

# ***Appendices***

# Appendix A - Survey instrument

## EGM DESIGN CHARACTERISTICS AND PLAYER BEHAVIOUR SMALL DELETIONS POST-PILOT VERSION 2-12-08 (N=1000)

Note that N=500 epi implies 500 EGM players who can be categorised as either non-problem gamblers or low risk gamblers on the CPGSI. This implies that EGM players will only have a score of either 0 (zero) as 'non-problem' gamblers or 1-2 as 'low risk' gamblers, as measured by the CPGSIs

Good morning/afternoon/evening. This is XX from I-View calling on behalf of the State Government of Victoria. The Victorian Government is conducting a study on how poker machine and electronic gaming machine design affects player behaviour.

**Sample A (N=500)** - Could I please speak to someone in your household who has played the pokies at least once in the past 12mths?

1. Yes
2. No (*It's actually a study to explore how poker machine design affects player behaviour. So it would be appreciated if you could contribute to this important social research study*)

**Sample B (N=500 EPI)** - Could I please speak to [insert name of respondent from epi panel] - I understand that you have agreed to take part in further research after participating in a study exploring gambling patterns in Victoria. May I just confirm that you have played the pokies in the past 12mths?

1. Yes
2. No (*Thanks anyway for your time. This study surveys people who have played poker machines at least once in the past 12mths). But we will be ringing you again soon as further studies will explore patterns of gambling over time*)

Would you kindly take part in this important Victorian Government study? It will take about 10 minutes and is strictly confidential.

**ALL N=1000 TO DO FULL SURVEY AS INDICATED IN SURVEY SCRIPT INSTRUCTIONS, SO SURVEY PILOT TIMING TO BE CONFIRMED ON THIS BASIS.**

**(Sample A only - N=500 RDD)** May I confirm...? [**Sample B - N=500 EPI variables to be inserted from epi data set**]

1. Your age: \_\_\_\_\_ (98-DK, 99-Refused) (If under 18 > "So sorry, but you don't qualify for the study" + Exit)  
(999 if won't give age - then prompt age bands and code the band)
2. Do you speak a language other than English at home? Yes/No (98-DK, 99-Refused)  
(If yes - 5b. which main language? \_\_\_\_\_)
3. Are you of Aboriginal, Torres Strait islander or Australian South Sea Islander background? Yes/No  
(98-DK, 99-Refused)
4. What is the total number of land telephone lines in your household (not faxes/mobiles or internet phones which don't have a land line number): \_\_\_\_\_ (98-DK, 99-Refused)
5. The total number of people 18yrs or over who usually live in this household: \_\_\_\_\_ (98-DK, 99-Refused)
6. Your Local Government Authority: \_\_\_\_\_ (98-DK, 99-Refused)
7. Your Suburb: \_\_\_\_\_  
Your Postcode: \_\_\_\_\_

7A. Gender - 1. Male 2. Female

ALL - Sample A N=500 and Sample B N=500 EPI

8. May I first ask how often you have played the pokies on average in the past 12mths? (record highest frequency)
1. Once a week or more
  2. Once a fortnight
  3. Once a month
  4. Once every 2mths
  5. Once every 3mths
  6. Less frequently
9. Where do you most frequently play the pokies? (PROMPT - SINGLE RESPONSE)
1. Clubs
  2. Pubs/hotel
  3. Casino
  4. Online
  5. Outside Victoria (eg. on holiday)
  6. Elsewhere (record) \_\_\_\_\_

**(SAMPLE A ONLY) [Sample B - N=500 EPI CPGSI variables to be inserted from epi data set]**  
**OLD VERSION OF CPGI SCALE - Canadian Problem Gambling Severity Index (9 item measure)**

**[DUE TO INTERVIEWER HABIT OF USING 1-4, RATHER THAN 0-3 ETC. (A HUMAN FACTOR ISSUE), I-VIEW WILL PROGRAM AS 1-4 FOR INTERVIEWERS, THEN IT WILL BE RECODED IN CATI SCRIPT "LIVE" AS INDICATED BELOW (ie. back to 0-3) - SCORES BELOW MUST BE USED TO FORM THE REAL CPGSI SCORES AND SEGMENTS - THIS IS TO AVOID HUMAN ERROR ON THE PART OF INTERVIEWERS]**

OK thanks for that... The next questions refer to all your gambling in the past 12mths.

