

CONNECTICUT COUNCIL on
PROBLEM
GAMBLING

Annual Helpline Report

2012

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. Chat services for the Helpline were implemented in 2011 and those results are currently being reviewed and will be released in a separate report later this year.

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 **564** calls to the Helpline in 2012, data from **430**(76%) calls were obtained from Connecticut gamblers or significant others of gamblers and **134** (24%) 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 **430** Connecticut callers whose data are included in this report, **311** (72%) were problem gamblers and **119** (28%) were significant others (almost entirely unrelated to the gambler callers).

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
CT Council on Problem Gambling

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword	2
Table of Contents	3
State of Residence/CT Population	4
Gender	4
Top CT cities for Calls to the Helpline	5
PROBLEM GAMBLER INFORMATION	
Age and Ethnic/Racial Groups	6, 7
Marital and Family Status,	8
PG's with Children under18 living with them	9
Occupation	9, 10
Income	10
Identified Areas of Problem Gambling	11, 12
Number of Different Areas	12
Issues Resulting from Problem Gambling	13
Possible Physical Harm Related to Gambler/Age Began Gambling	14
Family History/Other Excessive Behaviors	15
Financial Losses and Debts	16, 17
History of Treatment and Help Seeking Behaviors	18
Sources of Helpline Number	19
Resources Given Problem Gamblers	20
SIGNIFICANT OTHER INFORMATION	
Gender /Relationship to Gambler	21, 22
Persons for Who Help Was Sought	23
Age of Significant Other	24
Ethnic/Racial Groups	25
Marital and Family Status	25
Annual Income	26
Family effects of Problem Gambling	27
History of Treatment	27
Family Sources of Helpline number	28
Resources Given	29
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	30-35
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	36
CCPG PROGRAMS AND SERVICES	37

* 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.

HELPLINE CALLERS

State	Grand Total
CT	76.0%
MA	4.0%
RI	2.5%
NY	3.5%
Other States	14%
Grand Total	100.0%

II. Connecticut Callers Only (n= 430)

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

	Female (n= 189)	Male (n= 241)	Grand Total
PG - Called about own problem (n= 311)	31.0%	69.0%	100.0%
SO - Called about effects of someone else's problem (n= 119)	65.0%	35.0%	100.0%

- Of all CT callers, approximately 2.6 times as many were problem gamblers (PGs) than significant others (SOs) (62% vs. 38%).
- 2.2 times more men than women called the Helpline about their own problem (69.0% vs. 31.0%).
1.9 times more women than men called the Helpline about someone else's problem (65.0% vs. 35.0%).

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=311)

City	City % of Callers to Helpline	City % of State Population**
Hartford	3.9%	.03%
Waterbury	3.5%	.03%
New Haven	3.2%	.04%
Bridgeport	3.2%	.04%
Norwich	2.9%	.01%
Norwalk	1.9%	.02%

http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/community_facts.xhtml

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

- **Norwich** = 2.9 times greater
- **Hartford** = 1.3 times greater
- **Waterbury** = 1.1 times greater
- **Norwalk** = .9 times greater
- **New Haven** = .8 times greater
- **Bridgeport** = .8 times greater

➤ **Norwich proportionate to their city population had the highest rate of calls.**

2. Age of Problem Gamblers (n= 311)

Age Group	Female (n=97)	Male (n=214)	Grand Total
0-17	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
18-24	1.0%	8.9%	6.4%
25-34	9.3%	20.6%	17.1%
35-44	11.3%	12.6%	12.2%
45-54	41.2%	21.5%	27.7%
55-64	12.4%	20.6%	18.0%
65+	10.3%	3.7%	5.8%
Refused	13.5%	12.1%	12.5%
Grand Total	100%	100%	100%
Mean Age	49	43	45

- Under the age of thirty-five, 29.5% were men and 11.3% were women (2.5 times more men).
- For age 45 and over, 63.9% were women and 45.8% men (1.4 times more women).

3. Ethnic/Racial Groups of Problem Gamblers (n= 311)

Ethnicity	Female (n= 97)	Male (n= 214)	Grand Total	CT Population 2010 *
Caucasian	75.3%	71.0%	73.3%	70.9%
African American	12.4%	8.4%	9.6%	11.1%
Asian	1.0%	3.3%	2.6%	4.0%
Latino/Hispanic	4.1%	2.3%	1.9%	13.8%
Native Hawaiian /Pacific Islander	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%	0.1%
Multi-Ethnic	2.1%	1.9%	2.0%	2.0%
Other	0.0%	2.8%	1.9%	
Refused	5.2%	9.3%	8.0%	
Grand Total	100%	100%	100%	

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

Comparison Within the Caller group:

- **3 out of 4 callers were Caucasian (73.3%), with similar representation by males and females.**
- **Calls from the African American population were 5 times greater than those from the Latino population (9.6% vs. 1.9%).**

Comparisons Between Callers and CT Population:

- **For Caucasians and African Americans rates are similar to the CT population.**
- **Latino problem gambler callers were 7.3 times fewer than Latinos in the CT population (1.9% vs. 13.8%).**

