

CONNECTICUT COUNCIL on  
**PROBLEM**  
**GAMBLING**

# Annual Helpline Report

## 2011

Helpline data provide the most comprehensive and current source of information about the demographic characteristics, behavior patterns and gambling experiences of problem gamblers and significant others (primarily family) across Connecticut.

*Celebrating over 30 Years Serving Connecticut Residents*

# FOREWORD

The Connecticut Council on Problem Gambling (CCPG) operates a 24-hour Helpline service for callers seeking help with a gambling problem for themselves or for others who are negatively impacted by the problem gambler's behavior. Callers seeking more general information about problem gambling are referred to the CCPG office.

Annually, a report is compiled that reflects calls received by the Helpline in the prior year. The data on which this report is based only includes those calls that are specific requests for help with a gambling problem. Of **556** calls to the Helpline in 2011, data from **447**(80%) calls were obtained from Connecticut gamblers or significant others of gamblers and **109** (20%) were out-of state calls. In order to provide a more accurate picture of the impact on problem gambling in the State of Connecticut, only Connecticut information is included in this report beyond Table 1.

To understand the similarities and differences of the impact of problem gambling on the gambler and significant others, this report is presented in two parts: data collected from problem gamblers and data from significant others. Of the **447** Connecticut callers whose data are included in this report, **336** (75%) were problem gamblers and **111**(25%) were significant others.

At the end of this report, conclusions and recommendations are provided which relate to problem gamblers and/or significant others.

Mary Drexler, MSW  
Executive Director

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	2
Table of Contents	3
State of Residence/CT Population	4
Top CT cities for Calls to the Helpline	5
<b>PROBLEM GAMBLER INFORMATION</b>	
Gender, Age and Ethnic/Racial Groups	6, 7
Marital and Family Status,	8
PG's with Children under18 living with them	9
Occupation	10
Income	11
Identified Areas of Problem Gambling	12, 13
Number of Different Areas	13
Issues Resulting from Problem Gambling	14
Possible Physical Harm Related to Gambler/Age Began Gambling	15
Family History/Other Excessive Behaviors	16
Financial Losses and Debts	17, 18
History of Treatment and Help Seeking Behaviors	19
Sources of Helpline Number	19, 20
Resources Given Problem Gamblers	20
<b>SIGNIFICANT OTHER INFORMATION</b>	
Gender /Relationship to Gambler	21
Persons for Whom Help Sought	22
Age of Significant Other	23
Ethnic/Racial Groups	23, 24
Marital and Family Status	24
Annual Income	25
Family effects of Problem Gambling	26
History of Treatment	27
Family Sources of Helpline number	27, 28
Resources Given	28
<b>CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>	29-34
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS</b>	35
<b>CCPG PROGRAMS AND SERVICES</b>	36

## HELPLINE CALLERS

State	Grand Total
CT	80.0%
MA	5.9%
RI	2.5%
NY	2.0%
Other States	9.6%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

### II. Connecticut Callers Only (n= 447)

#### Gender of callers and whether they called about their own gambling problem or someone else's problem

Type	Female (n= 189)	Male (n= 241)	Grand Total
Called about own problem PG (n= 336)	36.0%	64.0%	50.0%
Called about someone else's problem SO (n= 111)	64.0%	36.0%	50.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

- **Of all CT callers, approximately three times as many were problem gamblers (PG's) than significant others (SO's).**
- **1.8 times more men than women called the Helpline about their own problem (64.0% vs. 36.0%). 1.8 times more females than males called the Helpline about someone else's problem (40.7% vs. 15.4%).**

**\* Tables throughout this report vary in the number of callers that are represented. Caution is warranted in interpreting the meaning of percentages when the number of callers utilized in calculating the percentages is small.**

The following tables contain information from problem gambler callers

## A. Problem Gamblers

### 1. Top Seven Cities in which Problem Gambling Calls were Greater than Each City's Proportion of the State Population (n=336)

City	City % of Callers to Helpline	City % of State Population**
Groton	3.0%	0.3%
Torrington	3.4%	1.0%
Mystic	0.3%	0.1%
Norwich	2.7%	1.1%
New London	2.3%	0.8%
Middletown	3.4%	1.3%
Ledyard	0.4%	1.0%

<http://connecticut.hometownlocator.com/census/estimates/cities>

➤ Top seven cities with higher percentages of problem gamblers who called the Helpline than would be expected based on the city population:

- Groton = 10 times greater
- Torrington = 3.4 times greater
- Mystic = 3 times greater
- New London = 2.9 times greater
- Middletown = 2.6 times greater
- Norwich = 2.5 times greater
- Ledyard = 2.5 times greater

➤ Groton disproportionately more often called the Helpline relative to the population of their city.

## 2. Age of Problem Gamblers (n= 336)

Age Group	Female (n=121)	Male (n= 215)	Grand Total
0-17	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
18-24	4.1%	10.2%	8.0%
25-34	9.1%	24.7%	19.0%
35-44	19.0%	17.7%	18.2%
45-54	20.7%	20.5%	20.5%
55-64	19.8%	9.3%	13.1%
65+	12.4%	3.3%	6.5%
Refused	14.9%	14.0%	14.3%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>
<b>Mean Age</b>	<b>49</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>43</b>

- **Over the age of thirty-five, one and a half times more females (72%) than males (50.8%) called the Helpline.  
Under the age of thirty-five, two and a half times as many males (34.9%) than females (13.2%) called the Helpline.**
- **18-24 year olds males called the Helpline 2.5 times more than females.**
- **For the age range of 50 years and older, females called the Helpline 2.6 times more than males.**

### 3. Ethnic/Racial Groups of Problem Gamblers (n= 298)

Ethnicity	Female (n= 106)	Male (n= 192)	Grand Total	CT Population 2010 *
Caucasian	64.0%	63.3%	63.7%	70.9%
African American	14.2%	18.6%	17.0%	11.1%
Asian	2.4%	1.4%	1.8%	4.0%
Latino/Hispanic	4.2%	4.2%	4.2%	13.8%
Native Hawaiian /Pacific Islander	2.7%	1.4%	1.8%	0.1%
Multi-Ethnic	4.1%	0.5%	1.8%	2.0%
Other	0.0%	1.4%	0.9%	
Refused	8.4%	9.2%	8.8%	
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