- CPGI\_1 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often have you bet more than you could really afford to lose?  
Would you say (PROMPT):
0. Never
  1. Rarely
  1. Sometimes
  2. Often
  3. Always

- CPGI\_2 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement? (PROMPT): WOULD YOU SAY
0. Never
  1. Rarely
  1. Sometimes
  2. Often
  3. Always

- CPGI\_3 - Thinking about the past 12 months, WHEN YOU GAMBLED, how often have you gone back another day to try to win back the money you lost? (PROMPT): WOULD YOU SAY
0. Never
  1. Rarely
  1. Sometimes
  2. Often
  3. Always

CPGI\_4 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble? (PROMPT) WOULD YOU SAY

- 0. Never
- 1. Rarely
- 1. Sometimes
- 2. Often
- 3. Always

CPGI\_5 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often have you felt that you might have a problem with gambling? (PROMPT) WOULD YOU SAY

- 0. Never
- 1. Rarely
- 1. Sometimes
- 2. Often
- 3. Always

CPGI\_6 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often have people criticized your betting or told you that you had a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true? (PROMPT) WOULD YOU SAY

- 0. Never
- 1. Rarely
- 1. Sometimes
- 2. Often
- 3. Always

CPGI\_7 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often have you felt guilty about the way you gamble, or what happens when you gamble? (PROMPT) WOULD YOU SAY

- 0. Never
- 1. Rarely
- 1. Sometimes
- 2. Often
- 3. Always

CPGI\_8 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often has your gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety? (PROMPT) WOULD YOU SAY

- 0. Never
- 1. Rarely
- 1. Sometimes
- 2. Often
- 3. Always

CPGI\_9 - Thinking about the past 12 months, how often has your gambling caused any financial problems for you or your household? (PROMPT) WOULD YOU SAY

- 0. Never
- 1. Rarely
- 1. Sometimes
- 2. Often
- 3. Always

Thank you for that.

CATI PROGRAMMER - Take extreme care with accuracy!
<p>9 CPGSI items summed in CATI script using codes displayed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0. Never</li> <li>• 1. Rarely</li> <li>• 1. Sometimes</li> <li>• 2. Often</li> <li>• 3. Always</li> </ul> <p>4 groups to be formed based on sum of 9 CPGSI items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Non-problem gamblers - total score=0</li> <li>• Low risk gamblers - total score=1-2</li> <li>• Moderate risk gamblers - total score=3-7</li> <li>• Problem gamblers - total score=8-27</li> </ul>

CATI PROGRAMMER - PUT ALL CPGI SCORES INTO A SINGLE SPSS VARIABLE

[ALL - EGM PLAYERS WITH A CPGSI RISK STATUS AS DEFINED BELOW]

NP=Non-problem gamblers, LR=low risk gamblers, MR=moderate risk gamblers, PGs=problem gamblers

OR ALL=implies all CPGSI risk status segments (ie. NPs, LRs, MRs, PGs)

10. Now I'd like you to imagine that the pokies were changed in their design. When I read out each possible design change, I'd like you to tell me how each change might... **(RETAIL ALL COLUMNS)**

- (1) Affect how often you play the pokies
- (2) Affect how long you play the pokies each session
- (3) Affect your spending on pokies and;
- (4) Affect your enjoyment of the pokies.