4. Marital and Family Status of Problem Gamblers (n= 311)

Marital Status	Female (n= 97)	Male (n= 214)	Grand Total	CT Population*
Cohabiting	7.2%	6.1%	6.4%	
Divorced	14.4%	8.4%	10.3%	10.9%
Married	23.7%	22.0%	22.5%	48.5%
Separated	3.1%	1.9%	2.3%	1.5%
Single	38.1%	52.3%	47.9%	33.0%
Widowed	5.2%	0.5%	1.9%	6.1%
Refused	8.3%	8.9%	8.7%	
Total	100%	100%	100%	100.0%

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

Comparisons within Caller Group:

- A higher percentage of females than males were widowed (5.2% vs. 0.5%) and divorced (14.4% vs. 8.4%).
- Males and females were similar in rates for marriage and cohabitating.
- A higher percentage of males than females were single (52.3% vs. 38.1%).

Comparisons between Callers and CT Population:

- The percentage of callers who were married is two times less than the CT population (22.5% vs. 48.5%).
- A higher percentage of callers were single than the CT population (47.9% vs. 33%).

5. Percent of gamblers who have children under the age of 18 living with them (n=311)

Children under 18 living with you	Female (n=97)	Male (n= 214)	Grand Total	*Connecticut Population
Children under 18 living with you	24.7%	21.5%	22.5%	29.8%

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

Comparisons within Caller Group:

- For both male and female male problem gamblers, the rates for having children under the age of 18 living with them are very similar (21.5% vs. 24.7%).

6. Occupations of Problem Gamblers (n= 311)

Occupation Gambler	Female(n=97)	Male (n= 214)	Grand Total	Connecticut Population
Construction, extraction & maintenance	1.0%	4.7%	3.5%	5.6%
Management, Prof & Related Occupations	12.4%	14.0%	13.5%	10.6%
Military/Armed Forces	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	0.3%
Production, transportation & materials moving	1.0%	4.2%	3.2%	9.6%
Sales and office	10.3%	10.3%	10.3%	24.2%
Service	13.4%	31.8%	26.0%	17.8%
Unemployed	36.1%	14.0%	20.9%	7.2%
Refused	9.3%	9.3%	9.3%	
Retired	7.2%	6.5%	6.8%	17.9%
Other	6.2%	2.8%	3.9%	
Student	3.1%	1.9%	2.3%	9.3%
Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	

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

Comparison within Caller Group:

- Almost one-half (46.9%) of the gamblers who called were either unemployed (20.9%) or in the services field (26.0%).
- The largest discrepancies between men and women: Unemployed (Women 36.1% & Men 14.1%); Service (Men 31.8% & Women 13.4%).

Comparison Between Callers and CT Population:

- Areas in which PG callers had a large percentage difference compared to the CT population were Service (26.0% vs. 17.8%) and Unemployed (20.9% vs. 7.2%).
- Areas in which the CT population had a large percentage difference compared to callers were: Sales and Office (24.2% vs.10.3%) and Retired (17.9% vs. 6.8%).

7. Annual Household Income of Problem Gamblers (n= 311)				
Household Income	Female (n= 97)	Male (n= 214)	Grand Total	CT population
\$0-4,999	14.4%	7.5%	9.6%	6.1% (for less than \$10,000)
\$5,000-9,999	2.1%	1.9%	1.9%	(see above)
\$10,000-14,999	4.1%	2.8%	3.2%	4.4%
\$15,000-24,999	11.3%	6.5%	8.0%	8.8%
\$25,000-34,999	8.2%	14.5%	12.5%	8.1%
\$35,000-49,999	10.3%	13.6%	12.5%	11.4%
\$50,000-74,999	8.2%	11.7%	10.6%	16.6%
\$75,000-99,999	2.1%	5.1%	4.2%	13.3%
\$100,000-149,999	2.1%	6.1%	4.8%	15.6%
\$150,000-199,999	0.0%	1.9%	1.3%	7.4%
\$200,000+	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%	8.3%
Refused	37.2%	28.0%	30.8%	
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

<http://factfinder2.census.gov> (*Approximately 38% of the total 311 PG callers refused to divulge income)

Comparison within Caller Group:

- A higher percentage of females than males earned below \$25,000 (31.9% vs. 18.7%);
- A higher percentage of males earned between \$25,000 and \$99,999 than females (45.9% vs. 28.8%).

Comparison between Callers and CT Population:

- A higher percentage of PG callers than the state population earned less than \$25,000 (22.7% vs. 19.3%) and a higher percentage of the state population than the PG callers earned \$100,000 or more (31.3% vs. 6.4%).

