.
- There were significant differences in responses according to whether young people were problem or at-risk gamblers or non-problem gamblers. Problem and at-risk gamblers were significantly less likely to report that they can do most things if they try (40%) compared with 70% of non-problem gamblers and the results were similar for the statement that there are many things that they do well.

¹⁹ The Family Affluence Scale is a method for young people to self-report their family's affluence using a series of questions about items and services the family has access to (vehicles, holidays abroad, computers, their own room, number of bathrooms, dishwasher). It was developed for the WHO Health behaviour in school aged children survey and is a standard question included on the YPO. A score is calculated and split into three categories – high, medium and low.

3.2.2 Support from adults: All young people

The next set of statements formed a question about the support available to the young person and these were asked to all young people regardless of their gambling behaviour.

Table 3.2: GA ADULT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that at home, there is an adult who...?

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers (last 12 months)		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Is interested in my school work	Agree	2042	76%	75%	78%	76%	79%
	Neither agree nor disagree	205	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
	Disagree	188	7%	8%	8%	6%	7%
	Don't know	160	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%
	Prefer not to say	91	3%	4%	-	3%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	7	*	*	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	1048	1,701	1,645
Really cares about me	Agree	2172	81%	78%	81%	82%	85%
	Neither agree nor disagree	113	4%	5%	5%	4%	4%
	Disagree	159	6%	8%	8%	5%	5%
	Don't know	151	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
	Prefer not to say	92	3%	4%	-	3%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	7	*	*	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	948	1,701	1,646
Tells me when I do a good job	Agree	2032	75%	73%	76%	77%	80%
	Neither agree nor disagree	194	7%	7%	8%	7%	7%
	Disagree	214	8%	10%	11%	7%	7%
	Don't know	157	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
	Prefer not to say	90	3%	4%	-	3%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	7	*	*	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	950	1,701	1,645

Table 3.2 continued GA ADULT: To what extent do you agree or disagree that at home, there is an adult who...?

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers (last 12 months)		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
I trust	Agree	2101	78%	75%	79%	80%	83%
	Neither agree nor disagree	140	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%
	Disagree	196	7%	10%	10%	6%	6%
	Don't know	154	6%	5%	6%	6%	6%
	Prefer not to say	95	4%	4%	-	3%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	7	*	*	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	949	1,701	1,641
Wants me to do my best	Agree	2254	84%	81%	84%	85%	88%
	Neither agree nor disagree	87	3%	4%	4%	3%	3%
	Disagree	116	4%	6%	6%	3%	3%
	Don't know	138	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%
	Prefer not to say	91	3%	4%	-	3%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	7	*	*	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	950	1,701	1,646

'Prefer not to say'/ satisficing

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is very low (between 3% and 4%). This indicates that these questions are acceptable to young people and are not considered to be asking about particularly sensitive topics. The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is also relatively low (between 3% and 6%), which indicates that these questions are easy for young people to understand and answer in relation to their own experiences. The neither agree nor disagree option was used by between 3% and 8% for these statements. A very small number did not answer this question because they had dropped out between the self-efficacy and support questions.

Distribution of answers

There is some variation in the distribution of answers across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'agree' ranges between 75% and 88%. The distribution of answers across the five-point Likert scale is concentrated at the top end ('agree') with a larger percentage strongly agreeing, than agreeing on all five statements. 64-65% strongly agreed that there is an adult who really cares about me or wants **me** to do my best, with only 3% strongly disagreeing.

Key findings

- Girls are significantly more likely to 'agree' with the majority of these questions compared to boys. For example, nine in ten (88%) girls 'agree' that there is an adult who wants them to do their best, compared to eight in ten (81%) boys.
- In addition, young people living in high affluence families are also significantly more likely to agree with each of these questions compared to young people from less affluent families.
- Young people aged 16 are the least likely to 'agree' with these questions compared to young people of other ages.
- For some but not all of the statements those who have gambled in the last 12 months or last 4 weeks are significantly more likely to disagree with the statements than those who have not. It is also notable that for some measures young people whose family have gambled in the last 12 months are more likely to agree with the support statements than young people overall ('Really cares about me,' 'I trust', 'Wants me to do my best'). This may relate to the relationship between family gambling and other characteristics such as family affluence. The percentage whose family has gambled in the last 12 months is highest among high affluence young people, which is also a group showing higher levels of agreement to these statements.
- While results for non-problem gamblers for these questions were similar to non-gamblers, problem and at-risk gamblers were less likely to agree with the statements than non-problem gamblers. The largest difference was for agreement that I can do most things if I try; 72% of non-problem gamblers and 43% of problem and at-risk gamblers agreed with this statement.

3.2.3 Sleep: All young people and gamblers

Young people were asked about their sleep. There were three statements just asked to gamblers about the impact of their gambling on sleep and then three statements asked to all young people.

Table 3.3: GA SLEEP²⁰: Over the past year, how often, if at all, have you lost sleep at night because...

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers (last 12 months)		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
You went to bed late because you were gambling	All the time/ often	21	2%	2%	2%	-	-
	Sometimes	9	1%	1%	1%	-	-
	Rarely/ never	734	74%	74%	88%	-	-
	Don't know	70	7%	7%	8%	-	-
	Prefer not to say	16	2%	2%	-	-	-
	Not applicable	130	13%	13%	-	-	-
	Not stated/ not answered	8	1%	1%	-	-	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	992	843	-	-
You have been excited about your own gambling	All the time/ often	32	3%	3%	4%	-	-
	Sometimes	21	2%	2%	2%	-	-
	Rarely/ never	713	72%	72%	85%	-	-
	Don't know	68	7%	7%	8%	-	-
	Prefer not to say	18	2%	2%	-	-	-
	Not applicable	128	13%	13%	-	-	-
	Not stated/ not answered	8	1%	1%	-	-	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	992	841	-	-
You have been worrying about your own gambling	All the time/ often	16	2%	2%	2%	-	-
	Sometimes	5	*	*	1%	-	-
	Rarely/ never	744	75%	75%	89%	-	-
	Don't know	68	7%	7%	8%	-	-
	Prefer not to say	18	2%	2%	-	-	-
	Not applicable	130	13%	13%	-	-	-
	Not stated/ not applicable	8	1%	1%	-	-	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	992	840	-	-

²⁰ Please note, only some of these question statements were shown to participants who indicated that they do not gamble.

Table 3.3 continued GA SLEEP²¹: Over the past year, how often, if at all, have you lost sleep at night because...

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers (last 12 months)		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
You have been worrying about the gambling of a family member or someone who is responsible for looking after you	All the time/ often	18	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
	Sometimes	11	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	734	74%	74%	88%	77%	87%
	Don't know	71	7%	7%	9%	8%	9%
	Prefer not to say	19	2%	2%	-	2%	-
	Not applicable	127	13%	13%	-	8%	-
Not stated/ not answered	8	1%	1%	-	*	-	
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	841	1,701	1,507
You have been worrying about something (else)	All the time/ often	203	21%	21%	23%	26%	28%
	Sometimes	156	16%	16%	18%	22%	23%
	Rarely/ never	447	45%	45%	52%	40%	43%
	Don't know	60	6%	6%	7%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	19	2%	2%	-	3%	-
	Not applicable	95	10%	10%	-	3%	-
Not stated/ not answered	8	1%	1%	-	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	870	1,701	1,588
You have been excited about something (else)	All the time/ often	168	17%	17%	19%	27%	29%
	Sometimes	241	24%	24%	28%	32%	34%
	Rarely/ never	400	40%	40%	46%	29%	31%
	Don't know	61	6%	6%	7%	6%	6%
	Prefer not to say	19	2%	2%	-	2%	-
	Not applicable	91	9%	9%	-	3%	-
Not stated/ not answered	8	1%	1%	-	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		2,693	2,693	992	877	1,701	1,601

²¹ Please note, only some of these question statements were shown to participants who indicated that they do not gamble.

'Prefer not to say' / satisficing

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is low (2%). This indicates that these questions are acceptable to young people and are not considered to be asking about particularly sensitive topics. The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is also relatively low (between 5% and 8%), which indicates that these questions are easy for most young people to understand and answer in relation to their own experiences. However, when combined with the percentages of young people answering 'not applicable' or not providing an answer at all, the proportion of answers that do not provide any meaningful insight is quite high – around one in ten. It is notable that only one more young person dropped out from the questionnaire between the previous question and this question (not stated/not answered).

Distribution of answers

There is some variation in the distribution of answers across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'all the time' or 'often' ranges between 2% and 23%.

Key findings

- Girls are significantly more likely than boys to report they have 'rarely/never' lost sleep at night because of something related to their own gambling or their family's gambling. For example, eight in ten (82%) girls say they have 'rarely/never' been to bed late because they were gambling, compared to seven in ten (70%) boys.
- Young people aged 14 are the most likely to report that they have 'rarely/never' lost sleep at night because of something related to their own gambling or their family's gambling compared to young people of other ages.
- When comparing gamblers and non-gamblers, those who have not gambled in the last 12 months are significantly more likely than those who have gambled to report losing sleep because they are worried about something or excited about something. This should be borne in mind when considering the sleep related harms from gambling – there are non-gambling-related causes of sleep loss which seem to affect non-gamblers more. However, it should be noted that non-gamblers just received three of the questions and there may be context effects in the results for the two groups.
- At-risk and problem gamblers were significantly more likely than non-problem gamblers to report ever losing sleep because they went to bed late because they were gambling (25% compared with 2%), to lose sleep because they were worrying about gambling (23% and 2% respectively) and to lose sleep because they were excited about gambling (36% compared with 6% respectively).