**ADD 98. DK and 99. Refused to all of the following battery questions.**

CPGSI risk status	STATEMENTS	(A) Would you play the pokies... (PROMPT)	(B) Would you play... (PROMPT)	(C) Would you spend... (PROMPT)	(D) Would this change make pokies play for you personally... (PROMPT)
<b>LINES OF PLAY - Let's first assume that the number of lines was changed on poker machines...</b> (If needed - Lines are just the rows of numbers on the front screen with all the symbols and patterns)					
ALL	1. If the number of lines was set to 50 lines maximum	1. Less often 2. About the same 3. More often	1. Shorter sessions 2. About the same length of session or 3. Longer sessions	1. Less money 2. About the same money or 3. More money	1. Less enjoyable 2. About the same 3. More enjoyable
ALL	2. How about if the maximum lines was set to 25 lines	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)

CPGSI risk status	STATEMENTS	(A) Would you play the pokies... (PROMPT)	(B) Would you play... (PROMPT)	(C) Would you spend... (PROMPT)	(D) Would this change make pokies play for you personally... (PROMPT)
ALL	3. How many lines per spin or game <u>on average</u> do you <u>currently</u> typically play when playing the pokies? 1. Single line 2. Up to 25% of available lines 3. 25-50% of available lines 4. 50-75% of available lines 5. Maximum lines available				
<b>PAY LINES - Now the next question is about <u>pay lines</u> which is about matching pictures on the pokies reels to win. You may recall that most poker machines currently have multiple 'pay lines', where wins can run in many directions... (The pay line is the winning line. How patterns and symbols are displayed in a row to win)</b>					
ALL	4. Now how about if there was only a <u>single pay line for winning on the pokies</u> rather than multiple pay lines	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>CREDITS PER LINE - Now thinking about changes to the maximum credits you can bet <u>per line</u> on the pokies.... (Credits are how much money you bet per line - Such as betting 1 or 2 credits per line. Putting in \$1 may give you 100 credits on a 1 cent machine)</b>					
ALL	5. How about if the maximum was <u>10 credits</u> bet per line	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	6. How about if the maximum was a <u>single credit bet</u> per line	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	7. How often do you bet <u>MULTIPLE</u> credits PER LINE (that is - more than one credit per line) when playing the pokies? (prompt) 1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always				
<b>BANK NOTE ACCEPTORS - Now I'd like you to think about the bank note and coin acceptors that allow you to put money into the pokies...</b>					
NP, LR	8. How about if you could only put in a maximum of a \$20 note in the pokies (ie. as the highest note taken)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
NP, LR	9. How about if you could only put in a maximum of a \$10 note in the pokies	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
NP, LR	10. How about if you could only put in coins into the pokies	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>SPIN - Now I'd like you to think about the speed of pokies games or the spin rate as it's often called... This is the time it takes for a game to end, after you press the button. You currently wait at least 2.13 seconds for a game to end on the pokies.</b>					
ALL	11. How about if you had to wait 5s between button presses? (imagine that) - it's quite a bit slower than currently	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	12. How about if you had to wait 4s between button presses? (imagine that) - a little slower than currently	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	13. How about if you had to wait 3s between button presses? (imagine that) - just a little bit slower than currently	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>DOUBLE UP - Now I'd like you to consider the double-up feature of pokies games, where you choose to gamble all or none... (If needed - This is where you are presented with the chance to risk your winnings after a win - You risk double or nothing or choose not to double up. It's also sometimes called 'gamble'. They sometimes ask you to pick red or black card colours or something like that)</b>					
NP, LR	14. If there was no "double up" or "gamble" button available during pokies play at all (where you risk double or nothing)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)

