









Location	Year Study Conducted	Age	Sources	Sample Size	Sampling Strategy	Survey Description	Administration Method	Response Rate	Weighting	Threshold for PG Questions	Assessment Instrument	Gambling Availability	Past-Year Gambling Prevalence	Problem Gambling Prevalence	Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence	Standardization Calculations	Demographic Correlates of PG	Game Correlates of PG	Comments	Reference URL	Reference URL
WASHINGTON	2013-2024	18+	Morones, D., Glover, M., & Fehrer, B. (2019). The 2013 Washington State Needs Assessment Household Survey. Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (DASA).	6713	Random digit dialing; 1 phone numbers from First Choice client list, school list, both certificate records, and ethnic surname samples of local telephone numbers. The telephone list is stratified by English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese. Stratified sampling over sampling young adults, lower income and members of ethnic and racial minority groups. An address letter with a brief description of the survey and a return card is sent to selected households with available address information; minimum number of 20 calls.	Part of an omnibus survey on several topics	Telephone interview	90% (80% "complete on site")	Yes to U.S. Census population counts	Not indicated. Seemingly Gambling in past year.	DSSG-14-Y (NODS)	10,923 EGAs in 2014. Population in 2014 was 6,203,789. People per EGAs = 367.	4%	0.1% (24); 0.4% (5); 1.2% (combined)	2.1%	1.2; 1.1; 1.144 + 2.1%	aged 25 to 44 years, 45 to 64 years, rural counties, American Indian or Alaska Native adults, adults who married more than one race, Blacks			<a href="http://dshs.wa.gov">http://dshs.wa.gov</a>	
WISCONSIN	1995	18+	Thompson, W.N., Gassl, R., & Rickman, D. (1996). The Social Costs of Gambling in Wisconsin. Wisconsin Policy Research Institute Report, 96/1, 1-44.	1000	Random digit dialing; 2 call-back attempts; the 1,000 respondents were a close match of the general Wisconsin adult population		Telephone interview	No		None	DSSG (weight modification)	Unknown number of EGAs in 1995.	65.1%	0.9% (3)	1.3%	0.9; 1.1; 1.159 + 14 = 1.3%		casino gambling		<a href="http://dshs.wa.gov">http://dshs.wa.gov</a>	

<b>Location</b>	ARIZONA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2002-2003
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (2003). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Arizona. Report to the Arizona Lottery. Northampton, MA: Gemini Research.
<b>Sample Size</b>	2750
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Quotas for gender and region of the state; minimum of 6 contact attempts; random selection within household.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"survey for the State of Arizona about people's attitudes toward gambling"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	56%
<b>Weighting</b>	By age and ethnicity to account for under-representation of younger adults and Hispanics. Details in Table 3: Demographics of Sample (p. 9). Note: Unweighted data used for NODS analysis.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	ever gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	9,044 EGMs in 2002. Population in 2002 was 5,456,453. People per EGM = 603.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	69.4% (Lifetime = 89%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.6% (3-4); 0.7% (5+); 2.3% combined SOGS-L: 3.6% (3-4); 1.9% (5+); 5.5% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.7% (3-4); 0.3% (5+); 1.0% combined DSM-IV-L: 1.6% (3-4); 0.5% (5+); 2.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $2.3 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.8\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $1.0 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.3\%$ Average: 1.6%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Hispanics; disabled; unemployed
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	EGMs; casinos; wagering privately
<b>Comments</b>	6% of the interviews (n=157) were conducted in Spanish; Lifetime problem gamblers significantly more likely to be male and have military experience.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48467">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48467</a>

<b>Location</b>	CALIFORNIA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1990
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1994). The prevalence and demographics of pathological gamblers: Implications for public health. American Journal of Public Health, 84, 237-241
<b>Sample Size</b>	1250
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to proportionally represent county populations on the basis of 1980 census figures. Random-digit dialing and random selection of respondents within households.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	Refusal rate = 27%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	EGM availability unavailable
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 89%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.9% (3-4); 1.2% (5+); 4.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.1 * .72 * .60 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.1\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; non-White; less education
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	larger number of games; cards; horse and dog races; games of skill; dice games; sports betting
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000">http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000</a>