\*<http://quickfacts.census.gov/2011>

#### Comparison Within the Caller group:

- **2 out of 3 callers were Caucasian (63.7%), with similar representation by males and females.**
- **For the Asian population, females called the Helpline almost twice as often than males (2.4% vs. 1.4%). The calls from males and females are similar for the Latino and African American populations.**

#### Comparisons Between Callers and CT Population:

- **Caucasians rates for gambling are just slightly lower than that of the CT population (63.7% vs. 70.9%).**
- **African Americans have a 1.5 times higher rate of problem gambling than Latino representation in CT (17.0% vs. 11.1%).**

#### 4. Marital and Family Status of Problem Gamblers (n= 336)

Marital Status	Female (n= 121)	Male (n= 215)	Grand Total	CT Population*
Cohabiting	5.8%	6.5%	6.3%	
Divorced	11.6%	10.2%	10.7%	10.9%
Married	34.7%	30.2%	31.8%	48.5%
Separated	2.5%	2.3%	2.4%	1.5%
Single	30.6%	39.5%	36.3%	33.0%
Widowed	6.6%	0.9%	3.0%	6.1%
Refused	8.2%	10.3%	9.5%	
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

\*<http://factfinder2.census.gov/2011>

#### Comparisons within Caller Group:

- A much higher percentage of females than males were widowed (6.6% vs. 0.9%).
- Males and females were similar in rates for marriage and divorce.
- More male gamblers were single (39.5%) than female gamblers (30.6%).

#### Comparisons between Callers and CT Population:

- The percentage of callers who were married is 1.5 times less than the CT population (31.8% vs. 48.5%). However, the percentage of female versus the percentage of male callers to the Helpline who were married is similar (34.7% vs. 30.2%).
- Compared to the general CT population, females had a higher divorce rate (11.6% vs. 10.9%), separation rate (2.5% vs. 1.5%) and a higher widowed rate (6.6% vs. 6.1%).
- Compared to the general CT population, males had a higher single rate (39.5% vs. 33.0%), but a much lower rate of widowed status (0.9% vs. 6.1%).



5. Percent of gamblers who have children under the age of 18 living with them (n=314)

Children under 18 living with you	Female (n=113)	Male (n= 201)	Grand Total	*Connecticut Population
Children under 18 living with you	25.6%	24.7%	50.3%	29.8%

\* <http://factfinder2.census.gov/2011>

**Comparisons within Caller Group:**

- For both male and female problem gamblers, the rates for having children under the age of 18 living with them, is very similar (25.6% vs. 24.7%).

**Comparison Between Callers and CT Population:**

- A higher percentage of callers to the problem gambling helpline reported children under 18 living with them as the CT population (50.3% vs. 29.8%).

## 6. Occupations of Problem Gamblers (n= 336 )

Occupation Gambler	Female(n=121)	Male (n= 215)	Grand Total	Connecticut Population
Construction, extraction & maintenance	0.0%	6.0%	3.9%	5.6%
Management, Prof & Related Occupations	22.3%	18.1%	19.6%	10.6%
Military/Armed Forces	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%
Production, transportation & materials moving	0.8%	2.8%	2.1%	9.6%
Sales and office	6.6%	7.0%	6.8%	24.2%
Self-Employed	2.5%	1.4%	1.8%	6.8%
Service	19.0%	20.5%	19.9%	17.8%
Unemployed	9.1%	13.0%	11.6%	7.2%
Refused	21.6%	23.3%	22.7%	
Retired	14.0%	4.2%	7.7%	17.9%
Other	3.3%	2.3%	2.7%	
Student	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%	9.3%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	

\*<http://factfinder2.census.gov/2011>

### Comparison within Caller Group:

- Areas in which PG callers had a higher percentage compared to the Ct population were management (19.6% vs. 10.6%), Service (19.9% vs. 17.8%), and Unemployed (11.6% vs. 7.2%).
- Approximately one-third (31.5%) of the gamblers who called were either unemployed or in the services field.

### Comparison Between Callers and CT Population:

- The unemployment rate for gamblers is higher than that of the state population (11.6% vs. 7.2%).
- CT Helpline callers who were self-employed were 3.8 times less than that of the state population.

## 7. Annual Household Income of Problem Gamblers (n= 336)

Household Income	Female (n= 89)	Male (n= 161)	Grand Total	CT population
\$0-4,999	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%	6.1% (for less than \$10,000)
\$5,000-9,999	2.5%	1.4%	1.8%	(see above)
\$10,000-14,999	3.3%	6.0%	5.1%	4.4%
\$15,000-24,999	6.6%	5.6%	6.0%	8.8%
\$25,000-34,999	5.8%	6.0%	6.0%	8.1%
\$35,000-49,999	9.1%	9.8%	9.5%	11.4%
\$50,000-74,999	12.4%	7.4%	9.2%	16.6%
\$75,000-99,999	3.3%	3.7%	3.6%	13.3%
\$100,000-149,999	1.7%	3.7%	3.0%	15.6%
\$150,000-199,999	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%	7.4%
\$200,000+	0.0%	2.8%	1.8%	8.3%
Refused	51.3%	49.7%	50.3%	
<b>Grand Total</b>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

<http://factfinder2.census.gov> (\*50% of the total 336 PG callers refused to divulge income)

### **Comparison within Caller Group:**

- **Approximately the same percentage of females and males earned below \$25,000 (15.7% vs. 16.3%); males earned over \$100,000 2.8 times more than females (7.0% vs. 2.5%).**

### **Comparison between Callers and CT Population:**

- **PG callers more than the state population earned less than \$25,000 (16.2% vs. 19.3%) and the state population more than the PG callers earned \$100,000 or more (31.3% vs. 5.4%).**

