

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 BACKGROUND.....	1
1.2 RESEARCH AIMS AND OBJECTIVES.....	1
1.3 PROJECT SCOPE.....	2
1.4 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT.....	3
<b>CHAPTER 2 REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 INTRODUCTION.....	5
2.2 KEY CHARACTERISTICS OF THE VICTORIAN GAMBLING INDUSTRY.....	5
2.3 ACCESSIBILITY AS AN INFLUENCE ON GAMBLING BEHAVIOUR.....	5
2.4 DIMENSIONS OF ACCESSIBILITY TO GAMBLING.....	7
2.4.1 Geographical Opportunities to Gamble.....	7
2.4.2 Machine Numbers.....	7
2.4.3 Machine Density.....	9
2.4.4 Proximity.....	10
2.4.5 Social Accessibility.....	11
2.4.6 Opening Hours.....	13
2.4.7 Conditions of Entry.....	14
2.4.8 Ease of Use.....	15
2.4.9 Initial Outlay.....	16
2.4.10 Summary.....	17
2.5 GAMBLING BY GAMING VENUE EMPLOYEES.....	17
2.5.1 Overseas Studies.....	17
2.5.2 Australian Studies.....	18
2.6 CHAPTER CONCLUSION.....	20
<b>CHAPTER 3 RESEARCH METHODS .....</b>	<b>23</b>
3.1 INTRODUCTION.....	23
3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN.....	23
3.3 SURVEY INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT AND PILOT TESTING.....	25
3.3.1 Draft Survey Development.....	25
3.3.2 Refining the Survey Instrument.....	27
3.4 SURVEY ADMINISTRATION.....	28
3.4.1 Survey Population, Sample Size and Selection.....	29
3.4.2 Survey Administration and Responses Generated.....	29
3.5 CHARACTERISTICS OF SURVEY RESPONDENTS.....	29

3.5.1	Demographic Characteristics .....	29
3.5.2	Workplace Characteristics .....	30
3.5.3	Employment Characteristics .....	31
3.5.4	Involvement in Workplace Gambling Operations .....	32
3.5.5	Summary .....	33
<b>3.6</b>	<b>THE QUALITATIVE PHASE: TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS.....</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>3.7</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4 RESTRICTIONS ON GAMBLING BY STAFF IN THE WORKPLACE .....</b>		<b>37</b>
<b>4.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.2</b>	<b>VICTORIAN LEGISLATION AND REGULATIONS .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.3</b>	<b>INDUSTRY CODES OF PRACTICE.....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.4</b>	<b>SURVEY RESULTS .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.5</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>CHAPTER 5 THE GAMBLING BEHAVIOUR OF GAMING VENUE STAFF .....</b>		<b>43</b>
<b>5.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>43</b>
<b>5.2</b>	<b>GAMBLING PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>43</b>
5.2.1	Overall Gambling Participation .....	43
5.2.2	Number of Gambling Activities .....	43
5.2.3	Participation in Different Gambling Activities .....	45
5.2.4	Gambling Participation Inside and Outside the Workplace .....	45
<b>5.3</b>	<b>GAMBLING FREQUENCY.....</b>	<b>48</b>
5.3.1	Overall Gambling Frequency .....	48
5.3.2	Characteristics of Regular Gamblers .....	49
5.3.3	Gambling Frequency Inside and Outside the Workplace.....	55
5.3.4	Characteristics of Regular Workplace Gamblers.....	58
<b>5.4</b>	<b>GAMBLING EXPENDITURE.....</b>	<b>62</b>
5.4.1	Overall Gambling Expenditure .....	62
5.4.2	Expenditure on Each Type of Gambling.....	62
5.4.3	Gambling Expenditure of Regular Gamblers.....	64
5.4.4	Gambling Expenditure Inside and Outside the Workplace.....	65
<b>5.5</b>	<b>GAMBLING DURATION .....</b>	<b>68</b>
5.5.1	Duration of Each Type of Gambling .....	68
5.5.2	Gambling Duration of Regular Gamblers .....	69
5.5.3	Gambling Duration Inside and Outside the Workplace .....	71
<b>5.6</b>	<b>CHANGES IN GAMBLING SINCE WORKING IN GAMING VENUES.....</b>	<b>73</b>
<b>5.7</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF RESULTS .....</b>	<b>73</b>
5.7.1	Key Results for All Types of Gambling.....	73
5.7.2	Key Results for Gambling Inside and Outside the Workplace .....	74
<b>5.8</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>76</b>

**CHAPTER 6 PROBLEM GAMBLING AMONGST GAMING VENUE STAFF .... 77**

<b>6.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>6.2</b>	<b>PREVALENCE OF PROBLEM GAMBLING .....</b>	<b>77</b>
<b>6.3</b>	<b>GAMBLING PARTICIPATION AMONGST CPGI GROUPS .....</b>	<b>78</b>
6.3.1	Gambling Participation for Each CPGI Group .....	78
6.3.2	Differences in Gambling Participation Amongst CPGI Groups .....	81
<b>6.4</b>	<b>GAMBLING FREQUENCY AMONGST CPGI GROUPS .....</b>	<b>82</b>
6.4.1	Gambling Frequency for Each CPGI Group .....	82
6.4.2	Differences in Gambling Frequency Amongst CPGI Groups .....	85
<b>6.5</b>	<b>GAMBLING EXPENDITURE AMONGST CPGI GROUPS .....</b>	<b>86</b>
6.5.1	Gambling Expenditure for Each CPGI Group .....	86
6.5.2	Differences in Gambling Expenditure Amongst CPGI Groups .....	89
<b>6.6</b>	<b>GAMBLING DURATION AMONGST CPGI GROUPS .....</b>	<b>90</b>
6.6.1	Gambling Duration for Each CPGI Group .....	90
6.6.2	Differences in Gambling Duration Amongst CPGI Groups .....	93
<b>6.7</b>	<b>DO WORKPLACE FACTORS INFLUENCE CPGI STATUS? .....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>6.8</b>	<b>GAMBLING PROFILES OF THE FOUR CPGI GROUPS .....</b>	<b>97</b>
6.8.1	Problem Gambler Group .....	97
6.8.2	Moderate Risk Gambler Group .....	98
6.8.3	Low Risk Gambler Group .....	99
6.8.4	Non-Problem Gambler Group .....	100
<b>6.9</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>100</b>

**CHAPTER 7 GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING AMONGST STAFF WHO CAN GAMBLE IN THEIR WORKPLACE AND THOSE WHO CANNOT 101**

<b>7.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>7.2</b>	<b>GAMBLING PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>7.3</b>	<b>GAMBLING FREQUENCY .....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>7.4</b>	<b>GAMBLING EXPENDITURE .....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>7.5</b>	<b>GAMBLING DURATION .....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>7.6</b>	<b>PROBLEM GAMBLING .....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>7.7</b>	<b>CHAPTER SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>108</b>
<b>7.8</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>108</b>

**CHAPTER 8 COMPARISON OF GAMBLING AND PROBLEM GAMBLING BETWEEN GAMING VENUE STAFF AND THE VICTORIAN POPULATION . 109**

<b>8.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>109</b>
------------	---------------------------	------------

<b>8.2</b>	<b>GAMBLING PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>109</b>
8.2.1	Overall Gambling Participation .....	109
8.2.2	Number of Gambling Activities .....	110
8.2.3	Participation in Different Gambling Activities .....	110
<b>8.3</b>	<b>GAMBLING FREQUENCY.....</b>	<b>111</b>
<b>8.4</b>	<b>GAMBLING EXPENDITURE.....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>8.5</b>	<b>GAMBLING DURATION .....</b>	<b>113</b>
<b>8.6</b>	<b>DISTANCE TRAVELLED FOR EGM GAMBLING.....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>8.7</b>	<b>PROBLEM GAMBLING.....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>8.8</b>	<b>CHAPTER SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>115</b>
<b>8.9</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>116</b>
	<b>CHAPTER 9 LINKS BETWEEN ACCESSIBILITY AND GAMBLING BEHAVIOUR AND GAMBLING PROBLEMS .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>9.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>9.2</b>	<b>DISTANCE TRAVELLED TO GAMBLE .....</b>	<b>117</b>
<b>9.3</b>	<b>CONSTRUCTION OF ACCESS SCALES.....</b>	<b>118</b>
9.3.1	Factor Analyses for Access to Each Type of Gambling .....	119
9.3.2	Interpretation of Factor Analyses for Access to Each Type of Gambling .....	124
9.3.3	Reliability of Access Scales for Each Type of Gambling .....	124
<b>9.4</b>	<b>THE ACCESSIBILITY OF EACH TYPE OF GAMBLING.....</b>	<b>125</b>
9.4.1	Perceived Accessibility of Each Type of Gambling.....	125
9.4.2	Perceived Ease of Physical, Social and Cognitive Access Across Different Types of Gambling .....	126
9.4.3	Perceived Ease of Physical, Social and Cognitive Access Within Each Type of Gambling .....	128
<b>9.5</b>	<b>PERCEIVED ACCESS FOR RESPONDENTS WHO CAN AND CANNOT GAMBLE IN THE WORKPLACE.....</b>	<b>131</b>
9.5.1	Perceived Access to Each Type of Gambling Available in the Workplace .....	131
9.5.2	Perceived Access of Dimensions Within Each Type of Gambling Available in the Workplace .....	132
9.5.3	Summary .....	134
<b>9.6</b>	<b>LINKS BETWEEN GAMBLING ACCESSIBILITY AND GAMBLING BEHAVIOUR.....</b>	<b>134</b>
9.6.1	Accessibility and Gambling Participation.....	134
9.6.2	Accessibility and Gambling Frequency .....	137
9.6.3	Accessibility and Gambling Expenditure.....	139
9.6.4	Accessibility and Gambling Duration .....	141
9.6.5	Summary .....	143
<b>9.7</b>	<b>LINKS BETWEEN GAMBLING ACCESSIBILITY AND PROBLEM GAMBLING .....</b>	<b>144</b>
9.7.1	Does Access to Lottery-Type Games Affect CPGI Status?.....	145
9.7.2	Does Access to Club Keno Affect CPGI Status? .....	145
9.7.3	Does Access to Horse and Greyhound Betting Affect CPGI Status? .....	146
9.7.4	Does Access to Sportsbetting Affect CPGI Status? .....	148