<b>Location</b>	CALIFORNIA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2005-2006
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A., Nysse-Carris, K.L., & Gerstein, D.R. (2006). 2006 California Problem Gambling Prevalence Survey. Submitted to California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs Office of Problem and Pathological Gambling.
<b>Sample Size</b>	7121
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random-digit-dialing; English or Spanish; interpreters used to interview eligible respondents who were unable to complete the interview in these two languages; strenuous efforts made to recruit a fully representative sample of California residents into the survey, including several mailings of advance and refusal conversion letters.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"Your household has been selected at random to be part of the California Gambling and Health Study" (verbal consent script). Complete script available in report Appendices (pp. 62-63)
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	47.2%
<b>Weighting</b>	Yes - weighted to adjust for differences in household size and to reflect the known demographic characteristics of the population. Details in Table 2: Demographics of Achieved and Weighted Samples (p. 27).
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	ever gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	50,599 EGMs in 2004. Population in 2005 was 36,132,147. People per EGM = 714.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	57.6%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	DSM-IV-PY: 0.9% (3-4); 0.4% (5+); 1.3% combined DSM-IV-L: 2.2% (3-4); 1.5% (5+); 3.7% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.7%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$1.3 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.7\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; young adults; African Americans and individuals belonging to racial and ethnic groups classified as 'other'; disabled; unemployed
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Internet gambling; card room gambling
<b>Comments</b>	Although participation by Asian and Hispanic respondents was low, the overall size of the study means that the survey includes the largest samples of Hispanics (N=1,569) and Asians (N=504) ever interviewed for a problem gambling prevalence survey in the United States.



**Reference URL**

<http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49227>

<b>Location</b>	COLORADO
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1997
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1997). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Colorado. Report to the Colorado Department of Revenue.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1810
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	"Random selection of households and random selection of respondents within households; After completing approximately 900 interviews, began screening for male respondents in eligible households in order to obtain adequate representation of men in the sample. Once the required 900 men was reached, screening efforts were stopped; Colorado sample is representative of the population in terms of gender, age and residence."
<b>Survey Description</b>	"survey of people in your community for the State of Colorado concerning the gambling practices of Colorado Citizens"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	44%
<b>Weighting</b>	"No ('After checking the impact of weighting the sample by ethnicity on key variables, including the prevalence of problem and pathological gambling, and given the relatively small difference of three percentage points between sample and census data, we elected not to apply weights to the Colorado sample.')
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	had ever gambled
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY (DSM-IV-MR-PY)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	16,266 EGMs in 1999. Unknown number in 1997.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	81%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.8% (3-4); 0.7% (5+); 2.5% combined SOGS-L: 4.4% (3-4); 1.8% (5+); 6.2% combined DSM-IV-PY: 1.7% (3-4); 0.5% (5+); 2.2% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.4%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $2.5 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.0\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $2.2 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.9\%$ Average = 2.4%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Lifetime: male, under the age of 30; never married. Current: under the age of 30; less likely to have graduated from high school
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Bingo; pulltabs; casinos; lottery games
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10176/co:5022">http://hdl.handle.net/10176/co:5022</a>

<b>Location</b>	CONNECTICUT
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1977
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Abrahamson, M. & Wright, J.N. (1977). Gambling in Connecticut. Storrs, CT: Connecticut State Commission on Special Revenue.
<b>Sample Size</b>	568
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Multi-stage probability sample; 169 towns in Connecticut were stratified into two categories according to whether or not they were part of a standard metropolitan area (as defined by the Census Bureau); total of 15 towns randomly selected corresponding with their share of the State's population; sections of towns randomly selected using a topographical grid and enumeration map; within each town 50 homes (or dwelling units) were selected and numbered 1 to 50 in each town; interviewer sought to interview males in all even numbered houses and females in all odd numbered houses; The demographic characteristics of the sample and those of the entire State are, in general, highly congruent.
<b>Survey Description</b>	how people in Connecticut bet money.
<b>Administration Method</b>	residential face-to-face interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	no
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	No threshold
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	3-Questions Related to Gambling Debts & Excessive Gambling: (1) At times I have bet so much that I had to put off buying clothes; (2) I have never had to borrow money because of bets I have made; (3) People close to me sometimes criticize the amount of money that I bet. Agreement with statement (1) and (3), and disagreement with statement (2) can all be viewed as possibly indicative of excessive gambling.
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in 1977.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	Figures only listed for 23 gambling formats. Most frequently engaged in was lottery -- "About one in five adults purchase a lottery ticket at least once a week, and nearly half participate monthly or more."
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	10 persons out of 545 answered all three questions in a problem-suggestive manner. This implies that about 1.8% of the State's adults may potentially be compulsive gamblers.
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	young; separated or divorced; unskilled occupations

<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	jai-alai, off-track betting, dog racing
<b>Comments</b>	

<b>Location</b>	CONNECTICUT
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1986
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Laventhol & Horwath, David Cwi & Associates, & Survey Research Associates, Inc. (1986). The Effects of Legalized Gambling on the Citizens of the State of Connecticut. Newington: State of Connecticut Division of Special Revenue.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1224
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Randomly selected listed telephone numbers
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	age, gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	any past-year gambling
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-III-L (DIS-III)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	State lottery, jai alai, greyhound racing, off-track betting on horse races. No EGMs in 1986.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	74%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.34% (endorsed first and two of remaining 3 questions)
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$(0.34 * 2.6 * .60 * 1.44 * .76 = 0.6\%)$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	None reported (only 4 respondents classified as pathological gamblers)
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	pari-mutuel bettors (jai alai, greyhound, horses at track, off-track betting or teletrack)
<b>Comments</b>	Results very tentative because of the unknown weighting factor that should be applied to the DIS-III and the fact that DIS only has 4 questions, whereas the DSM-III has 8 criteria. This study is not included in the tables or the analysis.