CPGSI risk status	STATEMENTS	(A) Would you play the pokies... (PROMPT)	(B) Would you play... (PROMPT)	(C) Would you spend... (PROMPT)	(D) Would this change make pokies play for you personally... (PROMPT)
<b>FREE SPINS/FEATURES - Now thinking about free spins and features...</b>					
ALL	15. How about if pokies no longer awarded free spins at all (If needed - these are the free games you win or free button presses)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	16. How about if pokies no longer awarded features at all (If needed - this is when something special happens on the pokie machine. Like the wheel of fortune spins as you've got a special win. In other cases, lights may flash in a certain way or special music may play)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	17. How about if features were awarded, but they were for entertainment only and <u>not linked</u> to winning money	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>OTHER FEATURES</b>					
ALL	18. Have you ever played the new types of pokies with touch sensitive screens? Yes/No (If needed - these are screen you touch instead of pressing a button) 19. Have you ever played the new types of pokies with the very tall screens? Yes/No (If needed - these are the fancy new taller machines) 20. Thinking of the new types of poker machines with touchscreens, using a scale where 1=not at all and 5=significantly, to what extent do you think the new "touchscreen" machines... 1. Encourage you to spend more money ____ 2. Encourage you to use double up/gamble your credits when it comes up ____				
ALL	21. Are you aware that poker machines have what is termed 'Player Information Displays'. These screens advise players about the odds of winning, amounts expended, losses, duration of play and Gambler's Help. 1. Aware 2. Not Aware 22. (Q21.=1) If How often have you used Player Information Displays when playing the pokies in the past 12mths? (prompt) 1. Never 2. Rarely 3. Sometimes 4. Often 5. Always				
<b>Expenditure limits - Now these questions are about the idea of setting expenditure limits for pokies play</b>					
ALL	23. How about being required to set your own expenditure limit before starting to play the pokies	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	24. How about ONLY being required to set an expenditure limit if you want your pokies expenditure to go above a certain amount	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	25. What amount of pokies expenditure in dollars <u>per day</u> would be best to require players to start using limits? If they are spending more than \$____ per day				
ALL	26. How about having to wait 24hr before being able to change your pokies expenditure limit	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>Breaks in play - Now I'd like you to think about breaks in play...</b>					
ALL	27. How about having to take a 20 minute compulsory break from the pokies after every 2hrs of play?	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)

CPGSI risk status	STATEMENTS	(A) Would you play the pokies... (PROMPT)	(B) Would you play... (PROMPT)	(C) Would you spend... (PROMPT)	(D) Would this change make pokies play for you personally... (PROMPT)
<b>Winning - Now let's talk about jackpots and winnings...</b>					
NP, LR	28. How about being able to only access linked jackpots across a <u>small number of poker machines</u> rather than all machines in a venue	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>Maximum cost per game - Now let's consider maximum spending for each pokies spin or game (limited sample - removed due to respondent difficulties)</b>					
NP, LR	29. How about being able to only access pokies with a maximum of \$3 per spin/game	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
NP, LR	30. How about being able to only access pokies with a maximum of \$1 per spin/game	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>Maximum cost per minute of play - Now let's think about spending per minute... (limited sample - removed due to respondent difficulties)</b>					
NP, LR	31. How about players being restricted in being able to spend no more than \$40 per minute on the pokies	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
NP, LR	32. How about players being restricted in being able to spend no more than \$30 per minute on the pokies	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>Player information and warnings - The next questions are about warnings and player information...</b>					
ALL	33. How about if you received an <u>visual warning</u> for every 30 minutes you spent on the pokies	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	34. How about if there was information on the pokies screen that told you your <u>nett loss</u> in a single session	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	35. How about if there was a <u>short survey</u> on the pokies screen to help identify if you have a gambling problem	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	36. How about if a warning statement like "Think of what you are really gambling with?" came up once a player had lost over \$100 in a single pokies session	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>EFTPOS - Now I'd like you to consider EFTPOS as a way to access cash while in pokies venues.... You may have heard that in 2012, no ATMs will be available in gaming venues... So now I'd like you to consider the impact of..</b>					
ALL	37. Having to ask a cashier for an EFTPOS withdrawal every time you needed to access to cash while at a pokies venue. If this was required to access cash...	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
ALL	38. To what degree does no ATM being available in gambling venues from 2012 affect your overall enjoyment of the pokies? 1. Has no effect at all 2. Makes play more enjoyable 3. Makes play less enjoyable				
ALL	39. Assuming ATMs are banned in venues and only EFTPOS is available to get money (which requires people to talk to venue staff), what do you believe is a reasonable limit on EFTPOS cash withdrawals per day in pokies venues? (Not spending, but cash withdrawals) \$_____				