**8. Areas of Non-casino % Casino Gambling in Which Problems Were Identified; n= 336 (# responses= 671)**

	<b>Female (n= 121)</b>	<b>Male (n= 215)</b>	<b>Total</b>
Non-C Bingo	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Non-C Business Speculation	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Non-C Cards	0.8%	3.3%	2.4%
Non-C Raffles	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Non-C Dice	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Non-C Dog/Cock Fighting	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Non-C Dog Racing	0.0%	1.9%	1.2%
Non-C Horse Racing	1.7%	8.8%	6.3%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Sports Betting	0.0%	3.7%	2.4%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Blackjack	0.0%	2.3%	1.5%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Video Poker	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Live Poker	0.0%	1.9%	1.2%
Non-C Internet - Other	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Non-C Lottery-Daily	10.7%	12.6%	11.9%
Non-C Lottery-Lotto	10.7%	11.6%	11.3%
Non-C Lottery-Powerball	7.4%	8.8%	8.3%
Non-C Lottery-Scratchoff	32.2%	32.1%	32.1%
Non-C Sports Betting	3.3%	8.8%	6.8%
Non-C Stock/Financial Markets	0.8%	5.6%	3.9%
Non-C Sweepstakes	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Poker in person	0.0%	1.7%	1.1%
Blackjack in person	0.0%	3.3%	2.2%
Casino Baccarat	0.8%	1.4%	1.2%
Casino Bingo	0.0%	3.3%	2.1%
Casino Blackjack	12.4%	27.0%	21.7%
Casino Craps/Dice	2.5%	10.2%	7.4%
Casino Horse Racing	0.0%	6.0%	0.0%
Casino Dog Racing	0.0%	1.9%	1.2%
Casino Jai Alai	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Casino Keno	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Casino Poker	5.0%	21.9%	15.8%
Casino Roulette	2.5%	9.8%	7.1%
Casino Slots	57.9%	29.8%	39.9%
Casino Video Poker	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%
Casino Other	3.3%	2.8%	3.0%

- The top three types of gambling for men are Lottery scratch-off tickets, casino slots and casino blackjack (32.1%, 29.8%, and 27.0%).
- Women gamble almost twice more on slots (57.9%) versus men (29.8%). Men gamble 2.2 times more on Blackjack (27%) versus women (12.4%).
- For men and women combined, the forms of gambling reported to be most related to the gambling problem are slots (39.9%), lottery scratch-offs (32.1%) and blackjack (21.7%).
- The top three types of gambling for women are slots, scratch-off tickets, and casino blackjack (57.9%, 32.2%, and 12.4%).

9. Number of Different Areas of Gambling in Which Problems Were Identified (n=329)

Number	Female (n= 118)	Male (n= 211)	Grand Total
0	7.6%	6.2%	6.7%
1	55.9%	43.6%	48.1%
2	20.3%	21.8%	21.3%
3	6.8%	9.0%	8.2%
4	4.4%	9.0%	7.3%
5	3.3%	3.3%	3.3%
6	1.7%	0.9%	1.2%
7	0.0%	2.4%	1.5%
8	0.0%	2.4%	1.5%
9	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
10 or more	0.0%	3.3%	0.6%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

- Approximately 1 out of 2 women callers (55.9%) had a problem in one area of gambling; for men more than 1 out of 3 had a problem with one type of gambling (43.6%).
- Women were 1.2 TIMES more likely than men to have a problem with one or two forms of gambling (76.2% vs. 65.4%); while men were 1.9 times more likely to have a problem with 3 or more forms of gambling (30.9% vs. 16.2%).

## 10. The Following Problems are Reported to Have Resulted From Gambling

<b>Emotional/Physical # responses 512</b>	<b>Female (n=195)</b>	<b>Male (n=317)</b>	<b>Total (n=512)</b>
Anxiety	60.3%	54.9%	56.8%
Depression	54.5%	47.0%	49.7%
Physical Health Problem	19.8%	9.8%	13.4%
Anger	25.6%	33.0%	30.4%
Abuse Physical, Emotional, Sexual	1.7%	5.0%	3.9%
<b>Family issues # responses 138</b>	<b>Female (n=45)</b>	<b>Male (n=93)</b>	<b>Total (n=138)</b>
Family or Spouse Conflict	34.7%	40.5%	38.4%
Family Violence	0.8%	2.3%	1.8%
Family Neglect	1.7%	0.5%	0.9%
<b>Financial impact # responses 430</b>	<b>Female (n=166)</b>	<b>Male (n=264)</b>	<b>Total (n=430)</b>
Difficulty Paying Household Bills	47.1%	47.4%	47.3%
Using Equity or Savings	32.2%	27.9%	29.5%
Bankruptcy	5.0%	3.7%	4.2%
Borrowed Money	37.2%	31.2%	33.3%
Eviction	5.8%	3.7%	4.5%
Loss of Job	5.0%	4.2%	4.5%
Sold or Hocked possession	2.5%	3.3%	3.0%
Other financial difficulties	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Foreclosure	3.3%	1.1%	1.9%
<b>Legal # responses</b>	<b>Female (n= 118)</b>	<b>Male (n=208)</b>	<b>Total (326)</b>
Fraud	1.7%	0.9%	1.2%
Embezzlement	3.3%	0.0%	1.3%
Robbery	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%
Other criminal acts	4.1%	3.8%	3.9%
Arrest	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Jail/Prison	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Probation	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%

- **Anxiety (56.8%) and depression (49.7%) were the most frequently reported emotional responses for both females and males.**
- **Family/spousal conflict (38.4%) was the most frequent family issue cited by both females and males.**
- **Difficulty paying bills (47.3%), borrowing money (33.3%), and using equity/savings (29.5%) were the most frequently reported financial issues for both females and males.**
- **Females ranked higher in participation in criminal acts, yet males indicated more involvement in the criminal justice system (jail, arrest, and probation) than did the females.**

### 11. Possible Physical Harm Reported at the Time of the call (n=180)

Concern:	Female (n=59)	Male (n=121)	Grand Total
Danger of harming self (suicidal thoughts)	3.4%	9.1%	7.2%
Danger of harming someone else	0.0%	0.8%	0.6%
Danger of being harmed due to debts	0.0%	0.8%	0.6%

- **Danger of harming someone else or being harmed due to debts was extremely low, however, danger of harming self (suicidal thoughts) was much higher for both females (3.4%) and males (9.1%), with males being at a 2.7 times greater risk than females.**

### 12. Average Age Began Gambling/Average Age When Problem Began/Average Age When Helpline Called

	Female	Male	Grand Total
Age began gambling	39 (n=45)	21 (n=98)	30 (n=143)
Age gambling began being problem	45 (n=44)	35 (n=100)	40 (n=144)
Years from start of gambling to Problem Gambling	6	14	10
Average age at which Helpline was called	54	44	49
Years from start of gambling until Helpline called	15	23	19
Years of Problem Gambling before Helpline called	9	9	9

- **Females began gambling an average of 18 years later than males (39 vs. 21).**
- **Females identified that their gambling had become a problem 8 years sooner than males (6 years vs. 14 years).**
- **After recognizing that gambling was a problem, both females and males did not contact the helpline for a significant amount of time (average 9 years).**

**13. In the family in Which the Problem Gambler Grew Up, There was a History of the Following Problem Behaviors (n=336)**

Family History Behavior:	Female (n= 121)	Male (n= 215)	Grand Total
Alcohol abuse	15.7%	12.6%	13.7%
Gambling problem	9.9%	10.2%	10.1%
Drug abuse	1.7%	5.1%	3.9%
Abusive behaviors	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Serious mental/emotional health problem	3.3%	2.8%	3.0%

- Females as compared to males reported that in their families of origin there was a higher frequency of alcohol abuse and mental/emotional health problems; males as compared to females reported a higher frequency of gambling problems and drug abuse.