<b>Location</b>	CONNECTICUT
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1991
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Christiansen / Cummings Associates. (1992). Legal Gambling in Connecticut: Assessment of Current Status and Options for the Future. Report to the Connecticut Division of Special Revenue. Details available in Appendix C. and Section 2.6.3 of Problem Gambling in Connecticut which is part of the main report.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1000
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing proportionate to the number of residents in each of the eight counties in the State; random selection within household.
<b>Survey Description</b>	legalized gambling in the state
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	no
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Foxwoods Casino opens 1992
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	86%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.6% (3-4); 2.7% (5+); 6.3% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$6.3 * .72 * .60 * 1.59 * .74 = 3.2\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; under age 35 years; unmarried; household income less than \$25,000.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Off-track betting; casinos; pulltabs; football pools; bet with a bookie on a sports event.
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48479">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48479</a>

<b>Location</b>	CONNECTICUT
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1996
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	WEFA Group. (1997, June). A Study Concerning the Effects of Legalized Gambling on the Citizens of the State of Connecticut. Prepared for: State of Connecticut Department of Revenue Services, Division of Special Revenue.
<b>Sample Size</b>	993
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified, single-stage random digit dialing; random selection within household
<b>Survey Description</b>	regarding leisure activities and hobbies
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, age, education, race
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled at least once in life
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Foxwoods Casino opens 1992
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	88%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.2% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 2.8% combined SOGS-L: 4.2% (3-4); 1.2% (5+); 5.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.8 * .72 * 1.44 = 2.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Reported that data is not statistically significant. Demographic information available (Section 5-13).
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Reported that data is not statistically significant. Gambling preferences information available (Section 5-14).
<b>Comments</b>	Prevalence study was one component of an overall study on socio-economic impacts of gambling.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.ct.gov/dosr/lib/dosr/gamblingstudy_1997.pdf">http://www.ct.gov/dosr/lib/dosr/gamblingstudy_1997.pdf</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://cslib.cdmhost.com/cdm/ref/collection/p128501coll2/id/70955">http://cslib.cdmhost.com/cdm/ref/collection/p128501coll2/id/70955</a>

<b>Location</b>	CONNECTICUT
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2008
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Spectrum Gaming Group. (2009). Gambling in Connecticut: Analyzing the Economic and Social Impacts. Linwood, NJ: Author.
<b>Sample Size</b>	3,099 (2,298 Telephone + 801 Online Panel)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; random selection within household; an additional 801 people participated through a separate online-panel survey; English and Spanish versions available.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"survey for the State of Connecticut about people's attitudes toward gambling"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview; self-administered online (Online Panel)
<b>Response Rate</b>	Telephone: 35.6% (calculated using data from report using response rates calculations recommended by Williams & Volberg, 2011). Online Panel = 6%
<b>Weighting</b>	Gender, education, age, ethnicity
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	13,697 s in 2008 clustered in two tribal casinos. Population in 2008 was 3,502,309. People per EGM = 256.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	70% (Past year participation in illegal gambling = 33.2%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	Telephone SOGS-PY: 0.9% (3-4); 0.7% (5+); 1.6% combined SOGS-L: 2.2% (3-4); 1.5% (5+); 3.7% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.8% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 1.4% combined DSM-IV-L: 2.1% (3-4); 1.2% (5+); 3.3% combined Online Panel SOGS-PY: 3.5% (3-4); 3.8% (5+); 7.3% combined SOGS-L: 4.5% (3-4); 4.5% (5+); 9.0% combined DSM-IV-PY: 3.4% (3-4); 2.1% (5+); 5.5% combined DSM-IV-L: 5.0% (3-4); 2.9% (5+); 7.9% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	Telephone SOGS-PY: $1.6 * .72 * 1.44 * .53 = 0.9\%$ Telephone DSM-IV-PY: $1.4 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.3\%$ Average = 1.1%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; 18-34 years old; some college education; urbanized counties of Hartford and New Haven
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	Study is a socioeconomic impact investigation that included a prevalence study of gambling and problem gambling.