9.7.5	Does Access to Gaming Machines Affect CPGI Status? .....	148
9.7.6	Does Access to Casino Table Games Affect CPGI Status? .....	149
9.7.7	Summary .....	150
<b>9.8</b>	<b>CHAPTER SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>151</b>
<b>9.9</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>153</b>
<b>CHAPTER 10 QUALITATIVE STAFF PERSPECTIVES ON HOW WORKING IN A GAMING VENUE INFLUENCES ACCESS TO GAMBLING.....</b>		
<b>10.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>10.2</b>	<b>VENUE POLICIES ON STAFF GAMBLING IN THE WORKPLACE.....</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>10.3</b>	<b>STAFF GAMBLING BEHAVIOUR .....</b>	<b>156</b>
10.3.1	Proportion of Staff Who Gamble in the Workplace .....	156
10.3.2	Proportion of staff who gamble outside the workplace.....	157
10.3.3	Preferred Form of Gambling for staff.....	158
<b>10.4</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF INTERVIEW THEMES .....</b>	<b>158</b>
10.4.1	Convenient Access or Proximity to Gambling .....	158
10.4.2	Familiarity with the Gaming Environment .....	160
10.4.3	Safety and Security .....	161
10.4.4	Influence of Other Staff on Gambling Within the Venue .....	162
10.4.5	Influence of Other Staff on Gambling at Other Venues .....	163
10.4.6	Knowing Other Patrons .....	164
10.4.7	Shiftwork .....	164
10.4.8	Knowledge and Familiarity with Gambling.....	166
10.4.9	Effect of Jackpots.....	168
10.4.10	Normalisation of Gambling.....	169
10.4.11	Financial Circumstances.....	169
10.4.12	Other Themes Raised.....	170
<b>10.5</b>	<b>SUMMARY OF THEMES IN RELATION TO ACCESS .....</b>	<b>172</b>
10.5.1	Physical access.....	172
10.5.2	Social Access .....	173
10.5.3	Cognitive access.....	174
<b>10.6</b>	<b>CHAPTER CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>175</b>
<b>CHAPTER 11 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS .....</b>		
<b>11.1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>177</b>
<b>11.2</b>	<b>DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS.....</b>	<b>177</b>
<b>11.3</b>	<b>OUTCOMES OF THE STUDY.....</b>	<b>182</b>
<b>REFERENCES .....</b>		<b>183</b>
<b>APPENDICES .....</b>		<b>191</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 2-1:	Why working in a gaming venue can potentially encourage staff gambling .....	19
Table 3-1:	Dimensions of accessibility and corresponding survey questions .....	26
Table 3-2:	Age and sex categories of respondents .....	30
Table 3-3:	Operator and venue categories where respondents worked.....	30
Table 3-4:	Number of EGMs in respondents’ workplaces .....	31
Table 3-5:	Venue categories and venue size where respondents worked.....	31
Table 3-6:	Employment basis of respondents.....	31
Table 3-7:	Job level of respondents.....	32
Table 3-8:	Frequency of seeing gambling facilities and activities while at work .....	32
Table 3-9:	Length of training in responsible gambling.....	33
Table 3-10:	Key characteristics of interviewees.....	34
Table 4-1:	Per centage of respondents allowed to gamble in their workplace .....	40
Table 4-2:	When respondents are allowed to gamble in their workplace.....	40
Table 4-3:	Respondents allowed to gamble in their workplace by venue and venue size.....	41
Table 5-1:	Number of gambling activities engaged in by gamblers for different demographic, workplace and employment variables.....	44
Table 5-2:	Participation in different gambling activities .....	45
Table 5-3:	Participation in different gambling activities inside and outside the workplace (all respondents) .....	46
Table 5-4:	Gambling participation by respondents inside and outside their workplace.....	47
Table 5-5:	Respondents allowed to gamble in their workplace who do so, hotels vs clubs and small vs. large venues .....	48
Table 5-6:	Frequency of gambling on different activities (all respondents).....	49
Table 5-7:	Demographic, workplace and employment characteristics for regular, non-regular and non- gamblers on EGMs.....	50
Table 5-8:	Demographic, workplace and employment characteristics for regular, non-regular and non- gamblers on horse and greyhound races at a TAB.....	52
Table 5-9:	Demographic, workplace and employment characteristics for regular, non-regular and non- gamblers on Club Keno .....	54
Table 5-10:	Frequency of gambling inside and outside the workplace (all respondents).....	56
Table 5-11:	Frequency of gambling inside and outside the workplace for staff who can and cannot gamble in their workplace.....	57
Table 5-12:	Demographic, workplace and employment characteristics for regular, non-regular and non- gamblers on workplace EGMs .....	59
Table 5-13:	Demographic, workplace and employment characteristics for regular, non-regular and non- gamblers on horse and greyhound racing at a TAB in the workplace .....	61
Table 5-14:	Monthly expenditure on different gambling activities (all respondents).....	63
Table 5-15:	Monthly expenditure on different gambling activities (all gamblers) .....	64
Table 5-16:	Monthly expenditure of regular and non-regular gamblers on different gambling activities ....	65
Table 5-17:	Monthly expenditure on different gambling activities inside and outside workplace (all respondents).....	66

Table 5-18: Monthly expenditure on different gambling activities inside and outside workplace (all gamblers) .....	67
Table 5-19: Usual duration of gambling on different activities (all respondents).....	68
Table 5-20: Usual duration of gambling on different activities (all gamblers) .....	69
Table 5-21: Usual duration of gambling on different activities (regular and non-regular gamblers) .....	70
Table 5-22: Usual duration of gambling on different activities inside and outside workplace (all respondents).....	71
Table 5-23: Usual duration of gambling on different activities inside and outside workplace (all gamblers).....	72
Table 5-24: Frequency distributions of reported changes in gambling behaviour since working in a gaming venue .....	73
Table 6-1: CPGI categories amongst all respondents .....	78
Table 6-2: Gambling participation in different activities amongst CPGI groups.....	80
Table 6-3: Frequency of gambling on different activities amongst CPGI groups.....	84
Table 6-4: Monthly gambling expenditure on different activities amongst CPGI groups.....	88
Table 6-5: Usual duration of gambling on different activities amongst CPGI groups .....	92
Table 6-6: Demographic, workplace and employment characteristics of CPGI groups.....	94
Table 6-7: Cross-tabulation of assisting patrons with gambling activities, length of responsible gambling training and CPGI groups .....	97
Table 7-1: Gambling participation by those who can and cannot gamble in the workplace .....	102
Table 7-2: Frequency of gambling on different activities by staff who can and cannot gamble in their workplace.....	103
Table 7-3: Gambling expenditure on different activities by staff who can and cannot gamble in their workplace.....	104
Table 7-4: Usual duration of gambling on different activities by staff who can and cannot gamble in their workplace .....	106
Table 7-5: Distribution of CPGI categories for staff who can and cannot gamble in their workplace.....	107
Table 8-1: Participation in different gambling activities (staff and Victorian surveys).....	111
Table 8-2: Frequency of gambling on different activities (staff and Victorian surveys).....	113
Table 8-3: Distance travelled to gamble on EGMs (staff and Victorian surveys) .....	114
Table 8-4: Distribution of CPGI categories (staff and Victorian surveys) .....	115
Table 9-1: Distance usually travelled to gamble on different activities.....	118
Table 9-2: Rotated component matrix: Lottery-type games .....	119
Table 9-3: Rotated component matrix: Club Keno .....	120
Table 9-4: Rotated component matrix: Horse & greyhound racing .....	121
Table 9-5: Rotated component matrix: Sporting events .....	122
Table 9-6: Rotated component matrix: EGMs.....	123
Table 9-7: Rotated component matrix: Casino table games .....	124
Table 9-8: Cronbach's Alpha coefficients for access to gambling scales.....	125
Table 9-9: Mean scores for perceived access to different gambling activities .....	126
Table 9-10: Mean scores for physical accessibility to different gambling activities .....	127
Table 9-11: Means scores for social accessibility to different gambling activities .....	127

