Ipsos MORI
Social Research Institute

September 2016

Young People and Gambling 2016

A research study among 11-15 year olds on behalf of the Gambling Commission

Young People Omnibus 2016, Technical Note

GAMBLING COMMISSION

Contents

Technical Note

1 Technical Details

Ipsos MORI, on behalf of the Gambling Commission, conducted research among 11-15 year olds to identify the prevalence of gambling among young people.

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

The findings are based on data from a representative sample of 2,411 11-15 year olds attending academies[2] and maintained[3] schools in England and Wales. The research was conducted in a sample of schools, with pupils filling out paper self-completion questionnaires under supervision by Ipsos MORI's interviewers.

1.1 Objectives

The overall aim of this research study was to explore gambling behaviours and attitudes. In addition, where previous data could be drawn upon, the study looked to analyse gambling trends over time. The survey covered the following key issues:

- Young people's rates of gambling on different types of games;
- Behaviour patterns of young people in relation to gambling, for example where and when they gamble and who they are with at the time;
- Perceptions and awareness of gambling advertisements; and,
- Gauging problem gambling among young people, in order to draw comparisons with earlier studies.

1.2 Research design

The Young People Omnibus aims to represent pupils aged 11-16 years attending academies and maintained secondary and middle schools in England and Wales.

1.2.1 Sampling

A three-stage sampling method was used:

i. a sample of schools selected from Edubase – a comprehensive listing of secondary schools in England and Wales. Special schools and sixth form colleges were excluded from the sampling frame. The frame was stratified by

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

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

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

Government Office Region (GOR) and, within each stratum, schools were selected proportional to the number of pupils attending the school. In total 452 schools were selected to participate in the survey;

ii. one curriculum year group (Year 7-Year 11) selected at random for each school. Interviewers were instructed to select only mixed ability class groups for interview;

iii. all members of a randomly-selected class group within the nominated curriculum year selected to fill out the self-completion survey.

1.2.2 Response rate

Of the 452 schools approached, 103 schools participated, giving an unadjusted school response rate of 23%. Overall, fully completed questionnaires were obtained from 2,555 pupils aged 11-16 years; an average of 25 pupils per class.

The focus of the Gambling Commission report is 11-15 year olds who are not legally old enough to play the National Lottery. In total the Young People Omnibus survey conducted 2,411 interviews with 11-15 year olds. However, 16 year olds were asked the same set of questions relating to gambling activities, and, where applicable, their responses will be included for comparative purposes.

1.2.3 Fieldwork

Interviewing was carried out through self-completion questionnaires with the whole class in one classroom period.

Interviewers attempted to secure interviews from all pupils in selected classes. If more than four pupils were absent on the day of interview, interviewers returned to the class to conduct 'mop up' sessions at a later date.

Interviewing was carried out through self-completion questionnaires with the whole class in one classroom period. An Ipsos MORI interviewer was present to explain the survey to pupils, to reassure them about the confidentiality of the survey, to assist them in completing the questionnaire, and to collect completed questionnaires.

Fieldwork for the study was conducted from 18th January to 26th April 2016.

1.2.4 Weighting

Data are weighted by gender, age and region. The weights were derived from data supplied by the Department for Education and StatsWales. The effect of weighting is shown in the sample profile.

1.3 Presentation and interpretation of data

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

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

1.4 Sample profile

The following table outlines the details of the sample profile for the 2016 study; covering all 11-16 year olds who participated in the Young People Omnibus. The subsequent table compares the sample profile for the current project with the previous three studies (2015, 2014 and 2013).

Sample profile - 2016	Number	Unweighted %	Weighted %
Total	2,555	100	100
Gender of Pupils			
Male	1,210	47	51
Female	1,345	53	49
Age of Pupils			
11	283	11	10
12	570	22	20
13	552	22	20
14	536	21	19
15	470	18	21
16	144	6	10
Year of Pupils			
7	577	23	20
8	542	21	20
9	550	22	20
10	589	23	20
11	297	12	20
Ethnic Origin			
White	1,972	77	78
BME	550	22	21
Region			
London	422	17	14
South East	362	14	15
South West	249	10	9
North East	121	5	5
North West	359	14	12
East of England	222	9	11
East Midlands	158	6	8
West Midlands	139	5	11
Yorkshire & Humberside	368	14	10
Wales	155	6	5

Sample profile – 2013-2016	2013 Weighted %	2014 Weighted %	2015 Weighted %	2016 Weighted %
Total	100	100	100	100
Gender of Pupils				
Male	50	50	50	51
Female	49	49	49	49
Age of Pupils				
11	9	8	9	10
12	20	19	19	20
13	20	20	19	20
14	20	21	21	19
15	19	20	21	21
16	12	11	11	10
Year of Pupils				
7	19	19	19	20
8	20	20	20	20
9	20	20	20	20
10	21	20	20	20
11	20	21	21	20
Household Composition				
Two parents in household	74	77	76	77
Single parent in household	24	21	22	20
Sibling in household	83	82	83	83
Region				
London	13	14	14	14
South East	15	15	15	15
South West	9	9	9	9
North East	5	5	5	5
North West	13	12	12	12
East of England	11	11	11	11
East Midlands	8	9	9	8
West Midlands	10	11	11	11
Yorkshire & Humberside	10	10	10	10
Wales	7	6	6	5

1.5 Statistical reliability

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

Size of sample on which survey results is based	Approximate sampling tolerances applicable to percentages at or near these levels		
	10% or 90%	30% or 70%	50%
	±	±	±
100 interviews	6	9	10
500 interviews	3	4	4
1,000 interviews	2	3	3
2,555 interviews *(Young People Omnibus children aged 11-16)*	1	2	2

Source: Ipsos MORI

For example, with a sample of 2,555 where 30% give a particular answer, the chances are 95 in 100 that the "true" value (which would have been obtained if the whole population had been interviewed) will fall within the range of plus or minus 2 percentage points from the sample result.