<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.ct.gov/dosr/lib/dosr/june_24_2009_spectrum_final_final_repo">http://www.ct.gov/dosr/lib/dosr/june_24_2009_spectrum_final_final_repo</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://cslib.cdmhost.com/cdm/ref/collection/p128501coll2/id/132536">http://cslib.cdmhost.com/cdm/ref/collection/p128501coll2/id/132536</a>

<b>Location</b>	DELAWARE
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1998
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Mateja, W., Wilson, R., & Ableman, B. (1998). A Survey of Gambling in Delaware. Newark, DE: Health Services Policy Research Group, University of Delaware.
<b>Sample Size</b>	3395
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	61%
<b>Weighting</b>	age, race, gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling at a frequency of once per month or more in the past 18 months
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-Past 18 Months
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	2,498 EGMs in 1999. Population in 1998 was 744066. People per EGM = 298.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	62% (past 18-months)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.17% (3-4); 0.68% (5+); 2.85% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.85 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.2\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	African-American; male; divorced; single; employed less than full time; household with an income of under \$40,000.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49235">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49235</a>

<b>Location</b>	DELAWARE
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1999-2000
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Health Services Policy Research Group, School of Urban Affairs and Public Policy, University of Delaware (2002). The Costs and Consequences of Gambling in the State of Delaware. Prepared for the State of Delaware, Health and Social Services, Division of Substance Abuse and Mental Health.
<b>Sample Size</b>	2638
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview?
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	age, gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV -L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	2,498 EGMs in 1999. Population in 1999 was 753,538. People per EGM = 302.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	72.3%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.4% (3-4); 0.3% (5+); 0.7% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$0.7 * 1.19 * .6 * 1.59 * .76 = 0.60\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; ages 18 – 24; female between the ages of 45 and 64
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	Purpose of this report was to study the social costs of gambling; The prevalence of problem gambling in Delaware is estimated from two recent surveys, both conducted by the University of Delaware (High Risk Geographic Area Survey, University of Delaware, 1999; Young Adult Survey, University of Delaware, 2000). The combined surveys are referred to as the Delaware Gambling Survey. Note: The High Risk Area Study included individuals aged 18 years and over who resided in ZIP- Code areas that were at high risk for alcohol and drug problems.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49234">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49234</a>

<b>Location</b>	FLORIDA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2001
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Shapira, N. A., Ferguson, M. A., Frost-Pineda, K., & Gold, M. S. (2002). Gambling and Problem Gambling Prevalence Among Adults in Florida . A Report to the Florida Council on Compulsive Gambling, Inc.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1504
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; 6 contact attempts; random selection within household
<b>Survey Description</b>	gambling practices among Florida residents
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	32.5% (calculated from response rate criteria recommended by Williams & Volberg, 2011).
<b>Weighting</b>	age, gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	Participated in at least one form of gambling in lifetime and spending more than \$12 on gambling in some year.
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	11,549 EGMs in 2002. Population was 16,396,515 in 2001. People per EGM = 1420.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	71%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.4% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 2.0% combined SOGS-L: 2.6% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 3.6% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.4% (3-4); 0.7% (5+); 1.1% combined DSM-IV-L: 0.6% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 1.6% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.05%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $2.0 * .72 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.1\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $1.1 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.0\%$ Average = 1.05%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; ages 18-29 and ages 50-65; Hispanics; African-Americans; never married; high school degree or less; females ages 50-54; tobacco use; alcohol use and abuse; depression.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Policy/numbers/Bolita; cock or dog fighting; games of skill for money; EGMs
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49230">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49230</a>

<b>Location</b>	FLORIDA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2011
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	<p>Spectrum Gaming Group. (2013). Gambling Impact Study. Prepared for the State of Florida Legislature October 28, 2013.</p> <p>Rotunda, R. J., &amp; Schell, T. L. (2012). Gambling and problem gambling prevalence among adults in Florida: A 2011 replication. University of West Florida, January 2012.</p>
<b>Sample Size</b>	2500
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; sampling of numbers was stratified in two subsamples of predetermined size: mobile phones and landline phone numbers; respondent quotas used based on gender and geographic region for the landline sample; households screened for eligible participants and language preference; calls made in English, but 2.5% of all interviews conducted in Spanish and 0.3% in Creole; most recent birthday method used if multiple individuals in household were available; procedure used to recruit 2500 individuals, 501 in the mobile phone subsample and 1999 in the landline phone subsample; to improve quality of mobile phone sample, incentive payments (\$10) to mobile phone respondents began half-way through the study; landline participants were never afforded incentives.
<b>Survey Description</b>	gambling practices of Florida residents
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	"The overall response rate among those households estimated to contain an eligible individual was 7.4% (i.e., American Association of Public Opinion Research, Response Rate 3)."
<b>Weighting</b>	weighted to more accurately represent those that rely primarily on mobile phones; also applied prestratification weights for gender, age and race.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	Participated in at least one form of gambling in lifetime and spending more than \$25 on gambling in any year (SOGS); Participated in at least one form of gambling in lifetime (NODS).
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	54.4%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-L: 2.7% (3-4); 2.2 (5+); 4.9% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.7% (3-4); 0.5% (5+); 1.2% combined DSM-IV-L: 1.4% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 2.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	