3.2.4 Impacts of gambling on finances: Gamblers only

Young people who had gambled in the last 12 months were asked about the impacts of their gambling on being able to buy things.

Table 3.4: GAMBIMP: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led to any of the following things? Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Stopped you from buying food or drink when out with friends or at school	All the time/ often	39	4%	5%
	Sometimes	16	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	661	67%	83%
	Don't know	81	8%	10%
	Prefer not to say	36	4%	-
	Not applicable	140	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	16	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	804
Stopped you from buying other things you have wanted	All the time/ often	47	5%	6%
	Sometimes	20	2%	3%
	Rarely/ never	652	66%	81%
	Don't know	82	8%	10%
	Prefer not to say	31	3%	-
	Not applicable	139	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	16	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	810
Stopped you from having enough money to use public transport	All the time/ often	44	4%	6%
	Sometimes	17	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	657	67%	82%
	Don't know	81	8%	10%
	Prefer not to say	33	3%	-
	Not applicable	140	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	16	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	807

Table 3.4 continued GAMBIMP: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led to any of the following things? Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Helped you buy food or drink when out with friends or at school	All the time/ often	55	6%	7%
	Sometimes	30	3%	4%
	Rarely/ never	632	64%	79%
	Don't know	86	9%	11%
	Prefer not to say	32	3%	-
	Not applicable	137	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	16	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	810
Helped you buy other things you have wanted	All the time/ often	60	6%	7%
	Sometimes	39	4%	5%
	Rarely/ never	616	62%	77%
	Don't know	85	9%	11%
	Prefer not to say	34	3%	-
	Not applicable	140	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	16	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	806
Helped you to have enough money to use public transport	All the time/ often	49	5%	6%
	Sometimes	21	2%	3%
	Rarely/ never	641	65%	80%
	Don't know	86	9%	11%
	Prefer not to say	33	3%	-
	Not applicable	142	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	16	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	806

'Prefer not to say'/ satisficing

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is low (3%). This indicates that these questions are acceptable to young people and are not considered to be asking about particularly sensitive topics. The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is higher (between 8% and 11%), which indicates that these questions might be difficult for a small minority of young people to understand and answer in relation to their own experiences. However, when combined with the percentages of young people answering 'not applicable' or not providing an answer at all, the proportion of answers that do not provide any meaningful insight is relatively high – around three in ten. Eight young people dropped out entirely between the previous question and this question, suggesting that dropping out is not

the main issue, it is use of 'prefer not to say', 'don't know' and not applicable codes. It is interesting that so many choose not applicable, since one would expect at least some of these statements to be applicable to most young people.

Distribution of answers

There is limited variation in the distribution of answers across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'all the time' ranges between 2% and 7%. For all statements the most common answer is rarely or never with 77% or more giving this answer.

Key findings

- Girls are significantly more likely than boys to answer 'never' to each of these questions. For example, 82% of girls reported that in the last 12 months their own gambling has 'never' stopped them buying things they wanted, compared with 78% of all young people.
- Young people aged 14, young people who are white, are most likely to respond rarely or never.
- Young people who gambled in the last 4 weeks were less likely to report never experiencing these financial harms, compared with those who had gambled in the last 12 months but not the last 4 weeks. For example, 87% of those who had not gambled in the last four weeks said they were never stopped from buying food or drink when out with friends compared with 76% who had gambled in the last 4 weeks.
- For all the statements, at-risk and problem gamblers were significantly more likely than non-problem gamblers to report ever experiencing any of these financial impacts from gambling (whether positive or negative). Among at-risk and problem gamblers 42% reported that gambling stopped them buying things they wanted compared with 7% of gamblers and the figures for gambling helping them to buy things they wanted were 48% for at-risk and problem gamblers and 13% of non-problem gamblers.

3.2.5 Impacts of gambling on education: Gamblers only

Young people were asked about the impact of their gambling on their schooling.

Table 3.5: GA HARD: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling... Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Made it hard for you to concentrate at school	All the time/ often	29	3%	4%
	Sometimes	13	1%	2%
	Rarely/ never	666	67%	86%
	Don't know	67	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	35	4%	-
	Not applicable	156	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	20	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	788
Made it hard for you to attend school	All the time/ often	32	3%	4%
	Sometimes	9	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	666	67%	86%
	Don't know	69	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	35	4%	-
	Not applicable	157	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	20	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	788
Made it hard for you to get to school on time	All the time/ often	31	3%	4%
	Sometimes	9	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	670	68%	86%
	Don't know	64	7%	8%
	Prefer not to say	37	4%	-
	Not applicable	156	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	20	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	788
Made it hard for you to put effort into your homework/ personal study	All the time/ often	32	3%	4%
	Sometimes	11	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	664	67%	86%
	Don't know	65	7%	8%
	Prefer not to say	35	4%	-
	Not applicable	160	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	20	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	786

Table 3.5 continued: GA HARD: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling...**Gamblers in last 12 months only**

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Made you feel very tired at school	All the time/ often	34	3%	4%
	Sometimes	7	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	664	67%	86%
	Don't know	67	1%	9%
	Prefer not to say	41	4%	-
	Not applicable	154	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	20	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	786
Made you feel energised at school	All the time/ often	39	4%	5%
	Sometimes	10	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	656	66%	85%
	Don't know	70	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	36	4%	-
	Not applicable	157	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	20	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	785

'Prefer not to say' / satisfying

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is low (4%). This indicates that these questions are acceptable to young people and are not considered to be asking about particularly sensitive topics. However, for most of these questions, the percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is slightly higher (between 7% and 9%), which indicates that for a small minority of young people, these questions might be difficult to understand and answer in relation to their own experiences. When combined with the percentages of young people answering 'not applicable' or not providing an answer at all, the proportion of answers that do not provide any meaningful insight is high – around three in ten. It is surprising that 16% of young people gave an answer or not applicable to these questions which should apply to most young people. The not applicable answer code was offered for participants to self-report it was not applicable (e.g. if they don't use public transport). However, since this question was routed on whether or not they gamble (and in a later section we suggest removing specific spending items), we recommend removing the not applicable answer option.

Distribution of answers

The distribution of answers is relatively consistent across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'rarely/never' only ranges between 85% and 86%. However, since the final statement is close to the opposite of the penultimate statement this raises concerns about whether young people are really thinking about the statements as they answer. Very similar percentages reported rarely or never feeling tired at school (86%) or energised at

school (85%) as result of gambling and 4% reported always or often being tired and 5% always or often being energised. This suggests that too many questions with lists of statements to respond to using the same scale, may encourage the use of mental short cuts and satisficing.

Key findings

- Boys are significantly more likely than girls to report that in the last 12 months their gambling has affected their school attendance and experience. For example, one in ten (10%) boys who gambled report that in the last 12 months their gambling has made it hard for them to attend school, compared to 3% of girls.
- Young people who are 'worst off' on the social ladder, are also more likely than those 'better off' to report that in the last 12 months their gambling has affected their attendance and experience across most of these measures.
- At-risk and problem gamblers were more likely than non-problem gamblers to report that gambling had affected their schooling with 31% of at-risk and problem gamblers saying it made it hard for them to attend school, and 29% saying it made it hard for them to concentrate at school compared with 4% of non-problem gamblers on both measures. Interestingly at-risk and problem gamblers were also significantly more likely to report feeling energised at school as a result of their gambling (31% compared with 5% of non-gamblers). This suggests that gambling gives young people energy as well as making them tired, that young people did not understand the word energised or that young people were satisficing by selecting the same answer for all items in the scale.

3.2.6 Impacts of gambling on emotions: Gamblers only

Young people who gamble were asked about how they feel when they gamble.