**14. Reported Other Excessive Behaviors of Problem Gamblers (n=154)**

Reported Excessive Behavior:	Female (n=61)	Male (n=93)	Grand Total
Tobacco	18.0%	15.1%	16.2%
Alcohol abuse	4.9%	15.1%	11.0%
Food	8.2%	2.2%	4.5%
Shopping	5.8%	3.3%	4.2%
Sexual behavior	3.3%	2.2%	2.6%
Work	2.5%	3.3%	3.0%
Other	1.6%	2.2%	1.9%

- The top 2 excessive behaviors were tobacco use (16.2%) and alcohol use (15.9%).
- The largest gender discrepancy was 10.2% (men 15.1% vs. women 4.9 %) for alcohol.



### 15. Financial Losses of Problem Gamblers in Last Year (n=173)

	Female (n=66)	Male (107)	Total
\$20,000 or less	81.8%	68.2%	75.0%
\$21-\$49,999	12.1%	13.1%	12.5%
\$50-\$99,999	3.1%	12.2%	7.5%
\$100-\$149,999	1.5%	0.9%	1.2%
\$150-\$199,999	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%
\$400-\$449,999	0.0%	1.9%	1.0%
\$450-\$499,999	0.0%	0.9%	0.5%
\$500-\$999,999	0.0%	1.9%	1.0%
\$1,000,000 or more	1.5%	0.0%	0.8%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%

- **Losses for females are 1.2 times greater than for males over the past 12 months in income levels below \$20,000 (81.2% vs. 68.2%).**
- **Losses are 2.2 times greater for males than females with income levels over \$100,000 (6.5% vs. 3.0%)**

16. Financial Losses of Problem Gamblers: Lifetime (n=144)

	Female (n=55)	Male (89)	Total
\$20,000 or less	41.8%	37.1%	38.8%
\$21-\$49,999	18.2%	4.6%	9.8%
\$50-\$99,999	25.5%	16.9%	20.0%
\$100-\$149,999	5.5%	7.9%	6.9%
\$150-\$199,999	3.6%	2.2%	2.8%
\$200-\$249,999	0.0%	10.1%	6.6%
\$250-\$299,999	0.0%	6.7%	4.2%
\$300-\$349,999	1.8%	1.1%	1.4%
\$350-\$399,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
\$400-\$449,999	0.0%	1.1%	0.6%
\$450-\$499,999	0.0%	1.1%	0.6%
\$500-\$999,999	0.0%	6.7%	5.6%
\$1,000,000 - \$1,999,999	3.6%	3.4%	2.1%
\$3,000,000 or more	0.0%	1.1%	0.6%
<b>Total</b>	100%	100%	100%

- **For losses over a lifetime, females have a 1.5 time greater loss under \$100,000 than males.**
- **For losses over a lifetime, males have a 2.9 times greater loss over \$100,000 than females.**

### 17. Ever received help for a gambling or other substance abuse problem (336)

Gambler	Female (121) Yes	Male (215) Yes	Total Yes
Gambler's Anonymous	4.1%	11.1%	15.2%
Professional Gambling TX	8.3%	6.5%	14.8%
Professional Treatment/12 step: Alcohol	3.3%	8.0%	11.3%

- **Males sought help for a gambling problem through Gambler's Anonymous 2.7 times more than females; while females sought help through professional treatment 1.3 times more often than males.**
- **Males also sought treatment for other substance abuse problems 2.4 times more often than females.**

### 18. Sources where the Helpline number was found (n= 336)

Sources	Female (n= 121)	Male (n= 215)	Grand Total
211 Infoline	1.7%	0.5%	0.9%
Back of Scratch Tickets	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%
Billboard	0.8%	0.9%	0.9%
Brochure	5.8%	3.3%	4.2%
Bus Advertising	1.7%	1.4%	1.5%
Don't Know	9.1%	6.0%	7.1%
Foxwoods	9.9%	7.4%	8.3%
Friend	6.6%	3.3%	4.5%
GA/Gam-Anon	0.0%	1.4%	0.9%
Internet / Website	5.0%	19.5%	14.3%
Lottery Point of Purchase	14.9%	15.3%	15.2%
Magazine / Newspaper	0.8%	0.5%	0.6%
Mohegan Sun	20.7%	14.4%	16.7%
OTB Windsor Tele-Theater / Sports Haven	0.0%	1.4%	0.9%
OTB Teletheater	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Other	3.3%	4.7%	4.2%
Other self-help group	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Phonebook	5.8%	4.7%	5.1%

Poster	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Presentation	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Radio	0.8%	0.0%	0.3%
Relative	7.4%	6.0%	6.5%
TV	1.7%	0.9%	1.2%
TX Professional / Social Service Agency	0.8%	2.8%	2.1%
Don't Remember	2.5%	2.3%	2.3%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

- **Mohegan Sun (16.7%), the Lottery point of purchase (15.2%), and the Internet (14.3%) are the most frequent sources of the Helpline number.**
- **Males more than females found the Helpline number at lottery point of purchase (15.3% vs. 14.9%), and on the internet (19.5% vs. 5.0%), while women found the number 1.5 times more than men at Mohegan Sun (20.7% vs. 14.4%).**
- **OTB's, Radio, and Print remain much lower on how callers heard of the Helpline service.**