<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; younger age; rent their home; living in south Florida; depression; have sought mental health treatment; on the extremes of income distribution
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	poker; cards; slots; poker machines (not at a casino); use bookies.
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.leg.state.fl.us/GamingStudy/">http://www.leg.state.fl.us/GamingStudy/</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	

<b>Location</b>	GEORGIA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1994
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1995). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Georgia. Report to the Georgia Department of Human Resources. With contribution by J. Boles.  Volberg, R.A., Reitzes, D.C., & Boles, J. (1997). Exploring the links between gambling, problem gambling and self-esteem. Deviant Behavior, 18, 321-342.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1550
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to proportionally represent county populations, based on the 1990 census. Random sampling of households and random selection of respondents within households; Up to 12 attempts were made to contact each number, and a minimum of eight callbacks were made to complete an interview with each respondent; When compared with information from the 1990 census, the sample was found to be representative of the adult population of Georgia in terms of gender, race, age, marital status, and income. However, individuals with less than a high school education were significantly underrepresented in the sample.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"gambling practices of the citizens of Georgia"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	73%
<b>Weighting</b>	No - analysis of the prevalence rates after weighting the sample by education did not produce significant changes. The data presented are based on the unweighted sample.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	Any gambling
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Georgia in 1999.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	74%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.5% (3-4); 0.8% (5+); 2.3% combined SOGS-L: 2.8%; (3-4); 1.6% (5+); 4.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.3 * .72 * 1.59 * .74 = 1.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	non-White, male, young, and single; no differences in education or income; lower self-esteem
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	

<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48482">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48482</a>



<b>Location</b>	GEORGIA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2000
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Emshoff, J.G., Broomfield, K., & Arganza, G. (2000). The Prevalence and Nature of Gambling in Georgia: A Population Survey. Report to the Georgia Department of Human Resources. Atlanta, Georgia State University.  Emshoff, J., Anthony, E., Lippy, C., Valentine, L. (2007). Gambling Survey for the Georgia Department of Human Resources. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University. September 2007.
<b>Sample Size</b>	
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Perhaps the same as done in 2007 by the same group.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	42%
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in 1999. 130 EGMs in 2002.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	69% lifetime
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.4% (3+) SOGS-L: 5.0% (3+)
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.4 * .72 * 2.18 * .51 = 1.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Male; under 35; nonwhite; income < \$35K
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48484">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48484</a>

<b>Location</b>	GEORGIA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2007
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Emshoff, J., Anthony, E., Lippy, C., Valentine, L. (2007). Gambling Survey for the Georgia Department of Human Resources. Atlanta, GA: Georgia State University. September 2007.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1602
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	random list of telephone numbers; stratified by gender, ethnicity, education, and income; random selection within household; up to five attempts were made to contact each number before the number was dropped from the list of available numbers; eligibility criteria included English-speaking, and a working household phone
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	22%
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	Not indicated; report indicates "If participants stated that they had ever wagered money or anything of value on these activities, they were asked the frequency with which they engaged in the activity."
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	130 EGMs in 2006. Population in 2007 was 9,544,750. People per EGM = 73,421.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	85%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	DSM-IV-PY: 1.1% (3-4); 0.4% (5+); 1.5% combined DSM-IV-L: 2.6% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 4.0% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.4%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$1.5 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.4\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males, non-white, under age 30; less than a high school education; earn less than \$25,000 a year; multiple regression revealed that while the above characteristics were significantly associated with rates of pathological gambling, their relationship with the single characteristic of education level appears to be driving the effects.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48484">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48484</a>

<b>Location</b>	INDIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1990
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Laventhol & Horwath, Guida, F.V., David Cwi & Associates, & Public Opinion Laboratory. (1990, November). A Study of Problem and Pathological Gambling among Citizens of Indiana associated with Participation in the Indiana State Lottery. Indianapolis, IN: Laventhol & Horwath.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1015
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing, with age and sex quotas by county
<b>Survey Description</b>	"We are conducting a research project for the State of Indiana to find out how people feel about the lottery."
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	44.4% (calculated from data contained in report)
<b>Weighting</b>	No -- "It was not necessary to weight the responses since the sampling method assures a representative sample of [residents] over 18."
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	Participation in Indian Lottery gambling in past 12 months (i.e., purchased at least one ticket for the Instant, Lotto Cash or Daily Pick Games).
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-L (using 9 of the criteria from the forthcoming DSM-IV). However, all of the questions were specific to lottery gambling (not gambling generally).
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Indiana lottery introduced Oct 1989. No EGMs in 1990.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	60.2% (participated in Indiana Lottery in past 12 months); 34% played lottery in another state in past 12 months.
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.8% (2+)
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	see comments
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; age 18 to 34
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	N/A -- Only lottery-related questions asked.
<b>Comments</b>	This study was described by Lesieur (p. 275; 1999) as being conducted "to find out how many adult Indiana residents were pathological lottery players."; "The survey did not count individuals who had gambling problems as a result of sports, casinos, horses, or other forms of gambling unless they also had an independent problem with lottery play." This study is not reported in the tables or included in the analyses.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48499">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48499</a>