Table 3.6: GA EXP: Thinking about your experiences of gambling, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
I feel happy when I gamble	Agree	118	12%	13%
	Neither agree nor disagree	167	17%	19%
	Disagree	320	32%	14%
	Don't know	279	28%	32%
	Prefer not to say	81	8%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	22	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	892
When I gamble I forget about my worries for a while and just enjoy myself	Agree	100	10%	11%
	Neither agree nor disagree	129	13%	15%
	Disagree	370	37%	42%
	Don't know	280	28%	32%
	Prefer not to say	87	9%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	22	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	889
When I gamble I feel that I can achieve something	Agree	106	11%	12%
	Neither agree nor disagree	121	12%	14%
	Disagree	378	38%	43%
	Don't know	267	28%	31%
	Prefer not to say	86	9%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	22	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	890

Table 3.6 continued GA EXP: Thinking about your experiences of gambling, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
I feel anxious or stressed when I gamble	Agree	56	6%	6%
	Neither agree nor disagree	124	13%	14%
	Disagree	202	20%	47%
	Don't know	283	29%	32%
	Prefer not to say	89	9%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	22	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	877
I feel guilty when I gamble	Agree	67	7%	8%
	Neither agree nor disagree	110	11%	13%
	Disagree	418	42%	47%
	Don't know	285	29%	32%
	Prefer not to say	85	9%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	22	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	890
I feel sad when I gamble	Agree	57	6%	7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	107	11%	12%
	Disagree	428	43%	49%
	Don't know	288	29%	33%
	Prefer not to say	86	9%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	22	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	888
I feel angry when I gamble	Agree	61	6%	7%
	Neither agree nor disagree	108	11%	12%
	Disagree	200	20%	48%
	Don't know	287	29%	33%
	Prefer not to say	89	9%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	22	2%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	886

'Prefer not to say' / satisficing

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is higher than on some other questions (between 8% and 9%). The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is also higher than for some other questions (between 28% and 33%). In addition, 12-19% neither agreed nor disagreed. This means that for all these statements less than half of young people reported either agreeing or disagreeing with the statements. This suggests that these questions are hard to answer, perhaps because the feelings vary from time to time or because young people may feel that saying gambling has a positive or a negative impact on their feelings may not be socially acceptable (even though this is a confidential online survey).

Distribution of answers

There is some variation in the distribution of answers across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'disagree' among those giving a valid answer, ranges between 23% and 48%. This suggests that in contrast to other questions, young people are considering each of these statements, and not just giving the same answer to each. It is also notable that the percentage agreeing is higher for the statements which indicate a positive rather than a negative impact of gambling. This is something which needs further exploration in subsequent research.

Key findings

- Boys are significantly more likely to 'agree' with each of these questions compared to girls. For example, one in ten (9%) boys 'agree' that when they gamble they feel guilty, compared to 3% of girls. However, boys were also significantly more likely to report the positive emotions when gambling, for example 15% of boys and 8% of girls said they feel happy when they gamble.
- On all the statements about feelings at-risk and problem gamblers were significantly more likely than non-problem gamblers to agree they experienced each feeling when they gamble. It is interesting that the greatest disparity was on positive feelings. So while 18% of at-risk and problem gamblers and 5% of non-problem gamblers reported feeling anxious or stressed when they gamble, 36% of at-risk and problem gamblers and 8% of non-problem gamblers reported forgetting about their worries and just enjoying themselves.

3.2.7 Impact of gambling on relationships: young people who gamble

Young people were asked about the impact of their gambling on their relationships with parents and friends.

Table 3.7: GA GAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led you to... Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Argue with your parents or guardians	All the time/ often	30	3%	4%
	Sometimes	12	1%	2%
	Rarely/ never	648	66%	85%
	Don't know	67	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	41	4%	-
	Not applicable	153	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	766
Lie to your parents or guardians	All the time/ often	30	3%	4%
	Sometimes	12	1%	2%
	Rarely/ never	650	66%	86%
	Don't know	69	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	39	4%	-
	Not applicable	153	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	768
Be out without your parents knowing where you are	All the time/ often	29	3%	4%
	Sometimes	19	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	644	65%	85%
	Don't know	71	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	39	4%	-
	Not applicable	151	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	769

Table 3.7 continued GA GAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led you to... Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Lose your parents' trust	All the time/ often	28	3%	4%
	Sometimes	11	1%	2%
	Rarely/ never	651	66%	86%
	Don't know	69	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	39	4%	-
	Not applicable	154	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	766
Talk to your parents about how you feel	All the time/ often	42	4%	6%
	Sometimes	20	2%	3%
	Rarely/ never	621	63%	82%
	Don't know	76	8%	10%
	Prefer not to say	40	4%	-
	Not applicable	153	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	765
Become less close to your friends	All the time/ often	22	2%	3%
	Sometimes	15	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	649	66%	86%
	Don't know	68	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	64	5%	-
	Not applicable	153	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	760

Table 3.7 continued GA GAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led you to... Gamblers in last 12 months only

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Not feel comfortable around your friends	All the time/ often	18	2%	2%
	Sometimes	13	1%	2%
	Rarely/ never	651	66%	87%
	Don't know	70	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	41	4%	-
	Not applicable	160	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	760
Make new friends	All the time/ often	40	4%	5%
	Sometimes	37	4%	5%
	Rarely/ never	604	61%	80%
	Don't know	70	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	45	5%	-
	Not applicable	157	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	758
Argue with your friends	All the time/ often	25	3%	3%
	Sometimes	15	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	640	65%	85%
	Don't know	74	8%	10%
	Prefer not to say	38	4%	-
	Not applicable	160	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	761
Feel that you need to gamble to be accepted by others	All the time/ often	23	2%	3%
	Sometimes	10	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	651	66%	87%
	Don't know	67	7%	9%
	Prefer not to say	43	4%	-
	Not applicable	159	16%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	35	4%	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		992	992	756

'Prefer not to say'/ satisficing

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is low (between 4% and 5%). The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is slightly higher (between 7% and 10%). When combined with the percentages of young people answering 'not applicable' or not providing an answer at all, the proportion of answers that do not provide any meaningful insight is quite high – around three in ten. At this point in the questionnaire 4% of those who started this section had dropped out, but the main issue is not young people stopping the questionnaire, but rather giving responses which do not indicate agreement or disagreement.

Distribution of answers

The distribution of answers is relatively consistent across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'rarely/never' only ranges between 80% and 87%. As with the questions about emotions, young people were slightly more likely to report agreement to the positive relationship related impacts, rather than the negative impacts.

Key findings

- Boys are significantly more likely than girls to report that in the last 12 months, their gambling has affected their relationships with their parents/guardians or friends. For example, one in ten (10%) boys report that in the last 12 months their gambling has 'sometimes', 'often' or 'all the time' led them to be punished by their parents or guardians, compared to a smaller percentage of girls (4%).
- Young people in Wales are more likely to answer 'rarely/never' in response to the majority of these questions in comparison to young people who live in other regions.
- Young people who are 'worst off' on the social ladder, are also more likely than those 'better off' to report that in the last 12 months their gambling has affected their relationships with their parents/guardians or friends across most of these measures.
- At-risk and problem gamblers were significantly more likely than non-problem gamblers to ever experience the relationship impacts from gambling (both positive and negative). At-risk and problem gamblers were more likely to report that their gambling led to them lying to their parents (39%) compared with 7% of non-problem gamblers, however 25% of at-risk and problem gamblers reported that gambling had led them to talk to their parents about how they feel compared with 9% of non-gamblers. The findings were similar for relationships with friends.

3.2.8 Financial impacts of gambling by others: young people whose family have gambled in the last 12 months

The harms framework is also designed to encompass the harms from the gambling of others. Therefore, the pilot included questions about the impact of other family members' gambling.

Table 3.8: GA FAMILYGAM: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your family's gambling led to any of the following things? Family has gambled in the last 12 months

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Stopped you from having enough food (food at home or money on school canteen card/ account)	All the time/ often	31	3%	8%	6%	1%	1%
	Sometimes	12	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	807	76%	73%	88%	79%	92%
	Don't know	45	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%
	Prefer not to say	8	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	136	13%	12%	-	13%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>399</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>503</i>
Stopped you from having other things you need (for example heating or hot water at home, or transport)	All the time/ often	31	3%	5%	6%	1%	2%
	Sometimes	7	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	808	77%	73%	88%	79%	92%
	Don't know	49	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%
	Prefer not to say	10	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	134	13%	12%	-	13%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>503</i>

Table 3.8 continued GA FAMILYGAM: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your family's gambling led to any of the following things? Family has gambled in the last 12 months

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Caused your family to go into debt or fall behind on rent, mortgage or other important bills	All the time/ often	28	3%	4%	5%	1%	2%
	Sometimes	11	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	804	76%	73%	88%	79%	92%
	Don't know	50	5%	5%	6%	5%	5%
	Prefer not to say	11	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	136	13%	12%	-	13%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>399</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>502</i>
Stopped you from belonging to clubs or doing activities you like doing	All the time/ often	35	3%	5%	6%	2%	2%
	Sometimes	5	*	1%	1%	*	*
	Rarely/ never	808	77%	73%	88%	79%	93%
	Don't know	47	4%	5%	6%	4%	5%
	Prefer not to say	10	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	134	13%	12%	-	13%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>502</i>
Stopped you from going on trips (e.g. family holidays or school outings)	All the time/ often	27	3%	4%	5%	1%	2%
	Sometimes	9	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	812	77%	74%	89%	79%	92%
	Don't know	50	5%	5%	6%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	9	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	133	13%	12%	-	13%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>400</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>504</i>

Table 3.8 continued GA FAMILYGAM: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your family's gambling led to any of the following things? Family has gambled in the last 12 months

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Helped your family to pay for things you need such as food, heating, or transport	All the time/ often	42	4%	6%	7%	2%	3%
	Sometimes	15	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	760	72%	71%	84%	73%	85%
	Don't know	80	8%	7%	8%	8%	10%
	Prefer not to say	8	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	134	13%	11%	-	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>402</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>500</i>
Helped your family to pay for other things or activities	All the time/ often	43	4%	6%	7%	3%	3%
	Sometimes	24	2%	3%	3%	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	753	71%	69%	82%	73%	86%
	Don't know	75	7%	6%	8%	8%	9%
	Prefer not to say	10	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	134	13%	11%	-	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>399</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>500</i>
Helped you to go on trips (e.g. family holidays or school outings)	All the time/ often	38	4%	5%	6%	2%	3%
	Sometimes	14	1%	1%	1%	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	770	73%	72%	86%	74%	87%
	Don't know	72	7%	6%	7%	8%	9%
	Prefer not to say	10	1%	1%	-	1%	-
	Not applicable	136	13%	12%	-	14%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	17	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>397</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>500</i>

'Prefer not to say'/ satisficing

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is small (1%). This indicates that these questions are totally acceptable to young people and are not considered to be asking about particularly sensitive topics. The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is higher (between 4% and 10%). When combined with the percentages of young people answering 'not applicable' (even though only those who reported their family gambled were asked the questions) or not providing an answer at all, the proportion of answers that do not provide any meaningful insight is quite high – around two in ten.