Table 9-12: Mean scores for cognitive accessibility to different gambling activities .....	128
Table 9-13: Mean scores for each dimension of accessibility to lottery-type games.....	129
Table 9-14: Mean scores for each dimension of accessibility to Club Keno .....	129
Table 9-15: Mean scores for each dimension of accessibility to betting on horse and greyhound races ....	129
Table 9-16: Mean scores for each dimension of accessibility to sportsbetting .....	130
Table 9-17: Mean scores for each dimension of accessibility to EGMs.....	130
Table 9-18: Mean scores for each dimension of accessibility to casino table games .....	131
Table 9-19: Mean scores of access to gambling scales for staff who can and cannot gamble in their workplace.....	132
Table 9-20: Mean scores for each dimension of access to different gambling activities, for staff who can gamble in their workplace and those who cannot .....	133
Table 9-21: Predicted participation in different gambling activities according to ease of accessibility.....	137
Table 9-22: Predicted yearly frequencies of gambling on different activities according to ease of accessibility .....	139
Table 9-23: Predicted monthly expenditure on gambling on different activities according to ease of accessibility .....	141
Table 9-24: Predicted usual duration in minutes on gambling on different activities according to ease of accessibility.....	143
Table 9-25: Significant relationships between dimensions of accessibility and gambling behaviour.....	144
Table 9-26: Likelihood ratio test: CPGI category and access to Club Keno.....	145
Table 9-27: Probabilities of CPGI groups for physical access to Club Keno.....	146
Table 9-28: Probabilities of CPGI groups for cognitive access to Club Keno.....	146
Table 9-29: Likelihood ratio test: CPGI category and access to horse and greyhound betting.....	147
Table 9-30: Probabilities of CPGI groups for physical access to horse and greyhound betting .....	147
Table 9-31: Probabilities of CPGI groups for cognitive access to horse and greyhound betting.....	147
Table 9-32: Probabilities of CPGI groups for social access to horse and greyhound betting .....	148
Table 9-33: Likelihood ratio test: CPGI category and access to EGMs .....	148
Table 9-34: Probabilities of CPGI groups for cognitive access to EGMs .....	149
Table 9-35: Probabilities of CPGI groups for social access to EGMs .....	149
Table 9-36: Likelihood ratio test: CPGI category and access to casino table games.....	150
Table 9-37: Probabilities of CPGI groups for cognitive access to casino table games.....	150
Table 9-38: Probability of being a problem or moderate risk gambler according to ease of physical, social and cognitive access to different gambling activities .....	151

## LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 3-1: Proposed research framework .....	24
---	----

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This research project was funded through the Victorian Government's Submission Based Grants System for Gambling Research for 2006, where the area of interest and focus was the theme of accessibility to gambling products. This study aligned with this theme by focusing on the gambling behaviour of a group of people who have heightened access to gambling products – staff who work in gaming venues.

The study aimed to test the link between accessibility to gambling and the prevalence of problem gambling by:

- comparing the gambling behaviour and prevalence of problem gambling amongst a population with very high accessibility to gambling (staff who work in gaming venues who are allowed to gamble in their workplace) to the gambling behaviour and prevalence of problem gambling amongst a comparable population with less accessibility to gambling (staff who work in gaming venues who are not allowed to gamble in their workplace);
- comparing the gambling behaviour and prevalence of problem gambling amongst gaming venue staff, a population with relatively high accessibility to gambling, to the gambling behaviour and prevalence of problem gambling amongst the general population of Victoria as measured by prior research;
- exploring the perceived influence that heightened access to gambling, along multiple dimensions, has on the gambling behaviour and development of gambling problems for gaming venue staff.

A review of international and Australian literature highlighted the multi-dimensional nature of accessibility to gambling and some evidence of a link between some of these dimensions and gambling behaviour and problem gambling. However, because results from prior research have been largely inconclusive, this study aimed to capitalise on a 'natural experiment' amongst three groups of people with different levels of access to gambling – gaming venue staff who are allowed to gamble in their workplace, those who are not allowed to gamble in their workplace, and the general population of Victoria. The few studies previously conducted into gambling by gaming venue staff were also reviewed, highlighting numerous reasons why these staff have high accessibility to gambling. These studies have also found a higher prevalence of gambling problems amongst gaming venue staff than amongst the general population.

Two key methods were used to collect empirical data for this study. The first was a survey of staff working in all Victorian hotels and clubs. Unfortunately, the Crown Casino declined to have their staff participate in the study. With the assistance of Tabcorp and Tattersall's, 1,566 surveys were mailed to 522 hotels and clubs in Victoria. This yielded 542 responses for a response rate of 34.5 per cent. However, only 533 responses were analysed as the remainder arrived after the data analysis was complete. All survey data were entered into SPSS and analysed using appropriate statistical techniques. The second phase of this study involved 15-30 minute telephone interviews with 40 of these survey respondents. These interviews were digitally recorded, transcribed verbatim and analysed using thematic analysis.

The research aims were expressed as six specific research objectives and the results for each are summarised below.

## RESULTS FOR OBJECTIVE ONE

The first research objective was to examine how legislative requirements, codes of conduct, and venue policies and practices may or may not restrict the kind of access that gaming venue staff have to gambling products within their workplace. A legislative review found that Victorian legislation prohibits hotel and club employees from gambling in their workplace whilst on duty, unless as a necessary part of their official duties; however, the legislation does not prohibit them from gambling in their workplace at other times. In contrast, legislation prohibits ‘special employees’ from gambling at the Crown Casino and the casino has extended this prohibition to all staff. A review of relevant venue and industry responsible gambling codes of conduct found that the Tabcorp and Tattersall’s codes of conduct do not prohibit staff from gambling in their workplace whilst off-duty, although the Tabcorp code encourages venues to develop house policies around this. Thus, apart from the casino, it is up to individual venues to develop and implement any restrictions around employees gambling in their workplaces when not on duty. The staff survey found that nearly half the respondents were allowed to gamble in their workplace on EGMs, Club Keno and the TAB (where provided), but typically only on days off and before or after work while not in uniform. Respondents from large hotels were the least likely to be allowed to gamble in their workplace on EGMs, Club Keno and the TAB.

## RESULTS FOR OBJECTIVE TWO

The second research objective aimed to measure the gambling behaviour of gaming venue staff, both within and outside their workplace, including gambling type (participation), frequency, duration and expenditure. Two types of restrictions preclude staff from gambling in their workplace. Venue policies may not *allow* them to gamble in the workplace and if their workplace does not provide a type of gambling (e.g. TAB, keno), then staff are not *able* to gamble on these in their workplace. These terms – ‘allowed’ and ‘able to’ - refer in this report to these distinctions. Key results are presented below.

### Key Results for All Types of Gambling

During the previous 12 months, 95.9 per cent of the 533 staff respondents reported participating in at least one of the gambling activities surveyed. The average number of different gambling activities undertaken amongst those who gambled was 4.4, with this being higher amongst respondents holding a Gaming Industry Employee’s Licence, those holding a gaming-related position, those aged 18-34 years, and male respondents. The average number of different gambling activities also increased with the length of time staff had worked in the industry.

The most common activities were playing lottery-type games (participated in by 77.9 per cent of respondents), playing EGMs (77.3 per cent), betting on horse or greyhound races through a TAB (59.1 per cent), and buying instant scratch tickets for yourself (51.6 per cent). Less common were betting on horse or greyhound races at a racetrack (46.3 per cent), playing Club Keno (35.5 per cent), playing table games at a casino (22.1 per cent), and sportsbetting at a TAB (20.1%). Least common were gambling privately with friends for money (13.5 per cent), playing bingo (12.2 per cent) and playing casino games on the internet (2.3 per cent).

During the previous 12 months, regular gambling (at least weekly) was most common on lottery-type games (33.4 per cent of respondents), EGMs (18.0 per cent), and horse or greyhound races at a TAB (14.3 per cent). Fewer than one in ten respondents gambled at least weekly on instant scratch tickets (7.3 per cent), horse or greyhound races at a racetrack (7.2 per cent), Club Keno (4.6 per cent) and sportsbetting (2.8 per cent). Very small proportions gambled at least weekly on

bingo (1.7 per cent), private gambling (0.8 per cent), casino table games (0.4 per cent) and internet casino games (0.2 per cent).

Spending more than \$20 per month was quite common amongst those who gambled on EGMs (58.9 per cent of participants), lottery-type games (47.7 per cent), casino table games (47.7 per cent), bingo (45.0 per cent), internet casino games (37.5 per cent), betting on horse or greyhound races at a TAB (36.6 per cent), betting on horse or greyhound races at a racetrack (37.1 per cent) and sportsbetting at a TAB (26.8 per cent). Spending more than \$20 per month was less common amongst those who gambled on private gambling (18.7 per cent), Club Keno (13.8 per cent) and instant scratch tickets (1.3 per cent).

Amongst those who participated in each form of gambling, the proportion of those normally spending more than one hour gambling on that activity were: 94.0 per cent for gambling privately with friends for money, 89.9 per cent for bingo, 56.1 per cent for casino table games, 50.0 per cent for internet casino games, 48.0 per cent for gambling on horse or greyhound races at a racetrack, 45 per cent for EGMs, 18.9 per cent for gambling on horse or greyhound races at a TAB, 11.2 per cent for Club Keno, and 7.1 per cent for sportsbetting through a TAB.

Regular (at least weekly) gamblers were more likely than non-regular gamblers to spend more than \$10 per month on racetrack betting, \$10 per month on Club Keno, \$10 per month on horse or greyhound racing at a TAB, and \$60 per month on EGMs. They were also more likely to spend more than 30 minutes gambling on racetrack betting, Club Keno and horse or greyhound races at a TAB, and more than 60 minutes gambling on EGMs.