<b>Location</b>	INDIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1998
<b>Age</b>	
<b>Sources</b>	Westphal, J.R., Rush, J.A., & Stevens, L. (1998). Problem and Pathological Gambling Behaviors within Specific Populations in the State of Indiana. Shreveport, LA: Gambling Studies Unit, Department of Psychiatry, Louisiana State University Medical Center.
<b>Sample Size</b>	2,546 (Adult sample)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	14,749 EGMs in 1999. Population in 1998 was 5,907,617. People per EGM = 401.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	5.3% (1-4); 0.8% (5+); 6.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$0.8 * 1.49 = 1.2\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	N/A - rates of pathological gambling too low to determine rates among adult members of minority groups or among different types of gamblers
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	N/A - rates of pathological gambling too low to determine rates among adult members of minority groups or among different types of gamblers
<b>Comments</b>	

<b>Location</b>	INDIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2005
<b>Age</b>	21-59
<b>Sources</b>	Rodak, A. & Wolf, J. (2005). Gaming and Betting by Adults, Age 21-59, in Indiana – 2005. Indianapolis, IN: Indiana University - Purdue University Survey Research Center.
<b>Sample Size</b>	751
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random selection within household; 10 contact attempts; the respondents that resulted from this approach were found to be representative of the population of Indiana, age 21-59 years old, based on recent Census findings for Indiana.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"...to discuss some important issues regarding older adults in Indiana. State officials have asked us to help determine the attitudes and behavior of people regarding gaming and betting of all types."
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	33.1%
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in the past year
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	17,772 EGMs in 2004. Population in 2005 was 6,271,973. People per EGM = 353.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	65% (90% Lifetime)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	N/A - So few respondents responded positively to any of the symptoms it was determined that this approach was not an effective measure of problem gambling.
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	N/A
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	N/A
<b>Comments</b>	There were separate but related reports for "60 Year Olds and Older" and "12-20 Year Olds".
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49236">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49236</a>

<b>Location</b>	IOWA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1989
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R A. (1994). The prevalence and demographics of pathological gamblers: Implications for public health. American Journal of Public Health, 84, 237-241.
<b>Sample Size</b>	750
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to proportionally represent county populations on the basis of 1980 census figures. Random-digit dialing and random selection of respondents within households were used.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a study of the gambling practices of the citizens of Iowa"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	(Refusal rate = 24%)
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	any lifetime gambling
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Lottery introduced in 1985; riverboat gambling in 1989
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 84%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.6% (3-4); 0.1% (5+); 1.7% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$1.7 * .72 * .60 * 1.59 * .74 = 0.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; lower education; unmarried
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	wagering on cards, horse and dog races, games of skill, dice games, and sports
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000">http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000</a>

<b>Location</b>	IOWA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1995
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1995). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Iowa: A Replication Survey. Des Moines, IA: Iowa Department of Human Services.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1500
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Sample stratified to proportionally represent county populations, males and young adults in Iowa on the basis of 1990 census figures; random selection of households and random selection of respondents within households used for first two-thirds of interviews; after approximately 1,000 interviews, interviewers began screening potential respondents to identify males between the ages of 18 and 29; up to five attempts made to contact each number; respondents with lower levels of education and income are somewhat under-represented.
<b>Survey Description</b>	study of the gambling practices of the citizens of Iowa
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	57%
<b>Weighting</b>	No - Note: To determine if education or income discrepancies contributed significantly to estimates of the prevalence of problem gambling in Iowa, prevalence rates were analyzed after weighting the sample by education and then by income. These analyses increased prevalence BUT were not used in order to maintain comparability with results from the 1989 survey.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Lottery introduced in 1985; riverboat gambling in 1989
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	72% (Lifetime = 88%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.3% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 3.3% combined SOGS-L: 3.5% (3-4); 1.9% (5+); 5.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.8%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$3.3 * .72 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.8\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; under the age of 30; non-Caucasian; unmarried
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	continuous types of gambling
<b>Comments</b>	Replication of 1989 study.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49226">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49226</a>