8. Areas of Non-casino & Casino Gambling in Which Problems Were Identified; n= 311

	Female (n= 97)	Male (n= 214)	Total
Non-C Bingo	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Non-C Dice	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%
Non-C Dog Racing	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Non-C Horse Racing	1.0%	3.7%	2.9%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Sports Betting	0.0%	3.3%	2.3%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Blackjack	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Video Poker	2.1%	1.4%	1.6%
Non-C Internet Gambling - Live Poker	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Non-C Internet - Other	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Non-C Poker in person	1.0%	1.4%	1.3%
Non-C Blackjack in person	1.0%	1.4%	1.3%
Non-C Lottery-Daily	8.2%	17.3%	14.5%
Non-C Lottery-Lotto	4.1%	14.5%	11.3%
Non-C Lottery-Powerball	7.2%	12.6%	10.9%
Non-C Lottery-Scratch-off	32.0%	29.9%	30.5%
Non-C Sports Betting	1.0%	5.6%	4.2%
Non-C Stock/Financial Markets	0.0%	1.9%	1.3%
Non-C Sweepstakes	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Casino Baccarat	0.0%	3.3%	2.3%
Casino Blackjack	17.5%	39.3%	32.5%
Casino Craps/Dice	4.1%	6.5%	5.8%
Casino Horse Racing	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Casino Dog Racing	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Casino Jai Alai	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Casino Keno	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Casino Poker	11.3%	33.2%	26.4%
Casino Roulette	2.1%	7.5%	5.8%
Casino Slots	48.5%	17.3%	27.0%
Casino Video Poker	2.1%	1.4%	1.6%
Casino Other	3.1%	0.9%	1.6%

- **The top four areas in which callers have a problem are: Casino Blackjack (32.5%), Lottery-Scratch-Off (30.5%), Casino Slots (27.0%), Casino Poker (26.4%).**
- **The top three types of gambling for men are Blackjack (39.3%), Casino Poker (33.2%), and Lottery scratch-off tickets (29.9%).**

- The top three types of gambling for women are Casino Slots (48.5%), Lottery Scratch-off (32%), and Casino Blackjack (17.5%).
- The percentage of women gamblers who gamble on slots is almost three times higher (48.5%) than men (17.3%). Men gamble 3.2 times more on Blackjack (39.3%) versus women (12.4%).

9. Number of Different Areas of Gambling in Which Problems Were Identified (n=285)			
Number	Female (n= 91)	Male (n= 194)	Grand Total
1	65.9%	43.8%	50.9%
2	22.0%	27.3%	25.6%
3	4.4%	11.3%	9.1%
4	4.4%	3.1%	3.5%
5	2.2%	1.5%	1.8%
6	1.1%	10.8%	7.7%
7	0.0%	1.5%	1.1%
8	0.0%	0.5%	0.4%
9	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

- A higher percentage of women than men had a problem in one area of gambling (65.9% vs. 43.8%)
- 38.6% of men and 26.4% of women had a problem in 2 or 3 areas of gambling.
- 17.4% of men and 7.7% of women had a problem in four or more forms of gambling.

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

Emotional/Physical # responses 436	Female (n=124)	Male (n=312)	Total (n=436)
Anxiety	67.0%	66.8%	66.9%
Depression	41.2%	45.3%	44.1%
Physical Health Problem	1.0%	6.1%	4.5%
Anger	18.6%	27.1%	24.4%
Abuse Physical, Emotional, Sexual	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Family issues # responses 136	Female (n=36)	Male (n=100)	Total (n=136)
Family or Spouse Conflict	36.1%	45.8%	42.8%
Family Violence	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Family Neglect	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%
Financial impact # responses 515	Female (n=163)	Male (n=352)	Total (n=515)
Difficulty Paying Household Bills	67.0%	68.2%	67.8%
Using Equity or Savings	33.0%	42.5%	39.5%
Bankruptcy	2.1%	2.3%	2.3%
Borrowed Money	42.3%	37.9%	39.2%
Eviction	3.1%	2.8%	2.9%
Wrote bad checks	4.1%	0.9%	1.9%
Stole Money or Possessions	5.2%	4.7%	4.8%
Sold or hocked possessions	4.1%	2.3%	2.9%
Loss of Job	7.2%	2.8%	4.2%
Legal # responses 5	Female (n= 0)	Male (n=5)	Total (5)
Arrest	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Jail/Prison	0.0%	1.9%	1.0%

- **Anxiety (66.9%) and depression (44.1%) were the most frequently reported emotional responses for both females and males.**
- **Family/spousal conflict (42.8%) was the most frequent family issue cited by both females and males.**
- **Difficulty paying bills (67.8%), using equity/savings (39.5%), and borrowing money (39.2%) were the most frequently reported financial issues for both females and males.**
- **Only 1.3% of callers indicated involvement in the criminal justice system (jail and arrest) (males 2.4% and females 0%).**

11. Possible Physical Harm Reported at the Time of the call (n=311)

Concern:	Female (n=97)	Male (n=214)	Grand Total
Danger of harming self (suicidal thoughts)	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Danger of harming someone else	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Danger of being harmed due to debts	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

- Both males and females (0%) indicated they were safe at the time of the call from harming themselves, harming someone else or being harmed.