When compared to non-gamblers and non-regular gamblers, there were higher proportions of regular (weekly) EGM gamblers amongst respondents who held a Gaming Industry Employee's Licence, held a gaming-related position in their workplace, held a front-of-house position, or a position that combined front-of-house and back-of-house duties, and were older. The likelihood of regular (weekly) EGM gambling also increased with the length of time staff had worked in the industry.

When compared to non-gamblers and non-regular gamblers, there were higher proportions of regular (at least weekly) gamblers on horse or greyhound races at a TAB amongst respondents who worked in venues where the EGMs were operated by Tabcorp rather than Tattersall's, worked in hotels rather than clubs, were aged 18-24 years or 45 years and over, and were male.

When compared to non-gamblers and non-regular gamblers, there were higher proportions of regular gamblers on Club Keno amongst respondents who held a Gaming Employee's Licence, worked in a gambling-related position, and had only a few hours training in responsible gambling. The likelihood of regular (weekly) Club Keno gambling also increased with the length of time staff had worked in the industry.

### **Key Results for Gambling Inside and Outside the Workplace**

During the previous 12 months, 29.2 per cent of respondents allowed and able to bet on Club Keno operated in their workplace did so, 26.7 per cent of those allowed to gamble on Club Keno in their workplace gambled outside their workplace on Club Keno, and 28.5 per cent not allowed to gamble on Club Keno in the workplace did so outside the workplace.

Of respondents allowed and able to bet on horse or greyhound races at a TAB operated in their workplace, 42.0 per cent did so in the last 12 months, 48.0 per cent those allowed to bet on races at a TAB in their workplace bet outside their workplace at a TAB, and 47.2 per cent of those not allowed to gamble on races at a TAB in their workplace did so outside the workplace.

Of respondents allowed and able to engage in sportsbetting at a TAB operated in their workplace, 15.7 per cent did so in the previous 12 months, 14.2 per cent of those allowed to gamble on sportsbetting in their workplace gambled on this at a non-work TAB, and 13.5 per cent of those not allowed to gamble on sportsbetting at a TAB in the workplace did so outside the workplace.

Of respondents allowed and able to play EGMs in their workplace, 62.4 per cent did so in the previous 12 months, 70 per cent of those allowed to gamble on EGMs in their workplace gambled on them outside their workplace, and 74.2 per cent of those not allowed to gamble on EGMs in the workplace did so outside the workplace.

Gambling on horse or greyhound races or on sporting events at a workplace TAB for those allowed is most common for employees of small hotels, followed by large hotels, but there were no significant differences amongst venue types for participation in workplace gambling on Club Keno or EGMs.

When regular (at least weekly) gambling is considered, 4.6 per cent of staff who could gamble on Club Keno in their workplace did so at least weekly, 13.9 per cent of staff who could bet on horse and greyhound races at a TAB in their workplace did so at least weekly, 2.9 per cent of staff who could bet on sporting events at a TAB in their workplace did so at least weekly, and 15.8 per cent of staff who could play EGMs in their workplace did so at least weekly. These proportions were all higher than for regular gambling outside the workplace.

The following proportions of those who gambled in the workplace on each of these surveyed activities spent more than \$20 per month on that activity: 25.6 per cent for workplace EGMs, 11.7 per cent for horse or greyhound races at a workplace TAB, 1.8 per cent for sportsbetting at a workplace TAB, and 2.6 per cent for workplace keno. These proportions were very similar for spending more than \$20 per month on gambling activities outside the workplace, except for EGMs, where this proportion was higher amongst those not allowed to gamble on EGMs in their workplace.

Amongst those who participated in each form of workplace gambling, the proportion of those normally spending more than one hour gambling on that activity were: 14.6 per cent for workplace EGMs, 4.6 per cent for gambling on horse or greyhound races at a workplace TAB, 0.4 per cent for workplace Club Keno, and none for sportsbetting at a workplace TAB. Usual gambling duration was similar for gambling on Club Keno and sportsbetting inside and outside the workplace, but longer for gambling on EGMs and horse and greyhound racing outside the workplace.

Regular gamblers were more likely than non-regular gamblers to spend more than \$20 per month on EGMs in the workplace, \$10 per month on horse or greyhound races at a workplace TAB, \$5 per month on Club Keno in the workplace, 30 minutes playing EGMs in the workplace, and 15 minutes betting on horse or greyhound races at a workplace TAB.

When compared to non-gamblers and non-regular gamblers, there were higher proportions of regular gamblers on EGMs in the workplace amongst respondents who held a Gaming Employee's Licence and held a gambling-related position. When compared to non-gamblers and non-regular gamblers, there were higher proportions of regular gamblers on horse or greyhound races at a workplace TAB amongst respondents who worked in a venue whose EGMs were operated by Tabcorp, worked in a hotel, and were male.

Since working in a gaming venue, 33.2 per cent of respondents reportedly had decreased their gambling, 46.9 per cent reported experiencing no change in their gambling, and 19.8 per cent reported an increase in their gambling.

## RESULTS FOR OBJECTIVE THREE

Research Objective Three aimed to measure the prevalence of non-gambling, non-problem, low-risk, moderate-risk and problem gambling amongst the gaming venue staff surveyed. Key results are presented below.

### Problem Gambling Prevalence

Using the *Canadian Problem Gambling Index*, 4.1 per cent of the 533 staff respondents were classified as non-gamblers, 54.1 per cent as non-problem gamblers, 22.4 per cent as low risk gamblers, 13.7 per cent as moderate risk gamblers, and 5.6 per cent as problem gamblers.

### The Problem Gambler Group

In the previous 12 months, the problem gambler group had gambled on an average of 4.4 different activities. The vast majority had gambled on EGMs (93.3 per cent) and lottery-type games (80.8 per cent), two-thirds had bought instant scratch tickets for themselves (66.7 per cent), and around one-half had bet on horse or greyhound races at a TAB (56.7 per cent), played Club Keno (53.3 per cent) and bet at a racetrack (50.0 per cent). Around one-third had played bingo (30.0 per cent), about one-quarter had gambled privately (26.7 per cent), played casino table games (23.3 per cent) and bet on sporting events at a TAB (20.0 per cent), while a small proportion had gambled on internet casino games (3.3 per cent). In the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the problem gamblers than of moderate risk, low risk or non-problem gamblers had bought instant scratch tickets for themselves, participated in private gambling, participated in bingo, participated in Club Keno, and participated in EGM gambling.

The proportions of the problem gambler group who were regular (at least weekly) gamblers were about one-half for EGMs (56.7 per cent) and lottery-type games (50.0 per cent), about one-quarter for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (23.3 per cent), one-tenth for Club Keno (10.0 per cent), and minor for instant scratch tickets (6.7 per cent), racetrack betting (6.7 per cent), sportsbetting at a TAB (6.7 per cent), private gambling (3.3 per cent) and bingo (3.3 per cent). None were regular gamblers on casino table games or internet casino games. In the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the problem gamblers than moderate risk, low risk and non-problem gamblers had gambled at least weekly on Club Keno and EGMs.

The proportions of the problem gambler group who spent \$20 per month or more on the different gambling activities were the vast majority for EGMs (90.0 per cent), about one-half for lottery-type games (53.3 per cent), about one-third for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (33.3 per cent), about one-sixth for racetrack betting (16.7 per cent), Club Keno (16.7 per cent), bingo (13.3 per cent) and casino table games (13.3 per cent), one in ten for sportsbetting at a TAB (10.0 per cent), minor for private gambling (6.7 per cent), and none for internet casino games or instant scratch tickets. In the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the problem gamblers than of the moderate risk, low risk and non-problem gamblers spent more than \$20 per month on lottery-type games, Club Keno, and EGMs.

The proportions of the problem gambler group who had normally spent two hours or more gambling were over one-half for gambling on EGMs (56.7 per cent), about one-quarter for betting at a racetrack (23.3 per cent), about one-fifth for playing bingo (20.0 per cent), about one-seventh for gambling on horse or greyhound races at a TAB (13.3 per cent) and gambling on casino table games (13.3 per cent), minor for gambling on Club Keno (6.7 per cent) and private gambling (6.7 per cent), and none for gambling on internet casino games or sportsbetting at a TAB. Higher proportions of the problem gamblers than of the moderate risk, low risk and non-problem gamblers

had normally spent more than two hours each time they gambled on EGMs, horse or greyhound races at a TAB, and Club Keno.

Staff who assisted patrons with gambling activities at work and who had less responsible gambling training were more likely to be problem or moderate risk gamblers.

### **The Moderate Risk Gambler Group**

In the previous 12 months, the moderate risk gambler group had gambled on an average of 5.2 different activities. The vast majority had gambled on EGMs (90.4 per cent) and lottery-type games (89.0 per cent), over two-thirds had bet on horse or greyhound races at a TAB (67.1 per cent), nearly two-fifths had bet at a racetrack (59.7 per cent) and bought instant scratch tickets for themselves (58.9 per cent), nearly one-half (45.2 per cent) had played Club Keno, about one-third had bet on sporting events at a TAB (37.0 per cent) and played casino table games (32.9 per cent), about one-sixth had gambled privately (16.4 per cent) and played bingo (15.1 per cent), and a very small proportion had gambled on internet casino games (4.1 per cent). In the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the moderate risk gamblers than of the problem, low risk or non-problem gamblers had bet on horse or greyhound races at a racetrack, and gambled on sportsbetting at a TAB.