<b>Location</b>	IOWA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2006-2008
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Black, D. W., McCormick, B., Losch, M. E., Shaw, M., Lutz, G., & Allen, J. (2012). Prevalence of problem gambling in Iowa: Revisiting Shaffer's adaptation hypothesis. <i>Annals of Clinical Psychiatry</i> , 24, 279-284.
<b>Sample Size</b>	356
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Telephone-based screen was conducted of randomly selected Iowa households with at least 1 resident age 18 or older between July 2006 and January 2008. Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) system used to collect the data. To match the demographic characteristics of family study probands, participants were screened for persons who fell within specific demographic groupings by household location, age, sex, and education level. Exclusion criteria included ever having been diagnosed with psychosis or a neurologic disorder and/or having been adopted. Many potential subjects in the initial 2,827 calls were excluded for not meeting study targets or refused to participate, as is common in research recruitment.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Lottery introduced in 1985; riverboat gambling in 1989
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-L: 2.2% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 3.6% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	younger age; minority group status; lower income levels
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	strongest associations with disordered gambling included card games, bingo, outcomes of sports events with acquaintances, and pull-tabs.



<b>Comments</b>	Data were collected while recruiting controls for an unrelated family study of PG; study not designed as a survey to be generalized to the state population; survey not designed to recruit a representative sample of adult lowans.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3509738/">http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3509738/</a>

<b>Location</b>	IOWA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2011 (Feb-May)
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Gonnerman, M.E. & Lutz, G.M. (2011). Gambling Attitudes and Behaviors: A 2011 Survey of Adult Iowans. Cedar Falls, IA: Center for Social and Behavioral Research, University of Northern Iowa. September 2011.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1700
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Invitation letters mailed out to 10,000 residential addresses. Adult with most recent birthday asked to complete the questionnaire online. Telephone follow-up calls made (when a telephone number was available) to household that did not respond.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"attitudes and experiences of Iowans regarding gambling"
<b>Administration Method</b>	470 online completions; 1,230 (72.4%) telephone completions
<b>Response Rate</b>	17%
<b>Weighting</b>	Household size, age, gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	none
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	CPGI; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS); self-report of problems
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	15,547 EGMs in 2010. Population in 2011 was 3,062,309. People per EGM = 197.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	69%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	CPGI: 2.6% (3-7); 0.6% (8+); 3.2% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.2% (3-4); 0.3% (5+); 0.5% combined DSM-IV-L: 0.6% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 1.2% combined Self-Report-PY: 0.5% Self-Report-L: 2%
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.94%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	CPGI: $3.2 * .58 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.42\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $0.5 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .53 = .45\%$ Average = 0.94%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Males; age 18-34; high interest in several other leisure/recreational activities; tobacco and alcohol use and dependence
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	EGMs; casino table games; keno; Internet gambling; horse racing; bingo; games of personal skill
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49231">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49231</a>

<b>Location</b>	IOWA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2013
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Lutz, G. M. & Park, K. (2014). Gambling Attitudes and Behaviors: A 2013 Survey of Adult Iowans. Cedar Falls, IA: Center for Social and Behavioral Research, University of Northern Iowa.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1826
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Dual-frame random digit dial (DFRDD) sampling methodology was used whereby both landline and cellular telephone numbers were included in the sample (564 landlines and 1,262 cellphones).
<b>Survey Description</b>	"...conducting a study about gambling in Iowa."
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	30% (Response Rate); 72% (Cooperation Rate)
<b>Weighting</b>	age, gender, ethnicity, race, education, place of residence, telephone status.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	CPGI; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS); self-report of problems
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	77.8%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	CPGI: 3.8% (3-7); 0.6% (8+); 4.4% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.6% (3-4); 0.4% (5+); 1.0% combined DSM-IV-L: 1.5% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.4% combined; Self-Report-PY: 0.8% Self-Report-L: 2.6%
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Younger age groups; lower income individuals (none statistically significant)
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="https://idph.iowa.gov/Portals/1/Files/IGTP/2013_adult_iowans_survey.pdf">https://idph.iowa.gov/Portals/1/Files/IGTP/2013_adult_iowans_survey.pdf</a>

<b>Location</b>	KANSAS
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2012
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services. (2012, November 23). Kansas statewide problem gambling study: Topline report. Topeka, KS: Author.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1600
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	The study was conducted with randomly selected landline and cell phone numbers located across the state, divided into four zones -- three of which, generally speaking, constituted the northeast, southcentral and southwest regions, while the fourth zone was the rest of the state (400 specified interviews for each region).
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in the past 30-days ("recent gamblers")
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	The first two questions (age and location of residence) were quota items, the racial/ethnic question was information that was merely collected from those who chose to participate, rather than a factor that was subject to quota. The lone exception was in the SW, where a floor of 133 Hispanic/Latino respondents was specified, to ensure accurate representation from this group in this zone.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://media.khi.org/news/documents/2013/01/09/Gambling_Survey.pdf">http://media.khi.org/news/documents/2013/01/09/Gambling_Survey.pdf</a>