<b>19. Resources recommended to callers by the Helpline (n= 336)</b>			
<b>Source Helpline (749 resources given)</b>	<b>Female (n= 121)</b>	<b>Male (n= 215)</b>	<b>Total</b>
resource suggested - State Sponsored TX Program	66.1%	67.9%	67.3%
resource suggested-GA	71.9%	66.0%	68.2%
resource suggested-call HL again	5.0%	5.1%	5.1%
resource suggested-peer counselor	44.6%	39.1%	41.1%
resource suggested-Gam Anon	10.7%	9.8%	9.2%
resource suggested-other	4.1%	4.2%	4.2%
resource suggested-mail problem gambling literature	17.4%	21.4%	19.9%
resource suggested - hospital? ER	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
resource suggested-warm transfer	5.0%	7.4%	6.5%

- **Callers were given an average of 2 to 3 resources during their calls to the Helpline.**
- **GA (68.2%) and State Sponsored Treatment (67.3%) were the top referral for both females and males. Referral to a peer counselor was also a significant referral at an average of 41.1% for males and females.**

## Significant Others (SO)

*The following tables represent information gathered from concerned significant others regarding the effects of another person's gambling problem upon the callers and/or others. These significant other callers are not related to the problem gambler callers in this report.*

II. Connecticut Callers Only SO (N= 111)			
Caller	Female (71)	Male (40)	Total
Called about someone else's problem SO (n= 114)	64.0%	36.0%	100.0%

- **Women called the Helpline with concern over the negative effects of someone else's gambling problem on them more than twice as often as men (67.5% vs. 32.5%).**

1. Relationship to Problem Gambler (n=56)			
Relationship	Female (n= 33)	Male (n= 23)	Total
Spouse	24.2%	13.0%	19.6%
Friend	21.2%	30.4%	25.0%
Adult Child	15.2%	8.7%	12.5%
Other Relative	12.1%	21.7%	16.1%
Sibling	12.1%	4.3%	8.9%
Co-Worker	0.0%	4.3%	1.8%
Employer	0.0%	4.3%	1.8%
Other	15.2%	13.0%	14.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **Women called 1.9 times more often than men regarding a spouse (24.2% vs. 13.0%) and 1.7 times more often regarding an adult child (15.2% vs. 8.7%) with a gambling problem. Males called 1.4 times more often about a friend (30.4% vs. 21.2%) and 1.8 times more often about another relative.**

## 2. Person(s) for whom the Callers were Seeking Assistance (n= 111)

Whom Seeking for Help	Female (n= 71)	Male (n= 40)	Total
Myself	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Spouse	26.8%	22.5%	25.2%
Parent	11.3%	7.5%	9.9%
Adult Child	12.7%	10.0%	11.7%
Child Under 18	4.2%	2.5%	3.6%
Sibling	8.5%	2.5%	6.3%
Other relative	4.2%	10.0%	6.3%
Friend	21.1%	35.0%	26.1%
Other	9.9%	7.5%	9.0%
My Employee	0.0%	2.5%	0.9%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **Males who called the helpline on behalf of someone else did not seek help for themselves.**
- **Females and males similarly sought help for their spouses (26.8% vs. 22.5%) and for an adult child (12.7% vs. 10.0%).**
- **Females called more than 1.6 times more often for a parent than males (11.3% vs. 7.5%).**
- **Males called 1.7 times more than females for a friend (35.0% vs. 21.1%).**

### 3. Age of Significant Others (n= 111)

Caller Age Group	Female (n= 71)	Male (n= 40)	Grand Total
0-17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18-24	8.5%	10.0%	9.0%
25-34	14.1%	7.5%	11.7%
35-44	7.0%	7.5%	7.2%
45-54	15.5%	15.0%	15.3%
55-64	9.9%	2.5%	7.2%
65+	8.5%	5.0%	7.2%
Refused	36.6%	52.5%	42.3%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Average Age of caller	44	41	42.5

- **The age ranges that had the major gender differences are: greater representation for females versus males ages 25-34 (14.1% vs. 7.5%) and ages 55 -64 (9.9% vs. 2.5%).**
- **For ages 35-54 female and male callers were the same (22.5%).**
- **Females were an average of 3 years older than men when calling (44 vs. 41).**

### 4. Racial Groups of Significant Others (n= 111)

Ethnicity	Female (n= 71)	Male (n= 40)	Grand Total
Caucasian	76.1%	55.0%	68.5%
African American	4.2%	10.0%	6.3%
Asian	1.4%	2.5%	1.8%
Latino/Hispanic	5.6%	5.0%	5.4%
Native Hawaiian /Pacific Islander	2.8%	0.0%	1.8%
Multi-Ethnic	0.0%	5.0%	1.8%
Other	1.4%	2.5%	1.8%
Refused	8.5%	20.0%	12.6%
<b>Grand Total</b>	100%	100%	100%

- Both females and males were predominantly Caucasian, but more so for females (76.1% and 55.0%).
- Over twice as many males identified as African American than females (10.0% vs. 4.2%).
- Percentages of females and males who identified as Latino/Hispanic were similar (5.6% vs. 5.0%).
- For the Asian population 1.8 times as many men called as women (2.5% vs. 1.4%).

5. Marital Status (n=111)	Female (n= 71)	Male (n= 40)	Grand Total
Cohabiting	14.1%	2.5%	9.9%
Divorced	5.6%	0.0%	3.6%
Married	50.7%	42.5%	47.7%
Separated	4.2%	2.5%	3.6%
Single	16.9%	32.5%	22.5%
Refused	8.4%	20.0%	12.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- 5.6 times as many females as males were cohabitating (14.1% vs. 2.5%), 5.6 times as many were divorced (5.6% vs. 0.0%), 1.2 times as many were married (50.7% vs. 42.5%), and 1.7 times as many were separated (4.2% vs. 2.5%).
- 1.9 times as many males as females were single (32.5% vs. 16.9%).