The proportions of the moderate risk gambler group who were regular (at least weekly) gamblers were about two-fifths for EGMs (41.1 per cent) and lottery-type games (37.0 per cent), about one-third for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (30.1 per cent), nearly one-fifth for racetrack betting (17.8 per cent), about one-seventh for buying instant scratch tickets (13.7 per cent), minor for Club Keno (6.8 per cent), sportsbetting at a TAB (5.5 per cent), private gambling (4.1 per cent), casino table games (1.4 per cent) and bingo (1.4 per cent), and none for internet casino games. In the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the moderate risk gamblers than of the problem, low risk and non-problem gamblers gambled at least weekly on horse or greyhound races at a racetrack, and horse or greyhound races at a TAB.

The proportions of the moderate risk gambler group who spent \$20 per month or more on the different gambling activities were about three-quarters for EGMs (76.7 per cent), nearly one-half for lottery-type games (46.6 per cent), about one-third for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (34.2 per cent), about one-sixth for racetrack betting (17.8 per cent), about one in ten for casino table games (12.3 per cent) and sportsbetting at a TAB (11.0 per cent), and minor for Club Keno (6.8 per cent), bingo (4.1 per cent), private gambling (2.7 per cent), instant scratch tickets (1.4 per cent) and internet casino games (1.4 per cent). During the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the moderate risk gamblers than of the problem, low risk and non-problem gamblers spent more than \$20 per month on betting on horse or greyhound races at a TAB.

The proportions of the moderate risk gambler group who had normally spent two hours or more gambling were about one-third for EGMs (35.6 per cent), about one-sixth for racetrack betting (16.4 per cent), minor for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (6.8 per cent), casino table games (6.8 per cent), private gambling (1.4 per cent), bingo (2.7 per cent) and Club Keno (1.4 per cent), and none for internet casino games or sportsbetting at a TAB.

As noted above, staff who assisted patrons with gambling activities at work and who had less responsible gambling training were more likely to be problem or moderate risk gamblers.

### **The Low Risk Gambler Group**

In the previous 12 months, the low risk gambler group had gambled on an average of 4.9 different activities. The vast majority had gambled on EGMs (89.1 per cent), about three-quarters had

gambled on lottery-type games (79.0 per cent) and bet on horse or greyhound races at a TAB (72.3 per cent), about half had gambled on instant scratch tickets (58.8 per cent), horse or greyhound races at a racetrack (52.1 per cent) and Club Keno (43.7 per cent), about one-quarter had gambled on sporting events at a TAB (26.1 per cent), casino table games (25.2 per cent) and private gambling (21.0 per cent), about one-sixth had played bingo (15.1 per cent), and a very small proportion had gambled on internet casino games (2.5 per cent). During the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the low risk gamblers than of the problem, moderate risk or non-problem gamblers had participated in horse or greyhound betting at a TAB.

The proportions of the low risk gambler group who were regular (at least weekly) gamblers were about one-third for lottery-type games (35.3 per cent), about one-quarter for EGMs (24.4 per cent), about one-sixth for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (17.6 per cent) and instant scratch tickets (14.3 per cent), minor for racetrack betting (8.4 per cent), Club Keno (6.7 per cent), sportsbetting at a TAB (1.7 per cent), bingo (2.5 per cent) and casino table games (0.8 per cent), and none for private gambling and internet casino games. During the previous 12 months, higher proportions of the low risk gamblers than problem, moderate risk and non-problem gamblers gambled at least weekly on instant scratch tickets.

The proportions of the low risk gambler group who spent \$20 per month or more on the different gambling activities were about two-thirds for EGMs (61.3 per cent), nearly one-third for lottery-type games (37.0 per cent) and horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (28.6 per cent), about one-sixth for racetrack betting (16.0 per cent), about one in ten for casino table games (10.1 per cent), and minor for Club Keno (6.7 per cent), bingo (6.7 per cent), sportsbetting at a TAB (5.0 per cent), private gambling (1.7 per cent), instant scratch tickets (1.7 per cent) and internet casino games (0.8 per cent). Low risk gamblers were more likely than non-problem gamblers to spend more than \$20 per month on lottery-type games, Club Keno, betting on horse or greyhound races at a TAB and EGMs.

The proportions of the low risk gambler group who had normally spent two hours or more gambling were nearly one-quarter for EGMs (22.7 per cent), about one-seventh for racetrack betting (14.3 per cent), nearly one-tenth for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (9.2 per cent), and minor for casino table games (7.6 per cent), private gambling (5.9 per cent), bingo (5.0 per cent), internet casino games (1.7 per cent), sportsbetting at a TAB (1.7 per cent) and Club Keno (0.8 per cent).

### **The Non-Problem Gambler Group**

In the previous 12 months, the non-problem gambler group had gambled on an average of 3.9 different activities. About three-quarters had gambled on lottery-type games (79.2 per cent) and EGMs (73.6 per cent), about half had gambled on horse or greyhound races at a TAB (56.6 per cent), instant scratch tickets (47.2 per cent) and horse or greyhound races at a racetrack (42.7 per cent), about one-third had played Club Keno (30.6 per cent), about one-fifth had played casino table games (19.1 per cent) and gambled on sporting events at a TAB (14.9 per cent), around one-tenth had played bingo (9.4 per cent) and gambled privately (9.0 per cent). A small minority had gambled on internet casino games 1.7 per cent).

The proportions of the non-problem gambler group who were regular (at least weekly) gamblers were about one-third for lottery-type games (32.6 per cent), about one-tenth for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (9.0 per cent), minor for EGMs (6.9 per cent), racetrack betting (4.5 per cent), instant scratch tickets (3.5 per cent), Club Keno (2.8 per cent), sportsbetting at a TAB (2.4 per cent), bingo (1.4 per cent), casino table games (0.8 per cent) and internet casino games (0.3 per cent), and none for private gambling and internet casino games.

The proportions of the non-problem gambler group who spent \$20 per month or more on the different gambling activities were about one-quarter for lottery-type games (28.5 per cent) and EGMs (21.9 per cent), about one in ten for horse or greyhound betting at a TAB (11.1 per cent) and racetrack betting (8.7 per cent), minor for casino table games (5.2 per cent), sportsbetting at a TAB (3.1 per cent), bingo (2.8 per cent), private gambling (1.7 per cent), Club Keno (1.0 per cent) and internet casino games (0.3 per cent), and none for instant scratch tickets.

The proportions of the non-problem gambler group who had normally spent two hours or more gambling were about one in twelve for racetrack betting (9.4 per cent) and EGMs (7.3 per cent), and minor for bingo (3.8 per cent), casino table games (3.1 per cent), private gambling (2.4 per cent), horse or greyhound races at a TAB (1.4 per cent), Club Keno (0.7 per cent), internet casino games (0.3 per cent) and sportsbetting at a TAB (0.3 per cent).

## **RESULTS FOR OBJECTIVE FOUR**

The fourth research objective compared the gambling behaviour and prevalence of non-gambling, non-problem, low-risk, moderate-risk and problem gambling between gaming venue staff who have access to gambling products within their workplace and those who do not.

When the gambling behaviour of the staff respondents who had access to the gambling products within their workplace is compared to the gambling behaviour of those who did not have access to the gambling products within their workplace, a few differences were apparent. During the last 12 months, higher proportions of those allowed to gamble in their workplace than of those not allowed to gamble in their workplace:

- participated in horse or greyhound betting at a TAB;
- participated in EGM gambling;
- gambled at least weekly on horse or greyhound races at a TAB;
- gambled 1-3 times a month and at least weekly on EGMs;
- spent more than \$20 per month on horse or greyhound races at a TAB;
- normally spent more than 2 hours playing EGMs.

However, there were no significant differences in the gambling participation, frequency, expenditure and duration for the other types of gambling surveyed, nor for the average number of gambling activities participated in during the previous 12 months. There were also no significant differences identified in the distributions of CPGI categories between respondents who could gamble in their workplace and those who could not, nor any significant association with total CPGI scores.

## **RESULTS FOR OBJECTIVE FIVE**

Research Objective Five aimed to compare the gambling behaviour and prevalence of non-gambling, non-problem gambling, low risk, moderate risk and problem gambling between gaming venue staff and the general population of Victoria.

When compared to results from the *2003 Victorian Longitudinal Community Attitudes Survey* (Centre for Gambling Research, 2004), the survey of 533 staff who work in Victorian hotels and clubs revealed a group who appear to be more actively engaged with gambling than the general Victorian population.

Overall, 95.9 per cent per cent of respondents in the staff survey reported participating in at least one of the gambling activities surveyed during the preceding 12 months, compared to 77.4 per cent in the Victorian survey. For the staff respondents, the average number of different gambling activities undertaken by those who gambled in the preceding 12 months was 4.4, compared to the Victorian survey figure of 2.3 activities. The gambling participation rates amongst the surveyed staff were higher than for the general population of Victoria for all types of gambling for which comparisons could be made. They were substantially higher for playing EGMs, betting on horse or greyhound races at a TAB, betting on horse or greyhound races at a racetrack and playing Club Keno. The gambling participation rates amongst the surveyed staff were somewhat higher for buying instant scratch tickets for themselves, playing lottery-type games, playing casino table games and betting on a sporting event at a TAB. The gambling participation rates amongst the surveyed staff were only marginally higher for playing internet casino games.