12. Average Ages of gambling Activity (n=311)

	Female	Male	Grand Total
Age began gambling	34	24	27
Age gambling began being problem	42	37	40
Average age at which Helpline was called	44	48	46
Years from start of gambling until Helpline called	10	24	17
Years of Problem Gambling before Helpline called	2	11	7

- Females began gambling an average of 10 years later than males (34 vs. 24).
- Females identified their gambling as a problem sooner than males (8 years vs. 13 years).
- After recognizing that gambling was a problem, females contacted the Helpline much sooner than males (2 years vs. 11 years).

13. In the family in Which the Problem Gambler Grew Up, There was a History of the Following Problem Behaviors (n=311)

Family History Behavior:	Female (n= 97)	Male (n= 214)	Grand Total
Alcohol abuse	19.6%	9.8%	12.9%
Gambling problem	10.3%	14.0%	12.9%
Drug abuse	7.2%	4.2%	5.1%
Abusive behaviors	1.0%	0.9%	0.9%
Serious mental/emotional health problem	2.1%	7.5%	5.8%

- A higher percentage of women as compared to men reported that in their families of origin there was alcohol abuse (19.6% vs. 9.8%) and drug abuse (7.2% vs. 4.2%).
- A higher percentage of men as compared to women reported that in their families of origin there was a gambling problem (14.0% vs. 10.3%) and a serious mental health/emotional problem (7.5% vs. 2.1%).

14. Reported Other Excessive Behaviors by Problem Gamblers (n=311)

Reported Excessive Behavior:	Female (n=97)	Male (n=214)	Grand Total
Alcohol/Other Drugs	4.1%	5.1%	4.8%
Food	3.1%	1.4%	1.9%
Shopping	1.0%	1.9%	1.6%
Sex	0.0%	1.4%	1.0%
Work	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Other	4.1%	2.3%	2.9%

- Very few male and female callers indicated other excessive behaviors.
- The top 2 excessive behaviors were Alcohol/Drug Use (4.8%) and food (1.9%)

15. Financial Losses of Problem Gamblers in Last Year (n=311)

	Female (n=97)	Male (214)	Total
\$20,000 or less	50.5%	59.3%	56.7%
\$21-\$49,999	11.4%	10.3%	10.5%
\$50-\$99,999	1.0%	4.7%	3.5%
\$100-\$149,999	1.0%	1.4%	1.4%
\$150-\$199,999	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
\$200-\$249,999	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
\$250-\$299,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
\$300-\$349,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
\$1,000,000 or more	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Refused	35.1%	23.4%	27.0%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **A higher percentage of males than females over the past 12 months had losses below \$20,000 (59.3% vs. 50.5%).**
- **Percentage losses for males and females over the past 12 months were relatively equal (2.4% vs. 2.0%) for incomes over \$100,000.**

16. Financial Losses of Problem Gamblers: Lifetime (n=311)

	Female (n=97)	Male (214)	Total
\$20,000 or less	25.8%	27.6%	27.0%
\$21-\$49,999	13.4%	15.0%	14.5%
\$50-\$99,999	7.2%	10.6%	9.6%
\$100-\$149,999	6.2%	9.8%	8.7%
\$150-\$199,999	2.1%	3.3%	2.9%
\$200-\$249,999	1.0%	3.3%	2.6%
\$250-\$299,999	2.1%	0.5%	1.0%
\$300-\$349,999	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
\$350-\$399,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
\$400-\$449,999	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
\$500-\$999,999	0.0%	2.3%	1.6%
\$1,000,000 - \$1,999,999	1.0%	1.4%	1.3%
\$2,000,000 or more	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Refused	40.2%	25.3%	29.9%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **For losses over a lifetime, females and males have similar percentage losses under incomes of \$100,000 (46.4 vs.53.2%).**
- **For losses over a lifetime, males have a 1.6 times greater percentage losses over \$100,000 than females.**

17. Are you currently receiving help for a gambling problem? (60)

Gambler	Female (30) Yes	Male (30) Yes	Total Yes
Gambler's Anonymous	14.4%	13.1%	13.5%
Professional Gambling TX	15.5%	0.9%	5.5%
Other	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Total	30.9%	14.0%	19.3%

- **Currently, males and females are receiving help for a gambling problem through Gambler's Anonymous at similar rates (13.1% vs. 14.4%).**
- **A much higher percentage of females are currently receiving help through professional treatment than males (15.5% vs. 0.9%)**

18. Have you received help for a gambling problem in the past? (133)

Gambler	Female (48) Yes	Male (85) Yes	Total Yes
Gambler's Anonymous	23.7%	28.0%	26.7%
Professional Gambling TX	20.6%	10.3%	13.5%
Other	5.2%	1.4%	2.6%
Total	49.5%	39.7%	42.8%

- **A higher percentage of females than males had received professional treatment in the past for problem gambling (20.6% vs. 10.3%).**
- **A slightly higher percentage of males than females (28.0% vs. 23.7%) received help from Gamblers Anonymous in the past.**

