## **Appendix 3**

## Tables from Productivity Commission Report no. 50

**Table 3.1** Regular and EGM players face more problems Queensland 2008-09

Outcomes	sometimes	often	always	Risk relative to non-regular gamblers (sometimes to always)	Risk relative to non-regular gamblers (always) <sup>a</sup>		
	%	%	%	Ratio	Ratio		
Non regular gamblers							
Bet more than could afford	1.15	0.12	0.03	1.0	1.0		
Felt might have problem	0.28	0.07	0.03	1.0	1.0		
Caused health problems	0.24	0.02	0.02	1.0	1.0		
Criticised about gambling	0.24	0.05	0.01	1.0	1.0		
Caused financial problems	0.12	0.04	0.01	1.0	1.0		
Felt guilty about gambling	1.09	0.22	0.14	1.0	1.0		
	Non-regu	lar EGM	gamblers	8			
Bet more than could afford	1.66	0.19	0.10	1.5	4.0		
Felt might have problem	0.74	0.02	80.0	2.2	2.8		
Caused health problems	0.35	0.00	0.05	1.5	3.1		
Criticised about gambling	0.47	0.26	0.03	2.4	2.1		
Caused financial problems	0.37	0.02	0.03	2.4	3.3		
Felt guilty about gambling	2.04	0.45	0.26	1.9	1.9		
	Regular (n	on-Lotto	gambler	S			
Bet more than could afford	11.59	0.93	2.39	11.5	95.0		
Felt might have problem	8.34	1.37	1.83	30.8	63.2		
Caused health problems	2.46	1.21	1.42	18.5	88.8		
Criticised about gambling	7.60	1.44	1.47	33.7	101.8		
Caused financial problems	4.00	1.05	0.79	33.6	87.5		
Felt guilty about gambling	12.1	3.9	1.4	12.0	10.2		
Regular EGM gamblers							
Bet more than could afford	14.68	1.38	2.51	14.3	99.8		
Felt might have problem	10.91	1.98	2.79	41.9	96.4		
Caused health problems	2.54	1.72	2.09	23.0	130.7		
Criticised about gambling	9.58	1.00	2.33	41.4	161.4		
Caused financial problems	5.05	0.85	1.15	40.5	127.4		
Felt guilty about gambling	14.32	5.27	2.15	15.0	15.5		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> A regular gambler is someone whose total frequency of gambling involving gaming machines, wagering, keno, casino table games and sportsbetting is 52 or more times per year. (The frequency of playing lotteries, scratchies, bingo and a variety of other gambling forms do not make any contribution to the total used to compute regular play — hence the term 'non-Lotto'.) A regular EGM gambler is one who plays EGMs once a week or more. A non-regular gambler includes people playing lotteries, scratchies or other games 52 times or more per year. The risk ratios in columns 5 and 6 are calculated respectively as (S<sub>R</sub>+O<sub>R</sub>+A<sub>R</sub>)/(S<sub>NR</sub>+O<sub>NR</sub>+A<sub>NR</sub>) and A<sub>R</sub>/A<sub>NR</sub> where R denotes regular (non-Lotto) or regular EGM players, and NR denotes a non-regular gambler. S, O and A are respectively the shares of the relevant gambling groups who say sometimes, often or always. For example, the likelihood of someone who is a regular EGM player saying they sometimes, often or always get criticised about their gambling is 41.4 times higher than a non-regular gambler. The likelihood of someone who is a regular EGM player saying they always are criticised about their gambling is 161.4 times higher than a non-regular gambler.

Source: Queensland prevalence survey 2008-09.