When gambling at least monthly during the 12 months prior to each survey was considered, higher proportions of respondents in the staff survey than in the Victorian survey had gambled at least monthly on EGMs, Club Keno, instant scratch tickets, internet casino games for money, horse or greyhound races, and sportsbetting. When gambling at least weekly during the 12 months prior to each survey was considered, higher proportions of respondents in the staff survey than in the Victorian survey had gambled at least weekly on EGMs, Club Keno, instant scratch tickets for themselves, horse or greyhound races and sportsbetting.

A further finding was that the staff respondents generally travelled less distance to play EGMs. Compared to the Victorian survey respondents, about double the proportion of staff survey respondents travelled less than 2.5 kilometres to play EGMs, with the proportion of staff travelling more than 20 kilometres being about one-quarter of the Victorian survey figure.

When measured on the CPGI, the problem gambling prevalence rate of 5.6 per cent amongst respondents to the staff survey is nearly six times higher than that identified for the Victorian population, using the same instrument. The moderate risk gambling rate of 13.7 per cent amongst respondents to the staff survey is around 15 times higher than that identified for the Victorian population. No separate comparisons for low risk gamblers and non-problem gamblers can be made, as the Victorian survey did not report these data.

### **Links between Accessibility and Gambling Behaviour and Gambling Problems**

Further analysis was undertaken to examine whether the increased accessibility to gambling that venue staff would seem to have explains the heightened gambling activity and problem gambling prevalence found amongst the respondents to the staff survey, when compared to the Victorian population.

This first required construction of scales to measure perceived accessibility. The scales used in the survey to measure accessibility to the six major types of gambling (lottery-type games, Club Keno, betting on horse or greyhound races, EGMs and casino tables games) were based mainly on the Productivity Commission's model of accessibility to gambling (1999). Survey data analysis found all six scales to have good reliabilities when treated as overall access to gambling scales. Further, factor analyses of each of these scales identified a common three component structure. These three components were interpreted as representing physical access, social access and cognitive access to gambling. Again, each of these components had good reliabilities.

When overall perceived access to each of the six types of gambling was examined, it was found that EGMs were considered the most accessible, followed by lottery-type games, Club Keno, horse/greyhound racing, and sportsbetting, respectively. Casino table games were considered the least accessible of these six types of gambling.

When the perceived ease of physical, social and cognitive access was examined across the six types of gambling, it was apparent that physical access was perceived as easiest for playing EGMs, somewhat less easy for gambling on lottery-type games, horse and greyhound races, sportsbetting and Club Keno, and the least easy for casino table games. Social access was perceived as easiest for gambling on Club Keno and lottery-type games, somewhat less easy for gambling on horse and greyhound races, playing EGMs and sportsbetting, and the least easy for casino table games. Cognitive access was perceived as easiest for EGMs, less easy for Club Keno, lottery-type games, betting on horse or greyhound races and sportsbetting, and the least easy for casino table games.

The perceived ease of physical, social and cognitive access were then examined within each type of gambling. For lottery-type games, betting on horse and greyhound races, sportsbetting and EGMs, physical access was perceived as the easiest of all three dimensions, followed by social access. For Club Keno and casino table games, social access was perceived as the easiest of all three dimensions, followed by physical access. Cognitive access was perceived as least easy for all six types of gambling, except for EGMs where social access was perceived as most difficult.

Differences in perceived access to each of the six types of gambling were examined for staff who can and cannot gamble in their workplace. Being able to gamble in the workplace significantly heightened the perceived access of respondents to gambling on three of the four types of gambling which hotels and clubs can offer - EGMs, Club Keno and betting on horse and greyhound races. However, it did not heighten perceived access to sportsbetting, which is also available through a workplace TAB where available. In considering which dimensions of perceived access are heightened by being able to gamble in the workplace, it was found that being able to gamble in the workplace heightened perceived physical, social and cognitive access to Club Keno, and social access to betting on horse and greyhound races, sportsbetting and EGMs.

The influence of perceived access on gambling behaviour was also examined. Easier physical access significantly increased the likelihood of participation in Club Keno and casino table games, the frequency of playing casino table games, and expenditure on instant scratch tickets. Easier social access significantly increased the likelihood of participation in sportsbetting and EGM gambling, but easier social access was associated with lower frequency of sportsbetting. Easier cognitive access increased the likelihood of participation in all six types of gambling examined. Easier cognitive access was also associated with increased frequency of gambling on lottery-type games, betting on races, EGMs and casino table games, and expenditure on Club Keno, race betting and EGMs. Easier cognitive access was also associated with increased usual duration of gambling sessions on race betting and EGMs.

Lastly, the influence of accessibility on problem gambling was examined. The probability of being a problem or moderate risk gambler was found to be higher when gamblers have extremely easy physical access to betting on horse and greyhound races. However, the effects were mixed for ease of physical access to Club Keno. There was no influence on the likelihood of being a problem or moderate risk gambler from ease of physical access to the other types of gambling activities.

The probability of being a moderate risk or problem gambler was found to be higher when gamblers have more difficult social access to betting on horse and greyhound races and EGMs. From this finding, it appears that moderate risk and problem gamblers feel less social access to gambling on horse/greyhound races and EGMs because of their heightened gambling on these activities. That is, being a moderate or problem gambler appears to reduce the perceived personal and social approval of the gambling activity.

The probability of being a moderate risk or problem gambler was found to be higher when gamblers have extremely easy cognitive access to Club Keno, betting on horse and greyhound

aces, EGMs and casino table games. It appears that moderate risk and problem gamblers have greater cognitive access to these activities due to their heightened gambling on these activities.

## **RESULTS FOR OBJECTIVE SIX**

Research Objective Six aimed to explore staff perspectives on how working in a gaming venue influences the access of gaming venue staff to gambling products and venues, both within and outside their workplace and along multiple dimensions of access. This was addressed via the interviews with 40 staff. Major findings in relation to their perceived physical, social and cognitive access to gambling are presented below.

### **Physical Access**

Physical access to gambling by staff was discussed by the interviewees mainly in terms of convenience, proximity to work and to home, and the influence of shiftwork and split shifts on the times that staff are likely to access gambling facilities.

Most respondents did not think convenient access to gambling, in terms of its proximity in the workplace, necessarily influences staff to gamble at work. This may be because of the unattractiveness of the venue to the staff member and/or because they have already spent a good deal of time around gambling and that venue while at work. However, it was readily acknowledged that staff, like the general public, have convenient access to venues in general.

If staff need to change out of their uniform to gamble at the workplace, those who live some distance away are more likely to gamble at a venue closer to home. However, if no other similar venue operates in the town, then staff may be more likely to gamble in their workplace. Even for staff not allowed to gamble in their workplace, other venues are often in close proximity to their workplace, allowing convenient gambling before or after work. These nearby venues were also considered good places to meet up with co-workers and staff from other venues whom they know. For others, it may be more convenient to gamble closer to home, either on their way home from work or during time off, than to go to a venue near the workplace.

A minority thought that the proximity of gambling facilities was an influencing factor on staff gambling in the workplace, especially as it is such a convenient way to relax after work. Some also gamble in the workplace when they come in to check rosters or return keys in their time off.

Shiftwork was another aspect of staff worklife that appeared to affect physical access to gambling. Late night finishes meant some staff did not have the opportunity to gamble after work, so staff gambling in the workplace was seen as confined to those working day shifts. However, staff who finished late did sometimes go to other venues after work and many had observed staff from other venues coming to the respondent's workplace before or after shifts to gamble. Essentially, shiftwork was seen as encouraging staff to gamble at other venues, rather than in their workplace. This was due to workplace policies on staff gambling, relative opening hours, opportunities to meet other hospitality workers, wanting to observe the gambling facilities at other venues and wanting privacy in their own gambling.

Several respondents also commented on seeing kitchen staff gambling between shifts. In terms of physical access, these staff often find it easier to stay close to their workplace in between split shifts. Gambling then becomes a way to pass that time.

## **Social Access**

Social access to gambling was discussed by the interviewees mainly in relation to the potential familiarity and comfort of gambling in their workplace, safety and security, encouragement from other staff to gamble, the influence of patrons, the normalisation of gambling, limits on other social activities, and management and workplace culture.

Most staff who could gamble in their workplace thought familiarity with their venue's gaming environment made it a comfortable and sometimes inviting place to gamble. Cheaper drinks for staff (where provided) and the non-judgemental attitude of others added to this comfort level. However, other staff who could gamble in their workplace felt that staff preferred to gamble elsewhere, so they felt they were away from work. In contrast, staff who could not gamble in their workplace tended to disagree that familiarity with gaming environments encouraged staff to gamble. Some reasons were that this familiarity turned staff off gambling and they get sick of the environment. Others felt that individual factors such as boredom were more influential than social factors.

Respondents were fairly evenly divided on whether the added safety and security of gambling in their own venue, rather than going to another, encouraged staff to gamble in their workplace. Some commented that knowing other people in the workplace added to the level of comfort and others that security is enhanced because they know so many staff and patrons and because their venue has a strict security system. However, others noted that alternative venues were just as safe.

The potential influence of other staff on social accessibility to gambling was the topic of much discussion. Most staff who could gamble in their workplace thought that knowing other staff encouraged workplace gambling. As well as adding to comfort and security levels when gambling in the workplace, the general collegiality was attractive, although this also applied for staff who gambled at other venues where they knew employees. Finishing a shift at the same time as other staff, the sociability of the TAB for men, a drinking and gambling culture, and sharing of 'hot tips' amongst staff were other encouraging factors noted. However, others felt that social factors had no influence on machine gambling, as it is such an individual and private activity, while heavier gamblers might prefer to gamble elsewhere to retain their privacy around this. It seemed that staff working in a venue where workplace gambling was allowed were more likely to encourage other staff to gamble with them, even outside the workplace. Some staff, however, did not want to socialise with the people they worked with.