Distribution of answers

The distribution of answers is relatively consistent across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'rarely/never' only ranges between 85% and 93%.

Key findings

- Across the majority of these questions, gender does not impact how young people answer.
- Young people who are 'worst off' on the social ladder, are more likely than those 'better off' to report that in the last 12 months their family's gambling has affected their access to commodities or activities across the majority of these measures.
- When comparing the data for those who have gambled themselves in the last 12 months and those who have not, those who have gambled themselves are significantly more likely to report that they 'all the time' or 'often' experience these negative financial impacts from their family's gambling.

3.2.9 Impacts of family gambling on relationships: those whose family has gambled in the last 12 months

The survey included a series of statements asked about relationships with family and friends as a result of family gambling.

Table 3.9: GA FAMLED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all have you felt that your family's gambling has led to... (Family has gambled in the last 12 months)

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Your parents or guardians having less time to spend with you	All the time/ often	19	2%	3%	4%	*	*
	Sometimes	21	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
	Rarely/ never	794	75%	73%	89%	77%	91%
	Don't know	47	4%	3%	4%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	10	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	147	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>390</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>496</i>
Your parents or guardians being less interested in your education	All the time/ often	25	2%	4%	5%	1%	1%
	Sometimes	13	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	793	75%	72%	89%	78%	91%
	Don't know	49	5%	4%	4%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	9	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	149	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>391</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>496</i>
Your parents or guardians talking to you less	All the time/ often	18	2%	3%	4%	1%	1%
	Sometimes	22	2%	3%	4%	1%	2%
	Rarely/ never	791	75%	72%	88%	77%	91%
	Don't know	48	5%	4%	4%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	10	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	149	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>391</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>495</i>

Table 3.9 continued GA FAMED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all have you felt that your family's gambling has led to... (Family has gambled in the last 12 months)

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Your parents or guardians not caring about your feelings	All the time/ often	22	2%	4%	5%	1%	1%
	Sometimes	12	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	800	76%	72%	89%	79%	93%
	Don't know	45	4%	3%	4%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	9	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	149	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>391</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>496</i>
You not being able to trust your parents	All the time/ often	24	2%	4%	5%	1%	1%
	Sometimes	12	1%	2%	2%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	797	75%	73%	89%	78%	92%
	Don't know	46	4%	4%	4%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	11	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	149	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>391</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>494</i>
More arguments or tension at home	All the time/ often	28	3%	3%	4%	2%	3%
	Sometimes	17	2%	2%	3%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	786	74%	73%	89%	76%	90%
	Don't know	49	5%	4%	5%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	9	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	149	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>391</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>495</i>

Table 3.9 continued GA FAMED: Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all have you felt that your family's gambling has led to...

Question statements	Answer codes	Total number	Total percentage	Gamblers		Non-gamblers	
				Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'	Percentage including 'prefer not to say'	Percentage excluding 'prefer not to say'
Your family spending more time doing things together	All the time/ often	33	3%	4%	5%	3%	3%
	Sometimes	20	2%	3%	3%	1%	2%
	Rarely/ never	764	72%	70%	87%	74%	87%
	Don't know	61	6%	5%	6%	7%	8%
	Prefer not to say	11	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	149	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>388</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>495</i>
You becoming less close to your friends	All the time/ often	20	2%	3%	4%	1%	1%
	Sometimes	11	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
	Rarely/ never	797	76%	73%	90%	78%	92%
	Don't know	51	5%	4%	5%	5%	6%
	Prefer not to say	9	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	150	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>389</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>495</i>
You feeling that you need to gamble to be accepted by others	All the time/ often	20	2%	3%	4%	1%	1%
	Sometimes	11	1%	2%	2%	*	*
	Rarely/ never	798	76%	73%	89%	78%	92%
	Don't know	51	5%	4%	5%	6%	7%
	Prefer not to say	9	1%	2%	-	*	-
	Not applicable	149	14%	13%	-	15%	-
	Not stated/ not answered	18	2%	3%	-	*	-
<i>Base (unweighted)</i>		<i>1,060</i>	<i>1,060</i>	<i>478</i>	<i>390</i>	<i>582</i>	<i>496</i>

'Prefer not to say'/ satisfying

The percentage of young people answering 'prefer not to say' to these questions is negligible (between 0% and 1%). The percentage of young people answering 'don't know' is slightly higher (between 4% and 8%). When combined with the percentages of young people answering 'not applicable' or not providing an answer at all, the proportion of answers that do not provide any meaningful insight is quite high – around two in ten.

Distribution of answers

The distribution of answers is relatively consistent across each of these questions. For example, the percentage of young people answering 'rarely/never' only ranges between 87% and 93%, as young people gave similar answers to each statement.

Key findings

- Across the majority of these questions, gender does not impact how young people answer, though boys reported higher impacts than girls for some of the relationship statements. For example, boys were significantly more likely than girls to report that family gambling leads them to feel they need to gamble to be accepted (5% of boys and 1% of girls).
- Young people who are 'worst off' on the social ladder, are more likely than those 'better off' to report that in the last 12 months they have felt that their family's gambling has affected their parents' interaction with them or level of attention across most of these measures.
- Those who have gambled themselves are significantly more likely than those who have not to report negative relationship consequences from their family's gambling 'all the time' or 'often'.

3.3 Item reduction

As described in the section on response patterns, a series of new questions with multiple statements were asked to explore different types of gambling harm. These are summarised below.

Question	Description	Number of statements
GA_SELF	Statements about self-efficacy (5 point Agree/disagree scale) Asked to all regardless of gambling behaviour.	3 (for all)
GA_ADULT	Statements about support from adults (5 point Agree/disagree scale) Asked to all regardless of gambling behaviour.	5 (for all)
GA_SLEEP	Statements about sleep, some of which can be asked to all and others can only be asked of gamblers (5 point Frequency scale Never to all the time)	6 (for gamblers) 3 (for non-gamblers)
GA_GAMBIMP	Statements about impact of gambling on their life (5 point Frequency scale Never to all the time) Asked to gamblers only	6 (for gamblers)
GA_HARD	Statements about impact of gambling on school life (5 point Agree/disagree scale) Asked to gamblers only	6 (for gamblers)
GA_EXP	Statements about feelings when gambling (5 point Agree/disagree scale) Asked to gamblers only	7 (for gamblers)

Question	Description	Number of statements
GA_GAMLED	Statements about relationships (5 point Frequency scale Never to all the time) Asked to gamblers only	11 (for gamblers)
GA_FAMILYGAM	Statements about impact of others gambling on their life (5 point Frequency scale Never to all the time) Asked to those whose family gambles	8 (for family gamblers)
GA_FAMLED	Statements about relationships (5 point Frequency scale Never to all the time) Asked to gamblers only	9 (for family gamblers)

In addition, some existing questions which related to these harms were also asked

IMP	How important things are in helping people do well and get on in life (4 point importance scale)	6 original and 2 added related to gambling harms
GC_FELTBAD	How often felt bad as a result of own gambling (5 point Frequency scale Never to all the time) Asked to gamblers only	1
GC_FELTBADFAM	How often felt bad as a result of family gambling (5 point Frequency scale Never to all the time) Asked to all	1

3.3.1 Multiple statements

Approach: Multiple statements were included in the questionnaire to test how they performed in the pilot and to generate some data about how responses from individuals on the different dimensions compare, to identify overlaps and redundant items. As a result of this we can suggest how the number of statements could be reduced in the questionnaire to reduce burden and questionnaire length.

3.3.2 Similar results across statements

A general finding from this analysis, shown in the pattern of response section and the item reduction analysis, is that levels of agreement to the harms statements were very similar across statements and therefore the results for the statements on each question were highly correlated. This could indicate that the statements measure the same concept and that young people experience a range of harms under a particular domain. This could suggest that in order to identify harm in that domain not all of the statements are needed. It could indicate satisficing in the way the questionnaires is completed with young people 'straight-lining' or selecting the same answer for all statements within a question, or a combination of these. Whatever the explanation for this high level of correlation between statements, it suggests that a substantial reduction in the number of statements being asked about harms would be desirable.