CPGSI risk status	STATEMENTS	(A) Would you play the pokies... (PROMPT)	(B) Would you play... (PROMPT)	(C) Would you spend... (PROMPT)	(D) Would this change make pokies play for you personally... (PROMPT)
<b>Alcohol consumption while playing the pokies - And how about...</b>					
ALL	40. Not being able to <u>drink alcohol at all</u> while playing the pokies (for instance, you have to leave the pokies room)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>Venue intervention</b>					
ALL	41. How about if venues <u>sensitively</u> approached any pokies players if they suspect that people may be experiencing a problem with their gambling	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)	(repeat scale)
<b>OTHER FACTORS IN THE PLAY EXPERIENCE</b>					
ALL	42. How many minutes or hours at a <u>minimum</u> do you generally need to play the pokies before you feel like you've had a good time? ___ minutes of play				
	43. What is the minimum number of <u>free spins</u> you generally need to get on the pokies, before you feel like you've had a good time? ___ free spins per session (ADDED CODE - 'Don't need to have any free spins to feel satisfied')				
	44. What is the minimum number of <u>features</u> you generally need to get on the pokies, before you feel like you've had a good time? ___ features per session (ADDED CODE - 'Don't need to have any features to feel satisfied')				

11. (NP only) Would the following theoretical changes to poker machine design lead you to do a different leisure activity other than pokies... (ADD 98. DK and 99. but apply same caution as advised for Q10.!)

1. Reducing the lines to 50 maximum - Y/N
2. Reducing the pay lines to a single pay line - Y/N
3. Reducing the maximum bets to a single credit - Y/N
4. Reducing the note acceptors to \$20 maximum - Y/N
5. Removing the ability to win free spins - Y/N
6. Removing the ability to win features - Y/N
7. Slowing spin rate from the current 2.14 seconds a spin to 4 seconds a spin - Y/N
8. Being made to take a compulsory 20 minute break every two hours - Y/N
9. How about if alcohol consumption was banned during pokies play - Y/N

**Thanks kindly for that...**

Future studies **Sample A ONLY (N=500)**

**[Sample B - N=500 EPI variables to be inserted from epi data set]**

The Victorian Government is doing a study to look at community views about gambling over time. Would you be happy for your name and contact details to be supplied to the Victorian Government with your responses? If you agree to this, the information that you supply would be used by other social researchers to conduct future studies to see how gambling patterns change over time.

This can also give you an opportunity to be selected for focus groups for incentives or free shopping vouchers.

1. Agree to participate
2. Soft refusal (could be converted)
3. Hard refusal (no way)

This only means that we may call to see if you're interested, so you can also decline to take part in the future.

Can I confirm your first name once again? \_\_\_\_\_

Can I confirm your phone number is \_\_\_\_\_

Are there other numbers or a mobile for future contact? (record all - including mobiles or other numbers)

[ALL]

I'd like to thank you for taking part in this Victorian Government study and advise you that my supervisor may call to verify your participation. (If Moderate Risk Gambler or Problem Gambler)

I was wondering whether you may be interested in some free confidential support from the Gambler's Help Telephone Line. Would you like their number or would you like someone from there to contact you?

1. Asked for number (1800 858 858) (NEW NATIONAL NUMBER)
2. Asked for counsellor to call (organise call back and advise within 1hr - Counselling in line with counsellor availability)  
(Confirm number for call and contact name \_\_\_\_\_)
3. Didn't want number or counsellor to call

## Study Sampling Design Notes

Item	Details
Sample source	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>N=500 from epi, N=500 from RDD</li></ul>
Sample	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>For RDD - Victorian adult population 18yrs or over (including 18yr olds)</li><li>For epi panel - EGM players with CPGSI scores from 0-2</li></ul>
Counters	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>Yes - Gender, Age (same as epi age groups), Region</li><li>ALSO daily updates on CPGSI segmentation for both - (1) RDD sample (2) Epi panel (at this stage target 0-2)</li></ul>
Stratification	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>DHS region - follow stratification by DHS region as per epi study using virgin sample from epidemiological study</li></ul>

# Appendix B - Other interesting findings relating to the problem gambler risk segment

## Context

While the major segments of interest in the current study were non-problem and low risk gamblers, problem gamblers are clearly a segment which offers significant policy value from a research perspective. For this purpose, the current section summarises how various EGM characteristics impacted the play behaviour of problem gamblers. Results also illustrate how high-risk gambling behaviour may be affected by various changes to EGM characteristics.