Knowing other patrons seemed to discourage staff from gambling in their workplace (where allowed), as staff liked some respite from their patrons and sometimes felt uncomfortable if patrons commented on their gambling or any wins. For some, however, knowing the patrons added to the social enjoyment.

The vast majority of interviewees recognised that gambling becomes very normalised for staff. Whether this translates into heightened gambling activity, however, depends on several other factors, such as the attractiveness of the gambling environment in the workplace, social pressures to participate, length of time working in the industry, and individual propensity to gamble. This normalisation, however, can reduce any stigma around gambling, and draw attention to its social benefits of relieving loneliness and boredom.

Also related to social access, is the limit on other social opportunities, family time and options for relaxing after work for venue staff, particularly those doing late shifts. As well as gambling in the workplace, some staff were attracted to other venues after work to socialise with other hospitality workers.

The financial circumstances of staff were also acknowledged as influencing the affordability of gambling for staff and thus the comfort level of spending limited disposable income on gambling. Most interviewees felt that staff would not consider gambling as a way to supplement their income, although some younger or newer staff members may be more naïve in this regard.

Social access to gambling in the workplace was also seen as dependent on management attitudes to staff gambling. Where a permissive policy applied, management can be seen as endorsing staff gambling. Similarly, when management is often absent, staff can feel more comfortable gambling in their venue.

Finally, hotels and TABs were perceived as places where staff gambling was more likely to occur, at sometimes excessive levels, given the more relaxed social environment of both.

### **Cognitive Access**

Several themes relating to cognitive access to gambling were raised by the interviewees. These were enhanced knowledge of the odds of gambling, greater product knowledge, attraction to individual machines, heightened access to and greater knowledge of jackpot levels, a desire to know what competitive venues are offering, and cognitive distortions of some staff.

It was widely acknowledged that staff should have a better knowledge than the general public of the odds of winning and losing at gambling and the extent of patrons' losses, so this should discourage them from gambling. However, whether this was the case depended on the financial means of the worker, whether this knowledge of the odds was stronger than the person's interest in gambling, and whether the worker perceived they had inside knowledge that would help them win. Knowing the machines in the workplace could attract staff to gamble on them, but more due to familiarity with individual machines rather than thinking that this familiarity would increase their chances of winning. However, the special knowledge required of staff working at a TAB also adds to their familiarity, comfort and knowledge of how to gamble on TAB activities. Others were genuinely interested in certain games (on machines) and, after watching patrons play them, wanted to try them themselves at their or another venue. Others observed patrons winning on particular machines and were enticed to play them to see if they could also win.

Staff were reported as having greater access to jackpot machines and greater knowledge about jackpot levels than did the general public. This led some staff to believe they know when jackpots are about to be won and others to then chase these jackpots. Staff can closely watch jackpot levels in their workplace, and then play these machines when off-duty or seek out a linked machine at another venue.

Staff gambling was also encouraged by a desire to see what competitive venues are offering, to try different machines to those in their venues and to know about alternative promotions and competitions. Some felt they gambled to enhance their product knowledge and work performance and to gain a better understanding of the patron experience.

In general, younger or newer staff were considered more vulnerable to cognitive distortions around gambling, to see gambling as 'easy money' after seeing patrons win. However, the majority thought that staff were more influenced by player losses which, in turn, deterred them from gambling themselves. Responsible gambling awareness was also cited as a discouraging influence for some staff, but the limited training of newer or younger staff added to their vulnerability in gambling.

## CONCLUSIONS

Staff of gaming venues have greater accessibility to gambling, not only in terms of physical access such as increased proximity and convenience if they are allowed to gamble in their workplace, but also because various workplace factors enhance their social and cognitive access. Thus, an important finding from this study is that the gaming venue staff had a much higher prevalence of problem and at-risk gambling than the Victorian population. This provides strong evidence that gambling problems may be linked to increased access to gambling, although it does not discount an alternative explanation that people with, or more likely to develop, gambling problems may be disproportionately attracted to working in the industry.

However, the case for a link between increased exposure and access to gambling and more active gambling and gambling problems is strengthened when some characteristics of the staff problem gamblers and regular gamblers are considered:

- Most staff problem gamblers were regular gamblers on those types of gambling most often provided in their workplaces, a finding which supports an exposure effect. Most were regular EGM gamblers, while regular betting on horse and greyhound races at a TAB was also common, but more so amongst the moderate risk gamblers.
- Staff who assisted patrons with gambling-related activities and who had received less responsible gambling training were also more likely to be moderate risk/problem gamblers than those who had received more training. In fact, amongst staff who assisted patrons with gambling-related activities, 85.3 per cent of those who had received only a few hours or less of responsible gambling training were moderate risk/problem gamblers, compared with 32.9 per cent of those who had been trained for at least half a day. This finding again supports an exposure effect, but suggests that this effect may be moderated by more responsible gambling training. Extending the duration of responsible gambling training to at least half a day for staff who assist patrons with gambling-related activities would likely lower the proportion who become moderate risk or problem gamblers.
- When compared to the Victorian population, higher proportions of the staff respondents were regular gamblers, particularly on those forms of gambling provided in their workplaces. In fact, the largest differences in regular gambling between the staff respondents and the Victorian population were for betting on horse or greyhound races (+16.0 percent), EGMs (+14.8 percent) and Club Keno (+9.0 percent).
- Further, staff who held a Gaming Industry Employee's Licence, worked in a gaming-related position, and had worked for a longer time in gaming venues. were over-represented amongst regular EGM and Club Keno gamblers. These characteristics were similar for regular workplace EGM gamblers. Thus, active and lengthy involvement in workplace gambling operations, such as assisting patrons with gaming machines, gaming promotions and cashier or change booth functions, appears to increase the likelihood of regular gambling on EGMs and Club Keno, again suggesting that exposure to gambling and gamblers is linked to gambling activity.
- Staff who worked in a Tabcorp rather than Tattersall's venue, worked in a hotel rather than a club, and who were male, were over-represented amongst regular TAB gamblers, including those who regularly punted in their workplace. Thus, effects from the workplace environment also seem to influence TAB gamblers. Tabcorp, as well as operating EGMs in Victoria, also operates the state's network of TAB outlets. A culture of punting on horse and greyhound races may be more likely to prevail in Tabcorp venues which, along with a

more relaxed environment in some hotels, might tacitly encourage such gambling amongst some staff, particularly males.

- Of those staff able to gamble in their workplace, about one-sixth were regular (weekly) gamblers on workplace EGMs, about one-seventh were regular gamblers on workplace TABs, and about one in 20 were regular gamblers on workplace Club Keno terminals. These proportions are not inconsiderable, especially for EGM and TAB gambling. Thus, a considerable proportion of staff return some of their wages to their workplaces as gambling losses. While these monies may have been spent at other venues if workplace gambling had been barred, the fact that these staff choose to spend them in their workplace suggests that proximity, convenience and a familiar environment are important determinants of gambling behaviour.
- Being able to gamble in the workplace is associated with heightened staff participation in some gambling activities, even those undertaken outside the workplace. For EGM gambling and TAB race betting, staff who could gamble in their workplace had a higher participation rate and were more likely to be regular gamblers on these activities, whether they gambled on these at work or elsewhere. They were also more likely to spend more than \$20 per month on race betting at a TAB and to play EGMs for longer than two hours each session, although not necessarily in their workplace. It seems the tacit endorsement of gambling through permissive policies on staff gambling in the workplace is accompanied by more active EGM and TAB gambling overall. However, being able to gamble in the workplace did not appear to influence staff participation, frequency, expenditure and duration for the other types of gambling surveyed.
- While staff with the additional access to gambling in the workplace were more active gamblers on EGMs and TAB race betting, this did not appear to elevate their levels of problem gambling or their at-risk status beyond those of staff who cannot gamble in their own venue. Nevertheless, while physical accessibility to gambling in the workplace was not a key determinant of gambling problems, the staff still had much higher levels of gambling problems than the Victorian population. This suggests that other aspects of accessibility are more operative.
- What was found to be more pertinent to the risk of gambling problems was heightened cognitive access to Club Keno, race betting, EGMs and casino table games. While the typically frequent and heavy gambling of problem and moderate risk gamblers no doubt enhances this cognitive access, working in a gaming venue can also heighten staff understanding and familiarity with gambling products, particularly those offered in their workplace – EGMs, keno and race betting. As such, the increased cognitive access that comes from working in a gaming venue best explained the elevated rates of gambling problems found amongst the staff respondents.

## LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The results of this study should be read with several limitations in mind. First, non-random sampling and the non-inclusion of casino employees mean the results apply only to the hotel and club staff who responded to the survey and cannot be generalised to the population of gaming venue staff in Victoria, or elsewhere. Similarly, the qualitative results derived from the 40 interviews do not claim to be representative of the population.