## 6. Annual Household Income of Problem Gamblers (n= 111)

Household Income	Female (n= 89)	Male (n= 161)	Grand Total	CT population
\$0-4,999	1.4%	2.5%	1.8%	6.1% (for less than \$10,000)
\$5,000-9,999	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%	(see above)
\$10,000-14,999	7.0%	0.0%	4.5%	4.4%
\$15,000-24,999	5.6%	0.0%	3.6%	8.8%
\$25,000-34,999	9.9%	7.5%	9.0%	8.1%
\$35,000-49,999	4.2%	12.5%	7.2%	11.4%
\$50,000-74,999	14.1%	2.5%	9.9%	16.6%
\$75,000-99,999	7.0%	7.5%	7.2%	13.3%
\$100,000-149,999	5.6%	2.5%	4.5%	15.6%
\$150,000-199,999	0.0%	2.5%	0.9%	7.4%
\$200,000+	1.4%	2.5%	1.8%	8.3%
Refused	42.2%	60.0%	48.6%*	
<b>Grand Total</b>	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

<http://factfinder2.census.gov> (\*48.6% of the total 111 SO callers refused to divulge income)

### Comparison within Caller Group:

- **1.3 times as many females (29.5%) had incomes less than \$50,000 compared to men (22.5%).**
- **2.5 times more females (25.3%) than males (10%) had an income below \$35,000.**
- **28.1% of females had an income of \$50,000 or more compared to 17.5% of males; however it is necessary to point out that more males refused to divulge income than females (60% vs. 42.2%).**

### Comparisons Between Callers and CT Population:

- **Almost twice as many people in the CT population compared to the callers (19.3% vs. 10.0%) had incomes lower than \$25,000.**
- **A higher percentage of callers earned between \$25,000 to \$35,000 than that percentage earning the same amount in the general population (9.0% vs. 8.1%).**

## 7. The Following Problems are Reported to Have Resulted From Gambling for Significant Others

<b>Emotional/Physical # responses 149</b>	<b>Female (n=110)</b>	<b>Male (n=39)</b>	<b>Total (n=149)</b>
Anxiety	69.0%	52.5%	63.1%
Depression	35.2%	17.5%	28.8%
Anger	12.7%	7.5%	10.8%
Alcohol/Drug Abuse	38.0%	20.0%	31.5%
<b>Family issues # responses 56</b>	<b>Female (n=43)</b>	<b>Male (n=13)</b>	<b>Total (n=56)</b>
Family or Spouse Conflict	50.7%	27.5%	42.3%
Family Violence	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Family Neglect	5.6%	5.0%	5.4%
Abuse – Emotional and/or Sexual	6.1%	0.0%	3.6%
<b>Financial impact # responses 72</b>	<b>Female (n=49)</b>	<b>Male (n=23)</b>	<b>Total (n=72)</b>
Difficulty Paying Household Bills	14.1%	20.0%	16.2%
Using Equity or Savings	14.1%	5.0%	10.8%
Bankruptcy	1.4%	2.5%	1.8%
Borrowed Money	7.0%	2.5%	5.4%
Eviction	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Loss of Job	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Other financial difficulties	29.6%	27.5%	28.8%

- **In emotional/physical responses to the problem gambling, female significant others had higher percentages in all 4 categories – anxiety, depression, anger, and alcohol/drug abuse.**
- **Family or Spousal conflict ranked highest in family issues for females and males (50.7% and 27.5%); family neglect were similar for females and males (5.6% vs. 5.0%).**
- **Females reported 1.4 times more family violence than the males who called and 6.1 times more emotional/sexual abuse than did the males.**

**8. Significant Others that have ever received help for the effects of the gambling problem (n= 110)**

Help	Female (n= 70)	Male (n= 40)	Total
Professional TX (relative)	15.7%	12.5%	14.5%
Gam-Anon (relative)	4.3%	2.5%	3.6%

- **The percentages for female SO's who received professional treatment were 1.3 times greater than for males (15.7% vs. 12.5%). For Gam-Anon female SO's accessed those services 1.7 times more than male (4.3% vs. 2.5%).**

**9. Sources where the Helpline number was found: (n= 93)**

How did caller hear about us?	Female (n= 61)	male (n= 32)	Grand Total
211 Infoline	4.2%	10.0%	6.3%
Brochure	4.2%	2.5%	3.6%
Foxwoods	5.6%	5.0%	5.4%
Friend	8.5%	7.5%	8.1%
Internet / Website	25.4%	25.0%	25.2%
Lottery Point of Purchase	5.6%	10.0%	7.2%
Magazine / Newspaper	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Mohegan Sun	5.6%	5.0%	5.4%
Other states Helpline	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Phonebook	16.9%	10.0%	14.4%
Poster	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Relative	2.8%	2.5%	2.7%
Refused	0.0%	2.5%	0.9%
TV	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
Workplace	1.4%	0.0%	0.9%
TX Professional / Social Service Agency	1.4%	2.5%	1.8%
Other	4.2%	2.5%	3.6%
Don't Know	8.5%	15.0%	10.8%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

- **“Internet” was the top resource for the Helpline number for female and male significant others (25.4% vs. 25.0%).**

- For women, phone book was the second highest referral source (16.9%) and Lottery Point of Purchase, Foxwoods and Mohegan Sun were third at 5.6%.
- For men, Lottery Point of Purchase, 211, and phonebook were the second highest referral source (10% each), and friend was third. (7.5%).
- Gambling industry referral sources: Lottery (17.2%), Mohegan Sun (5.4%) and Foxwoods (5.4%).

10. Resources recommended to Significant Others (n=271)			
Recommended Resources	Female (n= 179)	Male (n= 92)	Total
State Sponsored TX Program	76.1%	57.5%	69.4%
GA	52.1%	50.0%	51.4%
Call HL again	7.0%	2.5%	5.4%
Peer counselor	45.1%	52.5%	47.7%
Gam Anon	39.4%	27.5%	35.1%
Other	8.4%	10.0%	9.0%
Mail problem gambling literature	19.7%	30.0%	23.4%
Warm transfer	4.2%	0.0%	2.7%

- The top referral for both females and males were state sponsored treatment (69.4%); GA (51.4%) and Peer Counselor (47.7%) came in second and third as referral sources.

# Helpline Report Conclusions and Recommendations

## 1. NUMBER OF PROBLEM GAMBLERS VERSUS NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS

### Conclusion:

#### **Significant others are under-represented.**

We know that significant others far outnumber problem gamblers in the population. Three times as many gamblers, than significant others (336 vs. 111) call the Helpline each year. Further outreach efforts are necessary to educate and promote awareness of available resources for significant others (SO's). the large gap between the number of gamblers calling versus the number of significant others calling could be narrowed. Further outreach efforts are necessary to educate and promote awareness within the SO population as they are "greatly affected" by the problem gambler's behavior.