3.3.3 Principal Components Analysis: Approach

A principle components analysis was carried out to identify how the statements group into themes statistically. As a result of this we have been able to show that there are multiple statements in the same theme or factor and have grouped the statements into those factors.

Having done this, for each model, we identified the statement with the highest scores within each theme or factor. In most cases this determined the suggested statement to keep. In some cases, additional or alternative statements were considered for retention in the questionnaire, for example if the strongest statement was one which was positive (e.g. how gambling helped young people to buy something) and it needed to be balanced with a more negative one, since the focus is on harms.

Once the factor analysis had been carried out, Ipsos MORI recommended some statements to retain based on the analysis and the balance of questions which would work in the questionnaire. These recommendations were discussed with the Gambling Commission, GambleAware and the project steering group and a final list of statements to retain was agreed based on initial recommendations, information needs and the need to avoid making the questionnaire too long and repetitive for young people. For example, where the recommended statements were very similar to those in the existing youth adapted DSM-IV-MR-J questions a decision was made to avoid duplication. It is therefore recommended that in exploring harm, these items from the youth adapted DSM-IV-MR-J are analysed alongside the new harms questions (the relevant questions are shown in Annex A).

Once this subset of statements had been chosen, a further analysis was carried out to identify whether reducing the number of statements for analysis would affect the correlation of the statements with our chosen outcome measure (life satisfaction). To do this we compared the correlation between the full factor model based on all the statements and our chosen outcome measure (life satisfaction), with the correlation between the reduced statements and life satisfaction. It should be noted that there are generally low correlations between the harms statements and wellbeing, but we felt that if considering harms, well-being is the most sensible measure to use to test the impact of item reduction. There were no more suitable measures available in the data.

Five principle components analyses were carried out. We present the factor analysis, the proposed reduced statements and the analysis with life satisfaction for each of these analyses below.

Once the number of statements had been reduced, in order to streamline the questionnaire, some of the questions from the pilot were amalgamated into single questions where the question stem would be suitable for both sets of statements. The final recommended questions are shown in Annex A,

PCA 1: Self-efficacy, adult support and quality of sleep for all young people, regardless of gambling behaviour.

Analysis 1 included 11 statements (3 from GA_SELF about self-efficacy, 5 from GA_ADULT about support and the 3 from GA_SLEEP about quality of sleep which were asked of all participants). Table 1.11 shows that the statements group into three factors or themes corresponding to the three questions they formed part of. The correlation matrix in the appendix shows the high correlation between the statements within each factor.

Results

The clear factors and the high correlation between the statements suggest that most of them could be dropped from the self-efficacy and adult support questions. There was a lower correlation between the sleep statements suggesting they could all potentially be retained. However, keeping three sleep related statements and only one self-efficacy and one adult support statements would make the questionnaire imbalanced so we have suggested keeping only two of the sleep statements.

Recommendation

We recommend only keeping two of the sleep statements and one each for self-efficacy and adult support. The statements proposed for retention are shown in bold with * in the table below. They were selected to balance keeping those with high values in the analysis and which would look balanced in the questionnaire and meet the needs of the Gambling Commission.

Correlation analysis

When a correlation was run with these four statements against a measure of life satisfaction, the R-Square was 0.251, compared with a R-Square of 0.234 for the full three factor model including all the statements. Using a reduced number of statements does not reduce the correlation with this outcome measure.

Table 3.10: Principle Components Analysis 1

Keep	Variable	Statement	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3
	GA_SELF_1	I can work through my problems		0.827	
*	GA_SELF_2	I can do most things if I try		0.846	
	GA_SELF_3	There are many things that I do well?		0.84	
	GA_ADULT_1	At home, there is an adult who... Is interested in my school work?	0.833		
*	GA_ADULT_2	At home, there is an adult who... Really cares about me?	0.889		
	GA_ADULT_3	At home, there is an adult who... Tells me when I do a good job?	0.863		
	GA_ADULT_4	At home, there is an adult who... I trust?	0.87		
	GA_ADULT_5	At home, there is an adult who... Wants me to do my best?	0.9		
*	GA_SLEEP_4	Lost sleep because: You have been worrying about something			0.754
	GA_SLEEP_5	Lost sleep because: You have been excited about something			0.803
*	GA_SLEEP_6	Lost sleep because: You have been worrying about the gambling of a family member or someone who is responsible for looking after you			0.517

PCA 2: Impact of gambling behaviour on life in general and school life

Analysis 2 included variables measuring sleep, financial and educational harm for those who have gambled in the last 12 months.

Results

This showed that there were three factors or themes corresponding to how the statements were grouped into the three questions. The analysis results suggested that one statement should be included from each factor.

Recommendation

We recommend keeping two statements for each theme: sleep, finances, education. The statement from the financial harm related question which is suggested by the statistics was one relating to a positive financial benefit from gambling. We recommend that a statement indicating negative financial consequences is included. The six statements proposed for retention are shown in bold with * in the table below. We would suggest the wording of the financial ones are changed to remove the word 'other'. We suggest changing the wording of GA_GAMBIMP_5 from 'wanted' to 'needed'. We have included education statements which cover impacts at school as well as on their own study. There was a suggestion to retain 'Made it hard for you to attend school', however this is similar to the youth adapted DSM-IV-MR-J statement about missing school. Therefore, this statement has not been retained in the harms section but the relevant youth adapted DSM-IV-MR-J question about missing school should be included in the harms analysis.

Correlation analysis

A correlation analysis with life satisfaction was conducted with the reduced statements to be retained in the survey and the full factor model. This showed the R-Square for the four questions is 0.085, compared with a correlation of 0.073 for the full model. In both cases the correlation with a measure of wellbeing is low and reducing the number of statements very slightly improved the correlation.

Table 3.11: Principle Components Analysis 2

Keep	Variable	Label	Factor1	Factor2	Factor3
*	GA_SLEEP_1	You went to bed late because you were gambling			0.872
*	GA_SLEEP_2	You have been worrying about your own gambling			0.851
	GA_SLEEP_3	You have been excited about your own gambling			0.831
	GA_GAMBIMP_1	Stopped you from buying food or drink when out with friends		0.772	
*	GA_GAMBIMP_2	Stopped you from buying other things you have wanted?		0.768	
	GA_GAMBIMP_3	Stopped you from having enough money to use public transport?		0.728	
	GA_GAMBIMP_4	Helped you buy food or drink when out with friends or at school		0.826	
*	GA_GAMBIMP_5	Helped you buy other things you have wanted?		0.842	
	GA_GAMBIMP_6	Helped you to have enough money to use public transport?		0.825	
*	GA_HARD_1	Made it hard for you to concentrate at school?	0.881		
	GA_HARD_2	Made it hard for you to attend school?	0.862		
	GA_HARD_3	Made it hard for you to get to school on time?	0.858		
*	GA_HARD_4	Made it hard for you to put effort into your homework/personal study?	0.894		
	GA_HARD_5	Made you feel very tired at school?	0.888		
	GA_HARD_6	Made you feel energised at school?	0.818		
	GA_HARD_3	Made it hard for you to get to school on time?	0.858		

PCA 3: Impact of gambling behaviour on feelings and relationships

Analysis 3 included variables measuring emotional and relationship related harm, thinking of both positive and negative emotions and relationships with family and friends for those have gambled in the last 12 months.

Results

This showed that there were four factors or themes, with two factors from the emotions question – positive and negative and one each from the other questions.

Recommendation

The results suggested that one statement could be included from each factor. However, we recommend that for the feelings factor we include three statements: happy, guilty, sad. For the relationship factor three statements should be included, to cover parents (positive and negative statements) and friends. Talking to parents about how you feel is recommended because of the low correlation with the other statement chosen within this factor. The statements 'lie to your parents or guardian' and 'argue with your friends' were initially suggested for inclusion, however as they are similar to existing statements on the youth adapted DSM-IV-MR-J, alternative statements were agreed on. The harms analysis should include analysis of the relevant statements from the youth adapted DSM-IV-MR-J. These statements are shown in the Annex A. In the final question the statements about being punished by your parents and talking to your parents were reversed in order to start with a positive statement, followed by two negative statements.

The six statements proposed for retention are highlighted in the table below.

Although the existing question about whether your gambling led you to feel bad was identified as different factor, additional analysis showed that the new questions about feeling happy, sad, and guilty provided more nuanced information about feelings associated with gambling. The felt bad about gambling question was an existing question on the survey which had been introduced as a stop gap while the harms module was developed. Now that the full module is ready, it has been decided to drop this question.

Correlation analysis

When a correlation with life satisfaction was run the correlation was low for both the selected questions and the full factor model, but was slightly higher for the selected questions (R-Square of 0.073 compared with 0.051 for the full model).