19. Sources where the Helpline number was found (n= 311)

Sources	Female (n= 97)	Male (n= 214)	Grand Total
211 Infoline	1.0%	1.4%	1.3%
Brochure	3.1%	1.4%	1.9%
Bus Advertising	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Don't Know	0.0%	0.9%	0.6%
Foxwoods	18.6%	16.8%	17.4%
Friend	6.2%	3.7%	4.5%
GA/Gam-Anon	11.3%	3.7%	6.1%
Grocery Store	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
Internet / Website	12.4%	9.3%	10.3%
Lottery Point of Purchase	14.4%	11.7%	12.5%
Magazine / Newspaper	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Mohegan Sun	11.3%	12.1%	11.9%
OTB Windsor Tele-Theater / Sports Haven	0.0%	1.4%	1.0%
Other self-help group	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
Phonebook	2.1%	3.7%	3.2%
Poster	1.0%	0.9%	1.0%
Radio	2.1%	2.3%	2.3%
Relative	3.1%	4.7%	4.2%
TV	2.1%	0.9%	1.3%
TX Professional / Social Service Agency	3.1%	0.9%	1.6%
Other	6.2%	18.2%	14.5%
Refused	1.0%	4.2%	3.2%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **Foxwoods (17.4 %), the Lottery point of purchase (12.5%), Mohegan Sun (11.9%), and the Internet (10.3%) are the most frequent sources of the Helpline number.**
- **A higher percentage of females than males found the Helpline number at lottery point of purchase (14.4% vs. 11.7%), the Internet (12.4% vs. 9.3%), at Foxwoods (18.6% vs.16.8%), and from friends (6.2% vs. 3.7%).**

20 Resources recommended to callers by the Helpline (n= 311)

Source Helpline (559 resources given)	Female (n= 97)	Male (n= 214)	Total
resource suggested-Case management	5.2%	3.3%	3.9%
resource suggested-GA	56.7%	57.9%	57.6%
resource suggested-Gam Anon	5.2%	3.3%	3.9%
resource suggested-Mail problem gambling literature	23.7%	18.7%	20.3%
resource suggested-Other	2.1%	3.7%	3.2%
resource suggested-Other crisis line	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
resource suggested-OOS helpline	0.0%	0.5%	0.3%
resource suggested-Peer counselor	27.8%	16.8%	20.3%
resource suggested - Recall CT Helpline	2.1%	0.9%	1.3%
resource suggested - Social Services	1.0%	0.0%	0.3%
resource suggested - State Sponsored TX Program	50.5%	57.9%	55.6%
resource suggested-Warm transfer	16.5%	11.7%	13.2%

- **Callers were given an average of 2 resources during their calls to the Helpline.**
- **GA (56.7%) and State Sponsored Treatment (50.5%) were the top referrals for both females and males.**
- **Referral to a peer counselor and mailing of problem gambling information were both an average of 20.3%.**

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= 119)			
Caller	Female (77)	Male (42)	Total
Called about someone else's problem SO (n= 114)	64.7%	35.3%	100.0%

- **The percentage of women who called the Helpline with concern about the negative effects of someone else's gambling problem on them was almost twice that of men (64.7% vs. 35.3%)**

1. Relationship to Problem Gambler (n=119)

Relationship	Female (n= 77)	Male (n= 42)	Total
Myself	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
Spouse	29.9%	28.6%	29.4%
Parent	10.4%	26.2%	16.0%
Adult Child	13.0%	7.1%	10.9%
Child Under 18	1.3%	2.4%	1.7%
Sibling	6.5%	2.4%	5.0%
Other relative	5.2%	0.0%	3.4%
Friend	10.4%	19.0%	13.4%
Other	18.2%	9.5%	15.1%
My Co-Worker	0.0%	2.4%	0.8%
My Employee	0.0%	2.4%	0.8%
Refused	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **The percentages of females and males who called about a spouse were similar (29.9% vs. 28.6%).**
- **The percentage of males who called about a parent was 2.5 times the percentage of females who called about a parent (26.2% vs. 10.4%).**
- **A higher percentage of females than males called about an adult child (13.0% vs. 7.1%).**

2. Person(s) for whom the Callers were Seeking Assistance (n= 119)

Whom Seeking for Help	Female (n= 77)	Male (n= 42)	Total
Myself	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
Spouse	29.9%	28.6%	29.4%
Parent	10.4%	26.2%	16.0%
Adult Child	13.0%	7.1%	10.9%
Child Under 18	1.3%	2.4%	1.7%
Sibling	6.5%	2.4%	5.0%
Other relative	5.2%	0.0%	3.4%
Friend	10.4%	19.0%	13.4%
Other	18.2%	9.5%	15.1%
My Co-Worker	0.0%	2.4%	0.8%
My Employee	0.0%	2.4%	0.8%
Refused	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **Males who called the helpline on behalf of someone else did not seek help for themselves.**
- **The percentage of females and males who sought help for their spouses was similar (29.9% vs. 28.6%).**
- **The percentage of males who called for a parent was 2.5 times that of the percentage of females (26.2% vs. 10.4%).**
- **The percentage of males who called regarding a friend was 1.8 times more than the percentage of females who called regarding a friend (19.0% vs. 10.4%).**