**Table 3.2** Regular and EGM players face more problems Victoria 2008

Outcomes	Rarely or sometimes	often	always	Risk relative to non-regular gamblers (rarely to always)	Risk relative to non-regular gamblers (always) <sup>a</sup>
	%	%	%	ratio	ratio
5	Non-re	egular g	amblers		
Bet more than could afford	4.41	0.28	0.23	1.0	1.0
Felt might have problem	1.30	0.12	0.11	1.0	1.0
Caused health problems	0.89	0.09	0.11	1.0	1.0
Criticised about gambling	1.36	0.07	0.07	1.0	1.0
Caused financial problems	0.93	0.07	0.06	1.0	1.0
Felt guilty about gambling	3.34	0.26	0.42	1.0	1.0
<del></del>	Non-regu	ılar EGN	/ gambler	'S	
Bet more than could afford	13.86	1.21	0.88	3.2	3.8
Felt might have problem	5.65	0.39	0.6	4.3	5.5
Caused health problems	3.31	0.36	0.48	3.8	4.4
Criticised about gambling	4.16	0.4	0.35	3.3	5.0
Caused financial problems	3.41	0.26	0.28	3.7	4.7
Felt guilty about gambling	10.98	1.14	1.63	3.4	3.9
	Regular (r	on-Lott	o) gamble	ers	
Bet more than could afford	23.14	2.70	2.60	5.8	11.3
Felt might have problem	13.37	1.43	4.67	12.7	42.5
Caused health problems	8.29	2.03	1.87	11.2	17.0
Criticised about gambling	10.31	1.83	3.99	10.8	57.0
Caused financial problems	7.97	1.60	1.50	10.4	25.0
Felt guilty about gambling	18.50	4.29	5.16	7.0	12.3
-	Regula	ar EGM ç	gamblers		
Bet more than could afford	28.00	5.46	5.82	8.0	25.3
Felt might have problem	16.82	2.88	9.58	19.1	87.1
Caused health problems	9.38	5.18	4.37	17.4	39.7
Criticised about gambling	9.23	1.79	9.30	13.5	132.9
Caused financial problems	10.16	4.07	3.65	16.9	60.8
Felt guilty about gambling	19.18	8.75	9.81	9.4	23.4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> The second column of this table provides data for people scoring 1 on the relevant CPGI category (rarely or sometimes), rather than 'sometimes' only, as in the data shown for Queensland. See above table for construction of the table and its interpretation.

Source: Victorian prevalence survey 2008.

Table 3.3 Problems consistently rise with frequency of playing EGMS

Outcome	Share of group affected				
<del>,</del>	1-6	7-12	13-24	25-52	53+
	times	times	times	times	times
	%	%	%	%	%
Queensland 2008-09					
Bet more than could afford (sometimes or more)	1.0	2.4	5.5	13.6	28.8
Thought might have gambling problem (sometimes or more)		1.0	3.7	9.9	27.2
Health affected (rarely or more)	0.4	1.1	2.5	4.1	16.9
Criticised about gambling (sometimes or more)	0.3	1.0	2.5	9.2	20.0
Caused financial problems (sometimes or more)	0.0	0.1	2.9	4.7	12.9
Felt guilty about gambling (sometimes or more)	1.5	2.9	9.1	15.2	33.5
Wanted help	0.2	3.7	2.2	5.3	28.3
Victoria 2008 <sup>a</sup>					**
Bet more than could afford (often/always)	8.0	3.3	6.2	8.7	19.4
Health affected (rarely or more)	2.1	5.8	11.5	11.6	37.6
Criticised about gambling (often/always)	0.2	1.4	3.3	6.7	20.5
Caused financial problems (often/always)	0.1	1.4	1.9	3.7	15.4
Felt guilty about gambling (often/always)	1.4	4.3	6.1	15.5	27.7

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Other than the item relating to health problems, the data for Victoria use a more stringent categorisation of harm (often/always) than the Queensland data shown (sometimes to always). This reflects the fact that the unit record data for Victoria relate to the CPGI score, not the Likert rating. Were a CPGI 1+ score to be used to categorise some level of harm, then that would include rarely as well as sometimes, and would raise the probability of harm at any given frequency. For example, if the probabilities were calculated for feeling guilty about gambling (rarely to always) for Victoria, the probabilities associated with the frequency of playing EGMs from 1-6 to 53+ are, respectively, 8.5, 20.8, 25.9, 30.8 and 51.5 per cent.

Source: Queensland prevalence survey 2008-09 and Victorian prevalence survey 2008.