Table 3.12: Principle Components Analysis 3

Keep	Variable	Label	FACTOR 1	FACTOR 2	FACTOR 3	FACTOR 4
*	GA_GAMEXP_1	I feel happy when I gamble?			0.897	
	GA_GAMEXP_2	When I gamble I forget about my worries for a while and just enjoy myself?			0.858	
	GA_GAMEXP_3	When I gamble I feel that I can achieve something?			0.846	
	GA_GAMEXP_4	I feel anxious or stressed when I gamble?		0.874		
*	GA_GAMEXP_5	I feel guilty when I gamble?		0.923		
*	GA_GAMEXP_6	I feel sad when I gamble?		0.936		
	GA_GAMEXP_7	I feel angry when I gamble?		0.901		
	GA_GAMLED_1	Argue with your parents or guardians	0.88			
	GA_GAMLED_2	Lie to your parents or guardians	0.909			
	GA_GAMLED_3	Be out without your parents knowing where you are	0.86			
*	GA_GAMLED_4	Be punished by your parents or guardians	0.926			
	GA_GAMLED_5	Lose your parents' trust	0.888			
*	GA_GAMLED_6	Talk to your parents about how you feel	0.794			
	GA_GAMLED_7	Become less close to your friends	0.931			
*	GA_GAMLED_8	Not feel comfortable around your friends	0.937			
	GA_GAMLED_9	Make new friends	0.815			
	GA_GAMLED_10	Argue with your friends	0.937			
	GA_GAMLED_11	Feel that you need to gamble to be accepted by others	0.876			
	GC_FELTBAD	In the past 12 months how often, if at all, would you say you have felt bad as a result of your own gambling?				0.981

PCA 4: Impact of family gambling behaviour on finances, and relationships

The new harms questions were designed to capture the impacts of the gambling of family members on young people. Therefore, there were some statements which related specifically to this.

Result

The model showed that there were two factors which corresponded to the two questions.

Recommendation

We initially recommend that two statements for each theme are retained as shown in the table below. After discussion, it was decided to include four financial related statements, since the financial harms from family gambling could be more serious for young people than the financial consequences of their own gambling. During focus groups at an earlier stage of the project, young people raised the importance of clubs, trips holidays and other opportunities and therefore it was felt to be important to include these in the final questionnaire. The 'how often you felt bad as a result of family gambling' was not included in the original PCA but is shown in the table below as we initially proposed to retain it. Unlike the question about whether your own gambling makes you feel bad, the question about whether family gambling makes you feel bad measured something not included in the new harms questions. Based on the finding that questions about specific feelings worked better for young people's own gambling a decision was made to replace the existing felt bad as a result of family gambling question with a new question like the one about their own gambling which asked how often the gambling of family members made them feel sad or worried (two statements). The routing was also amended to make it consistent with the other questions about family gambling. The proposed new questions are shown in Annex A.

Correlation analysis

The correlation analysis with life satisfaction showed that for the model containing the questions being retained as well as GC_FELTBADFAM the correlation with life satisfaction is 0.047 and for the full model plus GC_FELTBADFAM it is 0.038, meaning the correlation with the more limited selection of statements is higher.

Table 3.13: Principle Components Analysis 4

Keep	Variable	Label	Factor1	Factor2
*	GA_FAMILYGAM_1	Stopped you from having enough food (food at home or money on school canteen card or account)		0.814
	GA_FAMILYGAM_2	Stopped you from having other things you need (for example heating or hot water at home, or transport)		0.813
	GA_FAMILYGAM_3	Caused your family to go into debt or fall behind on rent, mortgage or other important bills		0.814
*	GA_FAMILYGAM_4	Stopped you from belonging to clubs or doing activities you like doing		0.852
*	GA_FAMILYGAM_5	Stopped you from going on trips (e.g. family holidays or school outings)		0.836
	GA_FAMILYGAM_6	Helped your family to pay for things you need such as food, heating, or transport		0.872
*	GA_FAMILYGAM_7	Helped your family to pay for other things or activities		0.831
	GA_FAMILYGAM_8	Helped you to go on trips (e.g. family holidays or school outings)		0.808
*	GA_FAMLED_1	Your parents or guardians having less time to spend with you	0.833	
	GA_FAMLED_2	Your parents or guardians being less interested in your education	0.871	
	GA_FAMLED_3	Your parents or guardians talking to you less	0.879	
	GA_FAMLED_4	Your parents or guardians not caring about your feelings	0.889	
	GA_FAMLED_5	You not being able to trust your parents	0.884	
*	GA_FAMLED_6	More arguments or tension at home	0.819	
	GA_FAMLED_7	Your family spending more time doing things together	0.761	
	GA_FAMLED_8	You becoming less close to your friends	0.864	
	GA_FAMLED_9	You feeling that you need to gamble to be accepted by others	0.858	
*	GC_FELTBADFAM	How often would you say that gambling among your family members and/or people you live with has made you feel bad?		

PCA 5: Impacts on life attitudes

The Gambling Commission section of the questionnaire already had a question with multiple statements relating to what young people felt would help them get on in life. During the development work for the harms questions it was suggested that the question did not include two important statements relating to family support and working hard which might help people do well and get on in life. These two statements were added to the existing statements and a PCA was carried out to identify whether the new statements added a different theme to the question.

Result

This analysis showed a generally low correlation between the statements and that they did not group into factors or themes.

Recommendation

It is recommended that all the statements including the two new ones could be retained. However, as the two new statements are not core to the concept of gambling-related harm they should be reviewed by the team responsible for the main part of the questionnaire, to decide whether they are needed for the core module.

Correlation analysis

The correlation between each statement and whether or not the young person had gambled in the last 4 weeks was considered. This showed that those who agreed that being encouraged and supported by your family or working hard were important for getting on in life were less likely to have gambled in the last 4 weeks, in contrast to those who agreed that being lucky helped people get on in life who were more likely to have gambled in the last 4 weeks.

Table 3.14: Principle Components Analysis 5

Variable	Label
IMPCONT_NEW_1	Importance of in helping people to do well and get on in life - Being encouraged and supported by your family?
IMPCONT_NEW_2	Importance of in helping people to do well and get on in life - Working hard?
IMPCONT_OLD_1	Importance of - Being confident?
IMPCONT_OLD_2	Importance of - Being lucky?
IMPCONT_OLD_3	Importance of - Going to university?
IMPCONT_OLD_4	Importance of - Knowing the right people?
IMPCONT_OLD_5	Importance of - Passing exams/getting qualifications?
IMPCONT_OLD_6	Importance of - Family background

3.4 Overall harms measure

While each individual statement can be analysed and interpreted in its own right, another way of looking at harms is to create a score. There is the potential to do this for the proposed set of harms questions. Annex B includes some analysis which shows how this could be done and looking at how the overall harms measure scores are related to problem gambling. This analysis highlights the complexity of creating a score and the assumptions and decisions which need to be made. On reflection, it was agreed that, at this stage a firm approach to creating a score cannot be agreed, particularly because of the high number of answers across each statement set which cannot be used to create a score because of 'prefer not to say' and 'don't know' answers. A score is something which could be developed in the future, once the final new set of questions have been used and the results analysed at an individual question level.

Conclusions and recommendations

There are three main areas where we would recommend making changes to resolve the issues around missing answers, of potential satisficing, participant burden and harm scores.

Missing answers

The results presented here show that although the questions about harm did not lead to complete drop out from the questionnaire and the percentage saying 'prefer not to say' is low, the wide range of answer options which did not themselves indicate level of harm have resulted in missing answers from a substantial minority of the sample on many questions.

Implication

This impacts on the ability to report on harms, particularly as we do not know whether those who choose not to give a substantive answer are more or less likely than those responding to experience harm.

Recommendation

We suggest that consideration is given to removing the not applicable answer option where only groups for whom the questions should be relevant are routed to them.

Removal of 'prefer not to say' would not comply with our questionnaire quality and compliance rules and it would be unwise to remove 'don't know' on questions where this is a popular answer. In presenting results from the main data collection and analysis, the 'don't know' and neither agree nor disagree should be presented since they are such important responses.

Satisficing

There is evidence of young people giving very similar answers to every statement in a set within a question. However, analysis of one set of statements (self-efficacy) suggests that 40% of participants did give different answers across the three statements and so there is discrimination happening. For some participants, the same answer for all three statements is their genuine answer.

Recommendation

From a participant burden and statistical point of view it is desirable to reduce the number of statements as similar answers mean that many statements are not adding any additional information. A shorter, much simpler set of statements may also allow young people to think more deeply about the answers they are giving.

A principle components analysis was used to suggest the items which should be retained based on their statistical properties, but with additional judgements made based on the balance of the questionnaire. As a result, we have suggested reducing the statements or questions from 63 to 24. We have demonstrated that this would not affect the correlation with life satisfaction.

We have also reduced burden and rationalised the questionnaire by amalgamating statements into fewer questions. The final suggested questions are shown in Annex A.

Overall harms measure

We have carried out exploratory analysis to create an overall harms measure from the suggested statements for retention. However, an analysis of the links between the scores and measures of gambling behaviour and demographics shows very little correlation between the scores and these other measures. The exception, is evidence of greater harm for problem and at-risk gamblers.

Recommendation

We do not recommend developing an overall harms measure at this stage. It is our recommendation to analyse each of the statements separately and comment on the meaning and implication of results for that particular statement. This is because we suggest reducing the number of statements, because of missing data through 'prefer not to say' and 'don't know' answers, and inconsistency in the direction of harm in relation to the answer category values on many questions.

Creating a harms measure is a development which could be considered in the future but is not currently necessary and would need further statistical analysis and discussion to derive a robust overall harms measure, which overcomes the issue of missing data on one or more items which feed into the measure.