3. Age of Significant Others (n= 119)

Caller Age Group	Female (n= 77)	Male (n= 42)	Grand Total
0-17	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
18-24	3.9%	4.8%	4.2%
25-34	7.8%	7.1%	7.6%
35-44	10.4%	19.0%	13.4%
45-54	13.0%	11.9%	12.6%
55-64	13.0%	7.1%	10.9%
65+	9.1%	7.1%	8.4%
Refused	42.9%	42.9%	42.9%
Total	100%	100%	100%
Average Age of caller	47	48	47.5

- **The age ranges that had the major gender differences are: greater representation for males vs. females, ages 35-44 (19.0%vs. 10.4%) and greater representation of females vs. males, ages 55-64 (13.0% vs. 7.1%).**
- **For ages 18-34 and 45-54, female and male caller percentages were very similar.**
- **The average age of callers was similar for both males and females. (47 vs. 48).**

4. Racial Groups of Significant Others (n= 119)

Ethnicity	Female (n= 77)	Male (n= 42)	Grand Total
Caucasian	67.5%	69.0%	68.1%
African American	9.1%	9.5%	9.2%
Asian	0.0%	4.8%	1.7%
Latino/Hispanic	5.2%	2.4%	4.2%
Multi-Ethnic	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
Other	1.3%	4.8%	2.5%
Refused	14.3%	9.5%	12.6%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **Both females and males were predominantly Caucasian.**
- **For African Americans, the percentage of females who called the Helpline was very similar to the percentage of males who called (9.1% vs. 9.5%).**
- **The percentage of Latino/Hispanic females who called the Helpline was twice that of the percentage of Latino/Hispanic males (5.2% vs. 2.4%).**
- **For the Asian population, only males called the Helpline (4.8%).**

5. Marital Status (n=119)	Female (n= 77)	Male (n= 42)	Grand Total
Cohabiting	9.1%	7.1%	8.4%
Divorced	3.9%	4.8%	4.2%
Married	51.9%	50.0%	51.3%
Separated	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Single	16.9%	26.2%	20.2%
Widowed	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
Refused	14.3%	11.9%	13.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **Only females were represented as being widowed (2.6%)**
- **The percentage of males who were single was 1.5 times that of the percentage of single females (26.2% vs. 16.9%).**
- **For both males and females, there were strong similarities in percentages for cohabitating, divorced, and married.**

6. Annual Household Income of Problem Gamblers (n= 119)

Household Income	Female (n= 77)	Male (n= 42)	Grand Total	CT population
\$0-4,999	2.6%	4.8%	3.4%	6.1% (for less than \$10,000)
\$5,000-9,999	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%	(see above)
\$10,000-14,999	2.6%	2.4%	2.5%	4.4%
\$15,000-24,999	7.8%	4.8%	6.7%	8.8%
\$25,000-34,999	6.5%	4.8%	5.9%	8.1%
\$35,000-49,999	6.5%	4.8%	5.9%	11.4%
\$50,000-74,999	13.0%	16.7%	14.3%	16.6%
\$75,000-99,999	5.2%	7.1%	5.9%	13.3%
\$100,000-149,999	7.8%	4.8%	6.7%	15.6%
\$150,000-199,999	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	7.4%
\$200,000+	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%	8.3%
Refused	45.5%	50.0%	3.4%	
Grand Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100%

<http://factfinder2.census.gov> (*47.1% of the total 111 SO callers refused to divulge income)

Comparison within Caller Group:

- The percentage of females who had incomes less than \$50,000 was 1.3 times greater than the percentage of males (27.3% vs. 21.6%).
- For incomes of \$50,000 or more, males and females had similar percentages (28.6% vs. 27.3%)

Comparisons Between Callers and CT Population:

- The percentage of people in the CT population who had incomes lower than \$50,000 was 1.5 times that of the percentage of callers to the Helpline (38.8% vs. 25.2%).

7. The Following Problems for SOs are Reported to be a Consequence of Another Person's Gambling

Emotional/Physical # responses 149	Female (n=87)	Male (n=45)	Total (n=132)
Anxiety	2.6%	2.4%	2.5%
Depression	7.8%	9.5%	8.4%
Alcohol/Drug Abuse Behavior	1.3%	4.8%	2.5%
Anger	6.5%	9.5%	7.6%
Family issues # responses 56	Female (n=50)	Male (n=24)	Total (n=74)
Family or Spouse Conflict	62.3%	52.4%	58.8%
Family Violence	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Family Neglect	1.3%	4.8%	2.5%
Abuse: Physical, Emotional, and/or Sexual	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Financial impact # responses 72	Female (n=57)	Male (n=28)	Total (n=85)
Difficulty Paying Household Bills	36.4%	33.3%	35.3%
Using Equity or Savings	10.4%	19.0%	13.4%
Bankruptcy	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Borrowed Money	27.3%	14.3%	22.7%
Eviction	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Loss of Job	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