Additionally, there are inherent weaknesses in using a cross-sectional survey methodology. A key one is that, when investigating the link between access to gambling and problem gambling, cause

and effect are unclear. It seems that actual gambling behaviour can (and did) shape respondents' assessments of their accessibility to gambling, at least in the social and cognitive domains. This suggests the need for a more objective measure of these dimensions of accessibility. However, this seems particularly problematic when the nature of these constructs are considered, particularly if accessibility and problem gambling are measured concurrently, as was done here. Thus, while the accessibility scales developed for this study had good internal reliability and appeared to capture the constructs measured in ways that aligned with the interview results and with the model of accessibility to gambling developed by the Productivity Commission (1999), they were not able to isolate cause from effect. Whether social and cognitive access affect gambling behaviour, or whether gambling behaviour affects social and cognitive access, remains unclear.

## SUMMARY OF KEY RESULTS

Table A summarises the main results from the study.

**Table A: Summary of key research results**

<b>Restrictions on Staff Gambling in the Workplace</b>			
Victorian Legislation	Industry Codes	Hotel & Club Policies	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No gambling while on duty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No gambling while on duty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some prohibit staff gambling in the workplace</li> <li>Some allow staff to gamble in the workplace, under varying conditions</li> </ul>	

  

<b>Gambling Behaviour Amongst All Staff Respondents</b>			
Participation	Regular Gambling	Spent Over \$20 per Month	Spent Over 1 Hour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>95.9% participation</li> <li>average 4.4 gambling activities</li> <li>lottery-type games (77.9%)</li> <li>EGMs (77.3%)</li> <li>TAB races (59.1%)</li> <li>instant scratchies (51.6%)</li> <li>racetrack (46.3%)</li> <li>Club Keno (35.5%)</li> <li>casino table games (22.1%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (20.1%)</li> <li>private gambling (13.5%)</li> <li>bingo (12.2%)</li> <li>internet casino games (2.3%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>lottery-type games (33.4%)</li> <li>EGMs (18.0%)</li> <li>TAB races (14.3%)</li> <li>instant scratchies (7.3%)</li> <li>racetrack (7.2%)</li> <li>Club Keno (4.6%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (2.8%)</li> <li>bingo (1.7%)</li> <li>private gambling (0.8%)</li> <li>casino table games (0.4%)</li> <li>internet casino games (0.2%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EGMs (58.9%)</li> <li>lottery-type games (58.9%)</li> <li>casino table games (47.7%)</li> <li>bingo (45.0%)</li> <li>internet casino games (37.5%)</li> <li>TAB races (36.6%)</li> <li>racetrack (37.1%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (26.8%)</li> <li>private gambling (18.7%)</li> <li>Club Keno (13.8%)</li> <li>instant scratchies (1.3%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>private gambling (94.0%)</li> <li>bingo (89.9%)</li> <li>casino table games (56.1%)</li> <li>internet casino games (50.0%)</li> <li>racetrack (48.0%)</li> <li>EGMs (45.0%)</li> <li>TAB races (18.9%)</li> <li>Club Keno (11.2%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (7.1%)</li> </ul>

  

<b>Gambling Behaviour of Staff Able to Gamble in the Workplace</b>			
Participation	Regular Gambling	Spent Over \$20 per Month	Spent Over 1 Hour
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Club Keno (29.2%)</li> <li>TAB races (42.0%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (15.7%)</li> <li>EGMs (62.4%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Club Keno (4.6%)</li> <li>TAB races (13.9%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (2.9%)</li> <li>EGMs (15.8%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EGMs (25.6%)</li> <li>TAB races (11.7%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (1.8%)</li> <li>Club Keno (2.6%)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EGMs (14.6%)</li> <li>TAB races (4.6%)</li> <li>sportsbetting (0.0%)</li> <li>Club Keno (0.4%)</li> </ul>

**Problem Gambling Prevalence Amongst All Staff Respondents (non-gamblers = 4.1%)**

Problem Gamblers	Moderate Risk	Low Risk	Non-Problem
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5.6% of respondents.</li> <li>• average 4.4 gambling activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 13.7% of respondents</li> <li>• average 5.2 gambling activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 22.4% of respondents</li> <li>• average 4.9 gambling activities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 54.1% of respondents</li> <li>• average 3.9 gambling activities</li> </ul>
<p>Higher proportions of problem gamblers than the other CPGI groups had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gambled on instant scratch tickets, private gambling, bingo, Club Keno and EGMs</li> <li>• gambled at least weekly on Club Keno and EGMs</li> <li>• spent more than \$20 per month on lottery-type games, Club Keno and EGMs</li> <li>• spent more than two hours each time they gambled on EGMs, TAB races and Club Keno</li> </ul>	<p>Higher proportions of the moderate risk gamblers than of the other CPGI groups had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gambled at a racetrack and on sportsbetting</li> <li>• gambled at least weekly at a racetrack, and TAB races</li> <li>• spent more than \$20 per month on betting TAB races</li> </ul>	<p>Higher proportions of the low risk gamblers than of the other CPGI groups had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• gambled on TAB races</li> <li>• gambled at least weekly on instant scratch tickets</li> </ul> <p>Low risk gamblers were more likely than non-problem gamblers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• spend more than \$20 per month on lottery-type games, Club Keno, TAB races and EGMs</li> </ul>	

**Differences in Gambling Behaviour of Staff Who Can and Cannot Gamble in the Workplace**

Higher proportions of staff who could gamble in their workplace:

- participated in horse or greyhound betting at a TAB
- participated in EGM gambling
- gambled at least weekly on horse or greyhound races at a TAB
- gambled 1-3 times a month and at least weekly on EGMs
- spent more than \$20 per month on horse or greyhound races at a TAB
- normally spent more than 2 hours playing EGMs

**Differences in Gambling Behaviour of Staff Respondents and the Victorian Population**

- participation rate – 95.9% for staff; 77.4% for Victoria
- average no. of gambling activities – 4.4 for staff; 2.3 for Victoria
- staff participation rates were higher for all gambling activities, especially EGMs, TAB races, racetrack betting and Club Keno
- higher proportions of the staff respondents had gambled at least weekly on EGMs, Club Keno, instant scratchies, races and sportsbetting
- staff respondents generally travelled less distance to play EGMs

**Perceived Accessibility to Different Types of Gambling**

Most accessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EGMs</li> <li>• Lottery-type games</li> <li>• Club Keno</li> </ul>
↑ ↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Horse/greyhound races</li> <li>• Sportsbetting</li> </ul>
Least accessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Casino table games</li> </ul>

**Perceived Physical, Social and Cognitive Accessibility to Different Types of Gambling**

	Physical access	Social Access	Cognitive access
Most accessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EGMs</li> <li>• Lottery-type games</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Club Keno</li> <li>• Lottery-type games</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EGMs</li> <li>• Club Keno</li> </ul>
↑ ↓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Races</li> <li>• Sportsbetting</li> <li>• Club Keno</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Races</li> <li>• EGMs</li> <li>• Sportsbetting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lottery-type games</li> <li>• Races</li> <li>• Sportsbetting</li> </ul>
Least accessible	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Casino table games</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Casino table games</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Casino table games</li> </ul>

**Differences in Perceived Physical, Social and Cognitive Access Within Each Gambling Type**

	Lottery	Club Keno	Races	Sportsbetting	EGMs	Casino Table Games
Most easy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• physical</li> <li>• social</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• social</li> <li>• physical</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• physical</li> <li>• social</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• physical</li> <li>• social</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• physical</li> <li>• cognitive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• social</li> <li>• physical</li> </ul>
Least easy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cognitive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cognitive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cognitive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cognitive</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• social</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• cognitive</li> </ul>

**Differences in Perceived Access for Staff who Can and Cannot Gamble in their Workplace**

Being able to gamble in the workplace significantly heightened the perceived access to gambling on EGMs, Club Keno and horse/greyhound races

**Influence of Perceived Access on Gambling Behaviour**

<p>Easier physical access increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation in Club Keno and casino table games</li> <li>• frequency of playing casino table games</li> <li>• expenditure on instant scratch tickets</li> </ul>	<p>Easier social access increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation in sportsbetting and EGM gambling</li> </ul> <p>but decreased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• frequency of sportsbetting</li> </ul>	<p>Easier cognitive access increased:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation in lottery-type games, Club Keno, TAB races, sportsbetting, EGMs and casino table games</li> <li>• frequency of gambling on lottery-type games, betting on races, EGMs and casino table games</li> <li>• expenditure on Club Keno, race betting and EGMs</li> <li>• duration of gambling sessions on race betting and EGMs</li> </ul>
---	---	--

**Influence of Perceived Accessibility on Problem Gambling**

The probability of being a problem or moderate risk gambler was found to be higher when:

- gamblers have extremely easy physical access to betting on horse and greyhound races
- gamblers have more difficult social access to betting on horse and greyhound races and EGMs
- gamblers have extremely easy cognitive access to Club Keno, betting on horse/greyhound races, EGMs and casino table games

**Main Themes From Interviews on Workplace Influences on Gambling Accessibility**

Physical access	Social Access	Cognitive Access
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• convenience</li> <li>• proximity to work and to home</li> <li>• shiftwork and split shifts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• familiarity, comfort and security of gambling in the workplace</li> <li>• encouragement from other staff to gamble</li> <li>• influence of patrons</li> <li>• normalisation of gambling</li> <li>• limits on other social activities for staff</li> <li>• management and workplace culture</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• enhanced knowledge of gambling odds</li> <li>• greater product knowledge</li> <li>• attraction to individual machines</li> <li>• heightened access to and knowledge of jackpot levels</li> <li>• desire to know what competitive venues are offering</li> <li>• cognitive distortions of younger/newer staff</li> </ul>