### Recommendation:

- a. Continue media outreach to educate family members, friends, co-workers, businesses, and others that the Helpline is also a resource that will provide them with the needed help when gambling behaviors negatively impact their lives. When significant others seek help, there is increased likelihood that the problem gambler will also decide to access help.
- b. New advertising across the state has begun to be developed to reach families where they live. Campaigns with the DMV, Big Y, and Comcast have been implemented or will be in the upcoming year.

## 2. PREVIOUSLY UNSERVED

### Conclusion:

**The Helpline continues to strive to be more successful in reaching unserved problem gamblers and their families. We want to ensure problem gamblers and significant others continue to receive necessary referrals for problem gambling treatment than in the past.**

- a. Problem Gamblers: 67.3% received referrals for professional treatment for a gambling problem; 68.2% received a GA referral for a gambling problem; and 41.1% received a referral to a peer counselor for a gambling problem.
- b. Only 8.3% of women and 6.5% of men problem gamblers had actually received professional treatment for a gambling problem. Only 4.1% of women and 11.1% of men had actually attended a GA meeting.
- c. Significant Others: 35.1% received referrals for Gam-Anon; 69.4% received referrals for state sponsored treatment; 47.7% received referrals for peer counseling.

- d. For significant others, only 15.7% of women and 12.5% of men had actually received professional treatment related to the gambling problem. Only 4.3% of women and 2.5% of men had attended a Gam-Anon meeting.

**Recommendation:**

- a. Further efforts to increase the awareness of the CT Gambling Helpline number will continue as a means for increasing referrals for appropriate treatment.
- b. Live on-line chat is now being offered to CT residents as a means to reach unserved populations who may not choose to access help by phone, allowing for another avenue for problem gamblers and their families to access referrals for treatment. PG Chat is now being promoted in all our brochures as well as the Helpline number. Further awareness of the availability of Chat via our website will continue to be pursued.

### **3. GENDER DIFFERENCES**

**Conclusion:**

**There are gender differences in the number of men and women who called the Helpline.**

- a. Problem Gamblers: More men (64%) than women (36%) called the Helpline.
- b. Significant Others: A higher percentage of women (64%) than men (36%) called the Helpline.

**Recommendation:**

- a. To be more successful in outreach to women problem gamblers, we need to focus on gender specific messages when creating media outreach and developing written materials. We also need to continue to investigate and ensure this information is strategically placed at venues often frequented by women.
- b. To be more successful in outreach to male problem gamblers, gender specific messages, as with women, should also be created and placed at venues frequented by men.
- c. For both men and women significant others, more emphasis needs to be placed on self-care, regardless of whether or not the gambler is ready for treatment. Advertising should begin to reflect self-care for those impacted by the gamblers' behaviors.

### **4. FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES**

**Conclusion:**

**Problem gambling has serious financial consequences.**

- a. 75.0% of gambling losses in the last 12 months was \$20,000 or under, while another 12.5% was between \$20,000 and \$40,000.
- b. More females than males lost under \$20,000 (81.8% vs. 68.2%). Males rank 4 times higher in losses between \$50,000 and \$100,000 than females (12.2% vs. 3.1%). More males than females have over \$100,000 in gambling losses (5.0% vs. 3.0%).

**Recommendation:**

Continue to participate in the CT Employee Assistance Program Association (EAPA). Maintain membership in CT Chambers of Commerce to reach out to financial lending institutions, credit unions, financial consultants, accountants, and other relevant businesses with information on gambling addiction and its consequent devastation to individuals and their families as well as information on helping resources.

**5. LOW-INCOME**

**Conclusion:**

Families with low income are most negatively affected by a gambling problem.

- a. The highest percentage for income levels of women problem gamblers was low income (0 - \$34,999): women (25.3%).
- b. For men problem gambler, the income level with the highest percentage was \$40,000 - \$75,000: (22.5%).
- c. The percentage of female problem gamblers earning under \$35,000/yr. (25.3%) was 2.5 times greater than the percentage of male problem gamblers earning under \$35,000/yr. (10.0%)

Compared to the CT population, PG callers had a higher percentage representation at the low end of the income scale and a lower representation at the higher end of the scale.

- 61.2% of Connecticut’s population earns \$50,000 or more a year, while only 19.8% of problem gamblers earn \$50,000 or more a year.
- Unemployment data are consistent with the income data for PG’s.
- Unemployment was the third highest category for PG callers; it was almost two times higher than unemployment in the CT population (11.6% vs. 7.2%).

**Recommendation:**

- a. Continue to support projects, such as our past. inner city Bridgeport Project focusing on the Latino and African-American populations, to increase awareness of the effects of gambling addiction on gamblers and their families.
- b. Work with organizations serving low-income communities (DSS) and develop media messages for those communities that are culturally relevant.

**6. CO-OCCURRING DISORDERS**

**Conclusion:**

**Problem gambling typically occurs in the context of other related disorders.**

High rates of emotional distress caused by gambling (especially anxiety and depression) and other emotional and interpersonal issues were identified by male and female problem gamblers and significant others.

- a. Reports of anxiety by significant others (63.1%) were very similar to reports of anxiety by problem gamblers (56.8%). Rates of depression were 1.7 times higher for gamblers (49.7%) than for significant others (28.8%).
- b. Reports of anger for both the problem gambler and significant others was the 3<sup>rd</sup> highest for emotional distress: For Problem Gamblers (30.4%): For Significant Others: (10.8%).
- c. Family and Spousal Conflict was high among both problem gamblers and significant others (38.4% and 42.3% respectively).

**Recommendation:**

- a. Continue to educate agencies providing services for substance abuse, other addictions and other mental health disorders that problem gambling often co-exists with such disorders and needs to be recognized and treated.
- b. Clinical staff should receive ongoing training in the diagnosis and treatment of a gambling disorder and screening for problem gambling should be part of the routine intake process.
- c. School curricula that address health and wellness, including substance abuse and physical/emotional abuse, should include problem gambling educational components.

## 7. GAMBLING TYPE

**Conclusion:**

**Casino Slots, lottery scratch off, and blackjack are the areas most often reported as problems.**

There are gender differences in the types of gambling that male and female gamblers engage in and in which they develop problems:

- a. Women have a 1.9 times greater problem with slot machines than men (57.9% vs. 29.8%).
- b. Men have a 2.2 times greater problem with blackjack than women (27.0% vs. 12.4%).
- c. The top three areas identified as problems for:
  - Male gamblers: lottery scratch- off tickets, casino slots, casino blackjack.
  - Female gamblers: casino slots, lottery scratch-off tickets, and casino blackjack.
  - All gamblers: casino slots, lottery scratch- off tickets, and casino blackjack.