- **In emotional/physical responses to the problem gambling, male significant others had higher percentages in 3 categories - depression, anger, and alcohol/drug abuse; males and females were similar in percentage of anxiety.**
- **Family or Spousal conflict ranked highest in family issues for females and males (62.3% and 52.4%); Percentages in family violence, neglect and abuse categories were low, ranging from 0 to 4.8%.**
- **Regarding financial impact, the percentage of males that reported using equity or savings was almost twice that of the percentage of females (19.0 vs. 10.4), while the percentage of females who reported borrowing money was almost twice that of males (27.3 vs. 14.3).**
- **Difficulty paying financial household bills was the primary consequence of the gambling for women and men (36.4% vs. 33.3%).**

Significant Others that have ever received help for the effects of the gambling problem (n= 119)

	Female (n= 77)	Male (n= 42)	Total
Professional TX (relative) - Yes	7.8%	2.4%	5.9%

GA - Yes	6.5%	7.1%	6.7%
----------	------	------	------

- The percentage of female SO's who received professional treatment was greater than for males (7.8% vs. 2.4%). For GA, the percentage of females and males that accessed that service were similar (6.5% and 7.1%).

9. Sources where the Helpline number was found: (n= 119)			
How did caller hear about us?	Female (n= 77)	male (n= 42)	Grand Total
211 Infoline	6.5%	2.4%	5.0%
Brochure	3.9%	0.0%	2.5%
Bus Advertising	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Don't Know	0.0%	4.8%	1.7%
Foxwoods	3.9%	4.8%	4.2%
Friend	5.2%	7.1%	5.9%
GA / Gam-Anon	2.6%	0.0%	1.7%
Internet / Website	28.6%	33.3%	30.3%
Lottery Point of Purchase	14.3%	19.0%	16.0%
Magazine / Newspaper	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Mohegan Sun	7.8%	11.9%	9.2%
OTB Windsor Teletheater / Sports Haven	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Other	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Other self-help group	2.6%	4.8%	3.4%
Other states helpline	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Phonebook	5.2%	4.8%	5.0%
Poster	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Radio	1.3%	0.0%	0.8%
Relative	2.6%	2.4%	2.5%
Refused	5.2%	0.0%	3.4%
TV	0.0%	2.4%	0.8%
TX Professional / Social Service Agency	2.6%	2.4%	2.5%
Total	100%	100%	100%

- **“Internet”** was the top resource for the Helpline number for female and male significant others (28.6% and 33.3%).
- For women, Lottery Point of Purchase was the second highest referral source (14.3%) followed by Mohegan Sun (7.8%) and 2-1-1 (6.5%).
- For men, Lottery Point of Purchase was the second highest referral source (19%) followed by Mohegan Sun (11.9) and friend (7.1%).

- **Gambling industry referrals: Lottery (16.0%), Mohegan Sun (9.2%) and Foxwoods (4.2%)**

10. Resources recommended to Significant Others (n=192)			
Recommended Resources	Female (n= 128)	Male (n= 64)	Total
Case management	3.9%	0.0%	2.5%
GA	31.2%	35.7%	32.8%
Gam Anon	24.7%	19.0%	22.7%
mail problem gambling literature	33.8%	35.7%	34.5%
other	2.6%	2.4%	2.5%
crisis line	0.0%	2.4%	0.8%
OOS helpline	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
peer counselor	2.6%	7.1%	4.2%
call HL again	7.8%	2.4%	5.9%
State Sponsored TX Program	50.6%	42.9%	47.9%
warm transfer	9.1%	4.8%	7.6%

- **The top referrals for both females and males were state sponsored treatment (47.9%) followed by mail literature (34.5%), GA (32.8%) and Gam-Anon (22.7%).**

Helpline Report Conclusions and Recommendations

1. NUMBER OF PROBLEM GAMBLERS VERSUS NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT OTHERS

Conclusion:

Significant others continue to be under-represented.

While significant others far outnumber problem gamblers in the population, almost three times as many gamblers, than significant others (311 vs. 119) called the Helpline; twice as many of those callers are females as compared to males. Outreach efforts to reach this population have focused on advertising in supermarkets, on radio and at health/community fairs. Helpline data this year indicate that a large number of significant others found information on the Internet. Information continues to be added to CCPG's website to better engage those impacted by a problem gambler's behavior. The large gap between the number of gamblers calling versus the number of significant others calling can be narrowed.

Recommendation:

- a. Implement more outreach through use of Internet and social media to educate family members, friends, co-workers, businesses, and others about helping resources. The Helpline has increased accessibility and can now be reached by phone, chat and soon by text. A broader range of callers can be provided with the needed support when gambling behaviors negatively impact their lives and link them to options for treatment. When significant others seek help, there is increased likelihood that the problem gambler will also decide to access help.
- b. As many significant others find information on the Helpline at gambling venues, work will continue to enhance appropriate messaging at those venues relating to the signs of problem gambling and how to get help.

PREVIOUSLY UNSERVED

Conclusion:

The Helpline continues to strive to be successful in reaching unserved problem gamblers and their families.