Further research

The harms resulting from youth gambling are complex and questions on an online questionnaire can only provide a partial insight into this issue. In addition to including the questions on YPO we also recommend other parallel research is carried out to explore the issue of gambling harm more broadly. This includes the use of administrative data to understand aspects of harm and development which young people cannot report on themselves such as education attainment. These data could be usefully linked with the self-reported survey data. There are also issues such as links with youth offending which need a different approach because the prevalence is too low to explore in a survey.

In order to understand the nuances of harm and how they are experienced by young people qualitative interviews with young people are recommended, particularly to understand more about the emotional impacts. It would be useful to have the input of experts in the field of youth and child psychology to develop and interpret this line of work.

Annex A: Final questions

The final questions proposed for inclusion in the 2020 Young People's Omnibus on the subject of gambling harm are shown below. As described in the main part of the report, these statements are a reduced number from among those included in the pilot. Some of the statements have been amalgamated into the same question when this was appropriate. The questions are being added to the questionnaire after the youth adapted DSM-IV-MR-J questions.

SHOW ALL

GA_INTRO

The next few questions ask about your opinions on a range of issues. Remember, everything you tell us is confidential; no one at school will see your answers.

New questions

ASK ALL

Q1 GA_SELF /GA ADULT

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

Grid question. Single-code per row. Rotate scale

- 1 GA_SELFTRY I can do most things if I try
- 2 GA_ADULTCARES At home there is an adult who really cares about me

Columns:

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know
7. Prefer not to say

Q2 GA_SLEEP

Over the past year, how often, if at all, have you lost sleep at night because...

Grid question. Single-code per row. Note that not all statements will be shown to all participants

- 3 GA_SLEEPLATE You went to bed late because you were gambling (ASK OF gamblers only defined as ALL WHO CODED 'YES' A-C FOR ONE OR MORE OPTION AT GC_GAMSPEND)
- 4 GA_SLEEPWRYGAM You have been worrying about your own gambling (ASK OF gamblers only defined as ALL WHO CODED 'YES' A-C FOR ONE OR MORE OPTION AT GC_GAMSPEND)
- 5 GA_SLEEPWRYELSE You have been worrying about something (ASK ALL) (INCLUDE 'else' for gamblers defined as ALL WHO CODED 'YES' A-C FOR ONE OR MORE OPTION AT GC_GAMSPEND)
- 6 GA_SLEEPFAMGAM You have been worrying about the gambling of a family member or someone who is responsible for looking after you (ASK ALL)

Columns:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Often
5. All the time
6. Don't know
7. Prefer not to say
8. Not applicable (Only ask for 6 GA_SLEEPFAMGAM)

ALL WHO CODED 'YES' A-C ONE OR MORE OPTION AT GC_GAMSPEND

GA_GAMBIMP

The following questions are about the impacts of your gambling on your life. Remember, 'gambling' includes things like buying Lottery tickets, placing a private bet, playing cards for money, and playing on fruit or slot machines (e.g. at an arcade, pub or club).

ALL WHO CODED 'YES' A-C ONE OR MORE OPTION AT GC_GAMSPEND

Q3 GA_GAMB/ HARD

Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led to any of the following things?

Grid question. Single-code per row. ROTATE CODES 1-5

- 7 GA_GAMBSTBUY Stopped you from buying things you have wanted
- 8 GA_GAMBHPBUY Helped you buy things you have needed
- 9 GA_HARDCON Made it hard for you to concentrate at school
- 10 GA_HARDEFF Made it hard for you to put effort into your homework/personal study

Columns:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Often
5. All the time
6. Don't know
7. Prefer not to say

ALL WHO CODED 'YES' A-C ONE OR MORE OPTION AT GC_GAMSPEND

Q4 GA_EXP

Thinking about your experiences of gambling, how much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Grid question. Single-code per row. ROATE CODES 1-5

- 11 GA_EXPHAP I feel happy when I gamble
- 12 GA_EXPGUIL I feel guilty when I gamble
- 13 GA_EXPSAD I feel sad when I gamble

Columns:

1. Strongly agree
2. Agree
3. Neither agree nor disagree
4. Disagree
5. Strongly disagree
6. Don't know
7. Prefer not to say

ALL WHO CODED 'YES' A-C ONE OR MORE OPTION AT GC_GAMSPEND**Q5 GA_GAMLED**

Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your own gambling led you to...

Grid question. Single-code per row. ROTATE CODES 1-5

14 GA_GAMLEDTLK Talk to your parents about how you feel

15 GA_GAMLEDPUN Be punished by your parents or guardians

16 GA_GAMLEDCOM Not feel comfortable around your friends

Columns:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Often
5. All the time
6. Don't know
7. Prefer not to say

ASK ALL WHO SAY 'YES' CODE 1 TO ANY ACTIVITY AT GC_FAMGAM**GA_SCRNFAM**

The following questions are about the impacts of gambling by members of your family. By family we mean any family members who you live with and any other family members or guardians who are responsible for looking after you.

Remember, 'gambling' includes things like buying Lottery tickets, scratchcards, placing a private bet, playing cards for money and playing on fruit or slot machines. [Click here for a reminder of what gambling includes.](#)

ASK ALL WHO SAY 'YES' CODE 1 TO ANY ACTIVITY AT GC_FAMGAM**Q6 GA_FAMGAM/FAM LED**

Thinking about the last 12 months, how often, if at all, has your family's gambling led to any of the following things?

Grid question. Single-code per row. ROTATE CODES 1-5

17 GA_FAMGAMFOOD Stopped you from having enough food (food at home or money on school canteen card/account)

18 GA_FAMGAMCLB Stopped you from belonging to clubs or doing activities you like doing

29 GA_FAMGAMTRP Stopped you from going on trips (e.g. family holidays or school outings)

20 GA_FAMGAMPAY Helped your family to pay for other things or activities

21 GA_FAMLEDTME Your parents or guardians having less time to spend with you

22 GA_FAMLEDARG More arguments or tension at home

Columns:

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Often
5. All the time
6. Don't know
7. Prefer not to say

ASK ALL WHO SAY 'YES' CODE 1 TO ANY ACTIVITY AT GC_FAMGAM

GC_NEWFELTBADFAM

In the past 12 months how often, if at all, would you say that gambling among your family members and/or people you live with has made you feel...

23 GC_NEWFELTBADFAMSAD Sad?

24 GC_NEWFELTBADFAMWOR Worried?

Single-code

1. Never
2. Rarely
3. Sometimes
4. Often
5. All the time
6. Don't know
7. Prefer not to say

New statements for existing question which could be added, but which are not essential for the measurement of harms

ASK ALL

IMPCONT

And how important, if at all, is each of the following things in helping people to do well and get on in life?

Grid question. Single-code per row.

Rows:

IMPCONTENC Being encouraged and supported by your family

IMPCONTHARD Working hard

Columns:

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
5. Don't know
6. Prefer not to say

Existing questions of value for harms analysis and to be retained

ASK ALL WHO CODED A-C AT GC_GAMSPEND

GC_LED

In the past 12 months has your gambling ever led to the following?

Grid question. Single-code per row.

Rows:

GC_LEDRIKEDFAM Arguments with family/ friends or others

GC_LEDLYING Telling lies to family/ friends or others

GC_LEDRIKEDSCHL Missing school

Columns:

1. My gambling has never led to this
2. Once or twice
3. Sometimes
4. Often
5. Prefer not to say

ASK ALL**SCHWELL**

How well do you feel you are doing at school at the moment?

Single-code

1. Very well
2. Quite well
3. Not very well
4. Not at all well
5. Don't know
6. Prefer not to say

ASK ALL**LADDER**

Imagine that the ladder shown below pictures how British society is set up.

At the top of the ladder are the people who are the best off—they have the most money, the highest level of education, and the jobs that bring the most respect. At the bottom are people who are the worst off—they have the least money, little or no education, no job or jobs that some people say no one wants or respects.

Now thinking about your family. Tick the box next to the number that best describes where your family would be on this ladder.

Single-code

10	Best off
9	
8	
7	
6	
5	
4	
3	
2	
1	
0	Worst off

ASK ALL

IMP

How important, if at all, is each of the following things in helping people to do well and get on in life?

Grid question. Single-code per row.

Rows:

IMPCONF Being confident

IMPLUCKY Being lucky

IMPUNI Going to university

IMPKNOW Knowing the right people

IMPEXAM Passing exams/getting qualifications

IMPFAM Family background (for example, what members of a family do for a living, how much money a family has, which part of the country a family lives in and so on)

Columns:

1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
5. Don't know
6. Prefer not to say

SHOW ALL

LIFESCRN

The next questions are about your feelings on aspects of your life. There are no right or wrong answers. For each of these questions give an answer on a scale of 0 to 10, where 0 is "not at all" and 10 is "completely".

ASK ALL

GA_SATIS

Overall, how satisfied are you with your life nowadays?

Single code

0 – Not at all satisfied	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 – Completely satisfied
--------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---------------------------

Don't know

Prefer not to say

ASK ALL

GA_WORTH

Overall, to what extent do you feel that the things you do in your life are worthwhile?