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

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

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

Source: Ipsos MORI

1.6 Acknowledgements

It is clear that schools are increasingly working under great pressure from a number of different sources and that they receive numerous requests to participate in surveys such as this. We would like to thank the many schools that took part and we are indebted to all pupils and staff who made this survey possible. As a token of Ipsos MORI's appreciation, all participating schools will receive a curriculum pack, designed to aid lesson planning.

1.7 Presentation and interpretation of data

When interpreting the findings, it is important to remember that results are based on a sample of the maintained school population, and not the entire population. Consequently, results are subject to sampling tolerances, and not all differences between sub-groups are statistically significant.

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

1.8 Publication of data

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

2 Problem Gambling Overview

2.1 Problem gambling screen definitions

The 2014, 2015 and 2016 research studies asked a series of questions relating to potential issues associated with gambling and utilised the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screener to define typologies of gamblers[4]. The table below indicates how the questions asked in 2016 mapped onto the DSM-IV-MR-J problem gambling screen components and the percentage of children who gave the required answers to each question when the scoring system was applied to the data.

The core focus of previous ad hoc surveys[5] was the responses of 12 to 15 year olds who show a predisposition towards problem gambling behaviours. In order to maximise comparability over time the following analysis is based on responses from the same age group.

Problem and social gambler criteria from the DSM-IV-MR-J screen			
2016 Question No.	**DSM-IV criteria**	**Question wording: *During the past 12 months' . . . .***	**If any of the following answer criteria are ticked, that qualifies as 1 point**
QE9	Preoccupation	Have you found yourself thinking about gambling or planning to gamble	'Often'
QE12	Tolerance	Have you needed to gamble with more and more money to get the amount of excitement you want	'Sometimes' or 'often'
QE11	Withdrawal	Have you felt bad or fed up when trying to cut down on gambling	'Sometimes' or 'often'
QE13	Loss of control	Have you ever spent much more than you planned to on gambling	'Sometimes' or 'often'
QE10	Escape	Have you gambled to escape from problems or when you were feeling bad	'Sometimes' or 'often'
QE16	Chasing	After losing money on gambling have you returned another day, try to win back the money you lost	'More than half the time' or 'every time'
QE15b	Lying	Has you gambling ever led to the following: telling lies to family/friends or others	'Once or twice' 'sometimes' or 'often'
QE14	Illegal acts	Have you ever taken money from any of the following without permission to spend on gambling: Dinner money or fare money Money from family Money from things you've sold Money from outside the family Somewhere else	If any one or more of these options are ticked, then qualifies for one point in total
QE15	Risked relationships	Has your gambling ever led to the following: a) Arguments with family/friends or others d) Missing school	If any of the following are ticked, then qualifies for one point in total: 'once or twice', 'sometimes' or 'often'
			Source: Ipsos MORI

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

[5] 'The British Survey of Children, the National Lottery and Gambling, 2008-2009' Ipsos MORI for the National Lottery Commission, 2009 and 'Under 16s and the National Lottery' MORI for the National Lottery Commission 2006.

2.2 Problem gambling screen analysis

Using the DSM-IV-MR-J screen, a child who confirms that they had undertaken four or more of the behaviours / actions (from the overall screen of nine components outlined above) is considered a problem gambler, a score of two or three is used to identify an at-risk gambler and a score of zero or one indicated a social gambler[6].

Our findings indicate that in 2016 10.2% of children aged 12-15 were identified as social gamblers (n=218), 1.6% as at-risk gamblers (n=34) and 0.4% as 'problem' gamblers (n=8). The table below outlines the proportions for each category by age and gender.

Prevalence of social, at risk or problem gambling amongst key sub-groups*

	2016	*Type of gambler*[7]		
		Social	***At risk***	***Problem***
Total	*2,128*	10.2% (n=218)	1.6% (n=34)	0.4% (n=8)
Gender[8]				
Boys	*1,023*	14.6%	1.9% (n=19)	0.6% (n=6)
Girls	*1,105*	6.2%	1.4% (n=15)	0.2% (n=2)
Age				
12	*570*	9.6%	1.7% (n=10)	0.4% (n=2)
13	*552*	10.0%	1.8% (n=10)	0.4% (n=2)
14	*563*	11.0%	1.2% (n=7)	0.6% (n=3)
15	*470*	9.8%	1.4% (n=7)	0.2% (n=1)

Base: All children aged 12-15 (2,128)

*The data shown is unweighted in line with the approach taken in previous years.

2.3 Screening method applied

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

1) Respondents included in the screen were aged 12-15. Young people aged 11 and 16 were removed from the screen in order to ensure consistency with previous years. Young people who stated that they did not gamble at any of questions QE9 – QE15 were removed from the data set, along with those who did not state an answer

[6] Children who indicate at any point in the Problem Gambler Screen that they have not gambled in the past 12 months are excluded from the analysis.

[7] Respondents classified irrespective of whether they completed all nine elements of screen.

[8] Figures do not sum to the total sample size due to blank responses.

throughout each of these questions. Those remaining were all included in the screen (260 young people were included in the screen altogether)

2) Points were then awarded to each respondent based on the answers they gave during the screening questions.

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

Jane Stevens
Research Director
Jane.Stevens@ipsos.com

Will Dawes
Research Manager
Will.Dawes@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.