## Factors influencing EGM play frequency

Findings highlighted that the factors most likely to affect EGM play frequency for **problem gamblers** included:

Risk segment	Factors that had LARGEST impact in decreasing EGM play frequency	How other factors impacted EGM play frequency
<b>Problem gamblers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If pokies no longer awarded features at all (1.1)</li> <li>If features were awarded, but were for entertainment and not linked to money (1.3)</li> <li>If venues sensitively approached any pokies players if they suspected problem gambling (1.3)</li> <li>If pokies no longer awarded free spins at all (1.4)</li> <li>If a warning statement like 'Think of what you are really gambling with' was displayed (1.5)</li> </ul>	<p><i>No impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the maximum was a single credit bet per line (2.0)</li> <li>If you had to wait 5 seconds between button presses (2.0)</li> <li>Only being required to set a limit if spending above a certain amount (2.0)</li> <li>Being required to set your own expenditure limit before starting to play the pokies (2.0)</li> </ul> <p><i>Increase</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the maximum was 10 credits bet per line (2.3)</li> <li>If the maximum lines was set to 25 lines (2.1)</li> <li>If you had to wait 3 seconds between button presses (2.1)</li> <li>If the number of lines was set to 50 lines maximum (2.1)</li> </ul>

## Factors influencing EGM session length

Findings highlighted that the factors most likely to affect EGM session length for **problem gamblers** included:

Risk segment	Factors that had LARGEST negative impact on EGM session length	How other factors impacted EGM session length
<b>Problem gamblers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If pokies no longer awarded features at all (1.2)</li> <li>If features were awarded, but they were for entertainment only and not linked to winning money (1.3)</li> <li>If venues sensitively approached any pokies players if they suspected problem gambling (1.4)</li> <li>If there was information on the pokies screen that told you your nett loss in a single session (1.5)</li> <li>If pokies no longer awarded free spins at all (1.5)</li> <li>If there was a short survey on the pokies screen to help identify a gambling problem (1.5)</li> <li>If a warning statement like 'Think of what you are really gambling with' was displayed (1.5)</li> </ul>	<p><i>No impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the maximum was a single credit bet per line (2.0)</li> <li>If you had to wait 4 seconds between button presses (2.0)</li> <li>If you had to wait 5 seconds between button presses (2.0)</li> </ul> <p><i>Slight increase</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the number of lines was set to 50 lines maximum (2.1)</li> <li>ONLY being required to set a limit if wanted expenditure to go above a certain amount (2.1)</li> <li>If the maximum was 10 credits bet per line (2.1)</li> <li>If you had to wait 3 seconds between button presses (2.1)</li> </ul>

Factors influencing EGM spending

Findings highlighted that the factors most likely to affect EGM play spending for **problem gamblers** included:

Risk segment	Factors that had <b>LARGEST</b> negative impact on <b>EGM spending</b>	How other factors impacted <b>EGM spending</b>
<b>Problem gamblers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If pokies no longer awarded features at all (1.2)</li> <li>If features were awarded, but they were for entertainment and not linked to money (1.3)</li> <li>If venues sensitively approached any pokies players if they suspected problem gambling (1.3)</li> </ul>	<p><i>No impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ONLY being required to set a limit if you want expenditure to go above a certain amount (2.0)</li> </ul> <p><i>Slight increase</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If the number of lines was set to 50 lines maximum (2.1)</li> <li>If the maximum lines was set to 25 lines (2.1)</li> <li>If the maximum was 10 credits bet per line (2.1)</li> </ul>

Factors influencing EGM play enjoyment

Findings highlighted that the factors most likely to affect EGM play enjoyment for **problem gamblers** included:

Risk segment	Factors that had <b>LARGEST</b> negative impact on <b>EGM play enjoyment</b>	How other factors impacted <b>EGM play enjoyment</b>
<b>Problem gamblers</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If pokies no longer awarded features at all (1.2)</li> <li>If features were awarded, but they were for entertainment and not linked to money (1.2)</li> <li>If venues sensitively approached any pokies players if they suspected problem gambling (1.4)</li> <li>If pokies no longer awarded free spins at all (1.5)</li> <li>If there was only a single pay line for winning on the pokies rather than multiple pay lines (1.7)</li> <li>If a warning statement like Think of what you are really gambling with was displayed (1.7)</li> <li>Not being able to drink alcohol at all while playing the pokies (1.7)</li> <li>If you had to wait 4 seconds between button presses (1.7)</li> </ul>	<p><i>No impact</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If you had to wait 3 seconds between button presses (2.0)</li> <li>If the maximum was a single credit bet per line (2.0)</li> <li>If there was information on the pokies screen that told you your nett loss in a single session (2.0)</li> </ul> <p><i>Slight increase</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ONLY being required to set limit if you want your expenditure to go above a certain amount (2.1)</li> <li>If you received a visual warning for every 30 minutes you spent on the pokies (2.1)</li> <li>If the maximum was 10 credits bet per line (2.1)</li> </ul> <p><i>Decreasing enjoyment</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If pokies no longer awarded free spins at all (1.5)</li> <li>If venues sensitively approached any pokies players if they suspected problem gambling (1.4)</li> <li>If features were awarded, but they were for entertainment and not linked to money (1.2)</li> <li>If pokies no longer awarded features at all (1.2)</li> </ul>

Summary

Findings relating to problem gamblers tend to suggest that there is some inherent value in responsible gambling messaging on EGMs, as problem gamblers are likely to decrease their play frequency, session length, expenditure and play enjoyment, if responsible gambling messages were displayed during EGM play. In contrast, implementation of such messaging has only a very marginal effect on lower risk recreational players. This highlights that there may be future policy value in introducing responsible gambling messaging into EGMs for the purpose of harm-minimisation for problem gamblers.

Results particularly suggest that venues asking players about 'how they are going' (ie. in response to long periods of gambling), messaging such as 'Think of what you are really gambling with' and problem gambling diagnostics (on EGM displays) would be useful measures to encourage greater awareness of gambling in the problem gambler risk segment.

From this perspective, it would be worthwhile trialling such measures in future real-world EGM evaluations to assess their value from a harm-minimisation viewpoint. This is also important, given that there can often be a 'disconnect' between attitudes and behaviours. Given the common trend for message 'habituation' (where messages lose effectiveness over time), messages may also need to be rotated over time. Accordingly, this would be useful to explore from a research viewpoint.

Given that problem gamblers reported a likely increase in their play frequency if lines were restricted to 50 or 25 (arguably because they know that this would slow their 'rate of expenditure'), this is an area for some policy caution. Indeed, it may suggest that problem gamblers will spend a longer time gambling and the longer time spent gambling may have a deleterious effect on their interpersonal relationships (eg. with family members or a spouse). In this respect, this is an area for further research, given that the impact of such a change is currently unclear.

Review of other research findings relating to free spins and features in the current study also highlights that problem gamblers expect a greater number of these during play and possibly indicates that goals are set around free spins and features as part of EGM play. This may point to some benefit of education and awareness messages that players should not aim to 'target' free spins/features and that these only occur randomly throughout play.

It is similarly an interesting finding that problem gamblers report no decrease in play enjoyment as a result of a limit on bets per line to a single credit. From a policy viewpoint, this presents some evidence to support the implementation of single credit bets (as a maximum) as a future EGM design characteristic.

Moreover, this research also highlights that future awareness raising measures need to communicate to EGM players the value of player information displays and particularly need to remind high-risk groups (such as problem gamblers) to use those displays. This is particularly critical, in view of current evidence which suggests that problem gamblers are the least likely of all groups to use displays.

Finally, the study has also opened an interesting new area of enquiry relating to 'touch sensitive' screens and EGM play. While EGM players report a reasonable experience level with the new touch-sensitive poker machines, findings showed that problem gamblers found the screens more 'enticing' than lower risk groups and encouraged greater spending of money and use of double-up features during play (which is essentially a gamble/risk-taking function). Accordingly, this presents a new area for further research investigation and highlights the need for future policy to keep abreast of emerging product design issues from a harm-minimisation perspective.