Single code

0 – Not at all worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 – Completely worthwhile
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------------

Don't know

Prefer not to say

ASK ALL

GA_HAPPY

Overall, how happy did you feel yesterday?

Single code

0 – Not at all happy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 – Completely happy
-------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	--------------------------

Don't know

Prefer not to say

ASK ALL

GA_ANXIOUS

Finally, on a scale where 0 is "not at all anxious" and 10 is "completely anxious", overall, how anxious did you feel yesterday?

Single code

0 – Not at all anxious	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 – Completely anxious
---------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----------------------------

Don't know

Prefer not to say

Annex B: Overall Harms measure

Introduction

Based on the Principle Components Analysis (PCA), the statements which are proposed for inclusion going forward have been grouped into a series of harms measures which could also be grouped into an overall harms measure. This one approach to analysing data from statements on the same topic.

Because some questions are asked for all, for gamblers and for those whose family gamble, the score variables have been created like this. The scores were created by adding up the responses across the relevant variables in which strongly agree is 1 and strongly disagree is 5 and never is 1 and always is 5. For statements where never and strongly agree clearly represent a lack of harm this works well. There are statements where those scores indicate an impact of gambling, but one which could be interpreted as positive. Therefore, two versions of the scores were initially created, one in which any impact is negative and one in which a positive impact has a low score and never or strongly agree are given a score of 5. Further analysis of the individual statements against whether or not the young person is an at-risk or problem gambler shows that this group experience greater impacts from gambling, whether negative or positive, than other young people. Since there is an association of even apparently positive impacts with problem gambling, a decision has been made to treat all impacts of gambling as an indication of harm, even if on the face of, it the impact is positive, for example feeling happy when gambling.

This section has been moved to an annex, because after discussion it was agreed that it is too early to create an overall harms measure because we need a fuller understanding of the efficacy of these questions and their suitability for use in this way. There is also an issue that there are many participants for whom a score cannot be created because of 'prefer not to say' or 'don't know' answers on at least one statement and more sophisticated statistical work is needed to create an approach to the measure which could handle missing data.

This could be a future development once the data for the new questions has been fully analysed in a year in which just the selected statements have been included in the survey. At present it seems most fruitful to compare the gambling behaviour and demographic groups by individual statements and measures rather than creating a score which could hide interesting findings and reduces the number of participants included in the analysis.

Table A2.1: Summary of harms scoring approach

Item	Harm score 1 (all – self-efficacy, support, sleep)	Harm score 2 (gambler – finance, education, sleep)	Harm score 3 (gambler – feelings and relationships)	Harm score 4 (family gambler – finance, sleep, relationships, feelings)
Item 1	I can do most things if I try (GA_SELF_2)	You went to bed late because you were gambling (GA_SLEEP_1)	I feel happy when I gamble (GA_GAMEXP_1)	Stopped you from having enough food (food at home or money on school canteen) (GA_FAMILYGAM_1)
Item 2	At home there is an adult who really cares about me? (GA_ADULT_2)	Lost sleep because you have been worrying about your own gambling (GA_SLEEP_2)	I feel guilty when I gamble (GA_GAMEXP_5)	Stopped you from belonging to clubs or doing activities you like doing (GA_FAMILYGAM_4)
Item 3	Lost sleep because: You have been worrying about something (GA_SLEEP_4)	Stopped you from buying other things you have wanted? (GA_GAMBIMP_2)	I feel sad when I gamble (GA_GAMEXP_6)	Stopped you from going on trips (e.g. family holidays or school outings) (GA_FAMILYGAM_5)
Item 4		Helped you buy other things you have wanted (GA_GAMBIMP_5)	Be punished by your parents or guardians (GA_GAMLED_4)	Helped your family to pay for other things or activities? (GA_FAMILYGAM_7)
Item 5		Made it hard for you to concentrate at school (GA_HARD_1)	Talk to your parents about how you feel (GA_GAMLED_6)	Your parents or guardians having less time to spend with you (GA_FAMLED_1)
Item 6		Made it hard for you to put effort into your homework/personal study (GA_HARD_4)	Not feel comfortable around your friends (GA_GAMLED_8)	More arguments or tension at home (GA_FAMLED_6)
Item 7				Lost sleep because: You have been worrying about the gambling of a family member or someone (GA_SLEEP_6)
Score meaning	Low score means less harm.	Low score means less harm	Low score means less harm	Low score means less harm
Minimum	3	6	5	7
Maximum	15	30	25	35

For non-gamblers the only relevant score is Harm Score 1. However, for the gamblers Harm Score 2 and 3 can be summed together to create an overall harms measure for all gambling-related harm.

Note: In creating these scores 'don't know', 'prefer not to say' and other answers have been set to missing which means that harm scores are not available for every case. Given the relatively large number of cases giving a 'prefer not to say', 'don't know' or neither agree nor disagree answer, this does limit the analysis.

Correlation with other established measures

In order to understand whether the harms questions are measuring something meaningful, we have looked at mean harms measure scores according to whether or not the young person gambles, frequency of gambling and problem gambling. We have also looked at the measures by some key demographics (gender, ethnicity, year group and family affluence scale).

Findings

- Table A2.2 shows that there is no significant difference in harm scores for general harms not directly attributed to gambling or for harms related to family gambling, according to whether or not the young person has gambled in the last 12 months.
- Looking at harms related to gambling (Harm scores 2 and 3) there is very little difference in the harm scores related to the frequency of gambling.
- Looking at the scores for non-problem gamblers compared with those who are at-risk and problem gamblers, the harm scores are higher for at-risk and problem gamblers on all scores.

Table A2.2: Mean harms measure scores by gambling behaviour and problem gambling

Gambling behaviour	Harm score 1 (all – self-efficacy, support, sleep)	Harm score 2 (gambler – finance, education, sleep – any impact is negative)	Harm score 3 (gambler – feelings and relationships – any impact is negative)	Harm score 2 and 3 combined (gamblers – all impact is negative)	Harm score 4 (family gambler – finance, sleep, relationships, feelings – all impact is negative)	Base (unweighted)
Non-gambler	6.27	-	-	-	7.69	423 to 1,382
Gambled in last 12 months	6.11	7.39	9.11	16.457	8.41	429 to 764
Gambled in last 4 weeks	6.25	8.05	9.43	17.19	9.38	180 to 397
Gambled in last 7 days	6.25	9.21	10.12	18.90	11.04	80 to 191
Non-problem gambler	5.93	6.86	8.66	15.54	7.69	302 to 688
At-risk and problem gambler	7.62	11.27	12.44	22.63	12.98	45 to 75
Family has not gambled in last 12 months	6.08	7.24	8.76	15.93		162 to 1,200
Family has gambled in last 12 months	6.39	7.50	9.36	16.80	8.01	251 to 749

Unweighted Bases: The range for the bases is shown as the base for every cell is different. A range is shown so the reader can see the minimum and maximum base size for each category.

Demographic differences in harm measures

We have looked at how the answers to the individual questions/ statements and any overall score relate to key demographics, both overall and for gamblers/ non-gamblers. This helps to establish whether there may be other factors contributing to the level of harm, or to identify whether there are certain demographic groups for which the harms questions seem to work less well.

Findings

- Table A2.3 shows that there are limited differences in gambling harm scores for the different demographic groups. Boys experience greater harms in the domains of feelings and relationships and from family gambling than girls do. There are limited differences by ethnic background and year group.
- There are no clear patterns in the harm scores by family affluence and only relatively small differences between low and high affluence families, even though on some individual measures (particularly in the area of financial impact) there is greater harm for children from low affluence families.

Table A2.3 Mean harms measure scores by demographics

Gambling behaviour	Harm score 1 (all – self-efficacy, support, sleep)	Harm score 2 (gambler – finance, education, sleep)	Harm score 3 (gambler – feelings and relationships)	Harm score 2 and 3 combined (gamblers – all impact is negative)	Harm score 4 (family gambler – finance, sleep, relationships, feelings – all impact is negative)	Base (unweighted)
Boy	5.88	7.78	9.53	17.64	8.33	249-1,091
Girl	6.50	6.74	8.38	14.65	7.71	165-999
White British	6.29	7.39	9.08	16.20	7.91	336-1,554
Not White British	5.97	7.43	9.27	17.34	8.56	88-566
Year 7-9	5.97	7.36	8.81	16.15	7.95	205-1,152
Year 10-11	6.60	7.44	9.50	16.84	8.11	224-994
FAS: High affluence	5.94	7.34	9.16	16.31	7.57	185-851
FAS: Medium affluence	6.35	7.45	8.86	16.46	8.35	172-885
FAS: Low affluence	6.45	7.38	9.60	16.81	8.27	72-410

Unweighted Bases: The range for the bases is shown as the base for every cell is different. A range is shown so the reader can see the minimum and maximum base size for each category.

Margaret Blake

Research Director
margaret.blake@ipsos.com

Leila Morris

Senior Research Executive
leila.morris@ipsos.com

For more information

3 Thomas More Square
London
E1W 1YW

t: +44 (0)20 3059 5000

www.ipsos-mori.com

<http://twitter.com/IpsosMORI>

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.