**Recommendation:**

Prevention and education messages (visual, verbal, print) should refer to or depict men and women in a wide variety of gambling settings, including slots, scratch offs and blackjack.

**\*Note: Among the different legal and illegal forms of gambling available in Connecticut, the Helpline number is primarily found at lottery retailers and the two casinos. Therefore, compared to problem gamblers in the community at large, there is probably an under-representation of Helpline callers who have a problem in other forms of gambling, e.g., sports betting.**



## 8. DISTANCE FROM CASINOS

### **Conclusion:**

**The residents of cities closest to the casinos may be at greater risk for problem gambling than residents of cities at greater distance from the casinos.**

Relative to their populations, three cities near the two casinos, Groton (10 times greater), Mystic (3 times greater), and New London (2.9 times greater) had higher rates of callers to the Helpline than other large cities located much further from the casinos. One city outside the area of the casinos with a higher rate of calls to the problem gambling Helpline was Torrington (3.4 times greater). Torrington is home to an OTB and Lottery may also be an issue reflected in those calls. More research is needed to determine this higher call rate in the Torrington region.

### **Recommendation:**

Continue to provide concentrated information through presentations and media campaigns, regarding the availability of the Helpline and treatment services to residents in cities close to the casinos as well as across the state.

## 9. UNDER AGE 20

### **Conclusion:**

**Problem gamblers and significant others under age 24 rarely call the Helpline**

- a. Among problem gamblers, there was an under-representation of problem gamblers (0.5%) and significant others (0.0%) between the ages of 10 and 19. National and Connecticut research shows that high school and college students have problem gambling rates 2-3 times higher than adult rates.\*
- b. However, for problem gamblers between the ages of 18-24, males called the Helpline (10.2%) and females (4.1%). For significant others calls for that age range were: females (8.5%); males (10.0%)
- c. 50.3% of problem gamblers indicated they had children under 18 living with them and stated there were no signs of emotional distress noted.

\*Youth Gambling in CT 2008: Status and Challenges Special Report

### **Recommendation:**

- a. Schools and agencies serving youth need further training to increase their awareness and understanding of the issue of problem gambling and need to become more knowledgeable about treatment options available to youth.
- b. Since teens and young adults do not usually utilize help by telephone, CCPG has begun to provide online support for those problem gamblers and significant others who are unlikely to access help by phone. To date, teens and young adults have

primarily taken advantage of this new form of service – the majority of chats (approximately 55 to date) are under the age of 30.

- c. Continue educating parents/families about the issue of youth and problem gambling as legalized gambling continues to expand across the community, including the home. Inform families that there are treatment options, not only for the young gambler, but for them as well.

## **10. FAMILY OF ORIGIN ADDICTIONS/ABUSE**

### **Conclusion:**

**Problem gambling continues to be typically traceable to problem gambling and other dysfunctional behaviors in the family of origin.**

- a. In homes in which problem gamblers were raised; alcohol abuse (13.7%), gambling addiction (10.1%), and drugs abuse (3.9%), abusive behavior (1.0%) were reported.
- b. Alcohol abuse and gambling addiction were most prominent in families of origin of callers to the Helpline.

### **Recommendation:**

Disseminate public awareness information with family themes. Provide information to family counseling, medical family practice, and other community or statewide agencies serving families (i.e. DCF) about problem gambling and related disorders in families, emphasizing current and long term negative effects and where help is available.

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We wish to thank Bensinger/Dupont Problem Gambling Specialists who responded to and referred those who called the Helpline in 2011 to the services they needed. In addition, thank you to CCPG staff for their work coordinating CCPG's data collection and data organization for the Helpline.

We would like to express appreciation to Lori Ruggle, Ph.D., Director, Problem Gambling Services (PGS), a program of the State Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services, and the staff of PGS, as well as the Bettor Choice programs across the state, for their ongoing collaboration in the effort to rapidly link callers to treatment services.

We would also like to thank a Yale graduate student, for compiling the data. The data collected is crucial as it allows CCPG to collaborate with other researchers to conduct studies derived from Helpline data. In the past, and hopefully in the future, Helpline data can be integrated into publications, adding to the body of knowledge in the problem gambling field.

Finally, we are very grateful to the funding sources that have made the Helpline and other programs possible: the Mashantucket Pequot and Mohegan Tribal Nations and the State of Connecticut Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services.

## ***PROGRAMS AND SERVICES***

### **PROBLEM GAMBLING HELPLINE:**

Confidential, toll-free Helpline available

24 hours per day for problem gamblers and others who are negatively impacted by problem gambling in Connecticut, Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

**1-888-789-7777 or 1-800-346-6238.**

### **PROBLEM GAMBLING CHAT:**

Access via [www.problemgambling.org](http://www.problemgambling.org); click on Live Chat: Hours of operation: 5pm-midnight Monday –Friday; Saturday Noon – Midnight.

### **PUBLIC AWARENESS AND PREVENTION EDUCATION:**

Reach the general population, especially at-risk groups, with the signs of problem gambling, guidelines for responsible gambling, and the availability of treatment.

### **RESOURCES:**

Support the development of effective prevention programs and initiatives through partnership with community/state/private organizations and through dissemination of problem gambling materials.

### **PROFESSIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL TRAINING:**

Educational opportunities in Problem Gambling Prevention available to health and human service professionals, educators, staff of Employee Assistance Programs and other groups through CCPG conferences, workshops and presentations at conferences held by a variety of other organizations.

### **LEGISLATIVE AND PUBLIC POLICY ADVOCACY:**

Collaborate with other local and statewide organizations to advocate for legislation which funds problem and underage gambling programs. Advocate for the creation of public policies aimed at minimizing problem and underage gambling in Connecticut.

### **RESEARCH AND EVALUATION:**

Conduct and collaborate on research studies relating to problem gambling, as well as evaluate programs.

### **CORPORATE SERVICES:**

Provide education and consultation services to the gambling industry and various other corporations and businesses across Connecticut.

For more information about the Helpline and to learn more about problem and pathological gambling, or to become involved with CCPG's activities, please visit our website at: [www.problemgambling.org](http://www.problemgambling.org) or contact our office 860-664-3996 or e-mail to [info@ccpg.org](mailto:info@ccpg.org).