Most of the PG and SO callers had not received specialized problem gambling assistance in the past.

- (1) Gamblers: 20.6% of women and 10.3% of men had previously received professional treatment for a gambling problem; 23.7% of women and 28.0% of men had previously attended a GA meeting in the past.
- (2) Significant others: 7.8% of women and 2.4% of men had received professional treatment related to the gambling problem; 6.5% of women and 7.1% of men had attended a Gam-Anon meeting.

Recommendation:

- a. Live on-line chat and the introduction of Text services beginning September 2013, will be utilized to reach unserved populations who may not choose to access help by phone. PG Chat is now being promoted in all media and print outreach, as will text when it is initiated. The availability of Chat and Text will continue to be prominent on CCPG's website.

2. GENDER DIFFERENCES

Conclusion:

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

- a. Problem Gamblers: A higher percentage of men (69%) than women (31%) called the Helpline.
- b. Significant Others: A higher percentage of women (65%) than men (35%) called the Helpline.

Recommendation:

Increased efforts are needed to reach women problem gamblers and men significant others.

- a. For problem gamblers, increased focus is needed on gender specific messages when creating media outreach and developing written materials, especially for women. As well, increased attention is needed to the strategic placement of messages for both men and women to reach a higher percentage of both genders.
- b. For both men and women significant others, messaging should emphasize self-care for those impacted by a gambler's behavior, regardless of whether or not the gambler is ready for treatment.

3. FINANCIAL CONSEQUENCES

Conclusion:

Problem gambling has serious financial consequences.

- a. 56.7% of gambling losses in the last 12 months was \$20,000 or under, while another 10.5% was between \$20,000 and \$50,000.
- b. More males than females lost under \$20,000 (59.3% vs. 50.5%).
- c. More males than females have over \$100,000 in gambling losses.

Recommendation:

Continue participation 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 - \$50,000): (50.4%).
- b. For men problem gambler, the income level with the highest percentage was \$25,000 - \$75,000: (40.0%).
- c. The percentage of female problem gamblers earning under \$35,000/yr. (40.1%) was greater than the percentage of male problem gamblers earning under \$35,000/yr. (33.2%)

Recommendation:

- a. Continue to support projects 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, DCF, and Community Action Councils) and develop media messages that are culturally relevant for those communities.

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; while significant others cited spousal conflict as the primary issue.

- a. Reports of anxiety (66.9%) and depression (44.1%) scored highest for problem gamblers.
- b. Rates of depression were 5 times higher for gamblers (44.1%) than for significant others (8.4%).
- c. Reports of anger for the problem gambler (24.4%) were over 3 times greater than that of significant others (7.6%).
- d. Reports of Family and Spousal Conflict were 1.4 times higher among significant others than the gambler themselves (58.8% vs. 42.8%).

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. This is currently being achieved through the work of the DMHAS Problem Gambling Services Dig-In Project which brings together the CT Council, mental health providers, and substance abuse providers on a quarterly basis to educate one another about integrating assessments for gambling into the mental health and substance abuse service delivery system.
- 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/College curricula that address health and wellness, including substance abuse and physical/emotional abuse, should include problem gambling educational components.

7. GAMBLING TYPE

Conclusion:

The top four areas in which callers have a problem are: Casino Blackjack, Lottery-Scratch-Off, Casino Slots, and Casino Poker (26.4%).

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 2.8 times greater problem with slot machines than men (48.5% vs. 17.3%).
- b. Men have a 2.2 times greater problem with blackjack than women (39.3% vs. 17.5%).

- c. The top three areas identified as problems for:
- Male gamblers: casino blackjack, casino poker, and lottery scratch-off tickets.
 - Female 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 appears to be 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.

- a. Relative to its population, one city closest to the casinos, Norwich had a higher rate of callers to the Helpline (2.9 times greater) than other large cities located at a further distance from the casinos.
- b. Hartford and Waterbury were 2 other large CT cities with a higher rate of calls to the Helpline relative to their populations.

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 (8.9%) and females (1.0%). For significant others calls for that age range were: females (3.9%); males (4.8%)
- c. 22.5% 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 (DMHAS, CCPG, Yale)

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 now provides online support for those problem gamblers and significant others who are unlikely to access help by phone. By September of 2013, text services will be added to the scope of Helpline services provided 24/7. To date, teens and young adults have primarily taken advantage of this new form of service – the majority of chats (approximately 70 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 (12.9%), gambling addiction (12.9%), mental health/emotional health (5.8%), drug abuse (5.1%), and abusive behavior (1.0%) were reported.
- b. A history of alcohol abuse and gambling addiction was most prominent in Helpline callers' families of origin.

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, Community Action Agencies, doctors' offices, etc.) 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 2012 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 Rugle, 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.

CCPG
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: Hours of operation: 5pm-midnight Monday –
Friday; Saturday Noon – Midnight; click on Live Chat.

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 or contact our
office 860-664-3996 or e-mail to info@ccpg.org.