<b>Location</b>	KANSAS
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2017
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Learning Tree Institute at Greenbush Research and Evaluation Department. (2017). 2017 Kansas gambling survey: Results and Analysis. Topeka: KS: Kansas Department for Aging and Disability Services.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1,755
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified random sample of households throughout the State of Kansas in September, 2017. This survey is a follow-up to a statewide survey conducted in 2012 to assess gambling prevalence, type, and frequency, myths, perception, and public opinion about gambling, and awareness of problem gambling treatment.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.kansaspreventioncollaborative.org/Document/Assets/2017Ka">http://www.kansaspreventioncollaborative.org/Document/Assets/2017Ka</a>

<b>Location</b>	KENTUCKY
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2003
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Kentucky Legislative Research Commission. (2003). Compulsive Gambling in Kentucky. Frankfort, KY: Author.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1253
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; random selection within household; to determine if the sample was representative of the general adult population in Kentucky, the demographics of the survey respondents were compared with data from the 2000 Census
<b>Survey Description</b>	purpose of this study is to help evaluate gambling behaviors
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	51.6%
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, age
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in the past year
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-PY
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Kentucky in 2002.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	55.1%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.7% (3-4); 0.5% (5+); 1.2% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$1.2 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.6\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	(From the separate GA study included in the report) -- Table 4.2 (p. 44) lists the types of gambling GA respondents deemed to cause them the most serious problems. Casino/EGMs and horse racing/off-track betting were listed as the types of gambling most respondents stated caused serious problems.
<b>Comments</b>	A survey of Gamblers Anonymous (GA) respondents was conducted as part of this study.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49263">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49263</a>

<b>Location</b>	KENTUCKY
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2008
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Kentucky Council on Problem Gambling. (2009). Gambling in Kentucky: A Research Report on the Prevalence of Gambling among Kentucky Residents. Frankford, KY: Author.
<b>Sample Size</b>	850 (Note: Also reported as 846 within report)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; to assess the representativeness of the general adult population in Kentucky, the demographics of the survey respondents were compared with data from the 2000 Census
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	43.5%
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, age, race
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Kentucky in 2008.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 55.3%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	DSM-IV-L: 1.7% (3-4); 0.3% (5+); 2.0% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.0 * 1.19 * 0.60 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.1\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; 18-24 years of age; Blacks and other racial minorities; never married, divorced or separated; employed adults; individuals in residing in households with incomes of \$25,000 or less
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49228">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49228</a>

<b>Location</b>	LOUISIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1995
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	<p>Louisiana Compulsive Gambling Study Committee (1996). Report to the Legislature of the State of Louisiana. Baton Rouge, LA: Author.</p> <p>Westphal, J. R. &amp; Rush, J. (1996). Pathological gambling in Louisiana: An epidemiological perspective. Journal of the Louisiana State Medical Society, 148, 353-358.</p>
<b>Sample Size</b>	1818
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	random sample
<b>Survey Description</b>	"the wagering practices of the citizens here in Louisiana "
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	40%
<b>Weighting</b>	No – in order to maintain comparability with surveys in other states where the data have not been weighted.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	any lifetime gambling
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	17,038 EGMs in 1999. Unknown number in 1995.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	72.3%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 3.4% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 4.8% combined SOGS-L: 4.5% (3-4); 2.5% (5+); 7.0% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.8%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.8 * .72 * 2.18 * .51 = 3.8\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male, under the age of 30, non-Caucasian, unmarried, less likely to have graduated from high-school.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	The Louisiana survey found two clusters of pathological gamblers: First, an older male population who primarily wagered on horse racing and a younger male population who primarily wagered on video poker.
<b>Comments</b>	Some details (e.g., prevalence measures) of the 1995 study reported in 1998 replication study.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49265">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49265</a>



<b>Location</b>	LOUISIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1998
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R. A., & Moore, W. L. (1999). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Louisiana: A Replication Study, 1995 to 1998. Report to the College of Business Administration, University of New Orleans.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1800
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to proportionally represent the eight parish-regions in the state as well as males and females on the basis of the most recent information from the U.S. Bureau of the Census; random selection of households; random selection of respondent within households; up to 5 callbacks.
<b>Survey Description</b>	gambling practices of Louisiana citizens
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	58.6% (CASRO approach)
<b>Weighting</b>	No -- but effects of weighting were examined and effects were small.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY (DSM-IV-MR-PY)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	17,038 EGMs in 1999. Population in 1998 was 4,362,758. People per EGM = 256.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	61.5%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.3% (3-4); 1.6% (5+); 3.9% combined SOGS-L: 3.3% (3-4); 2.5% (5+); 5.8% combined DSM-IV-PY: 1.9% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.8% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $3.9 * .72 * 1.59 * .74 = 3.3\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $2.8 * 1.19 * 1.59 * .74 = 3.9\%$ Average = 3.6%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Age 18-24 and those aged 35-44; Black and Hispanics; never married; separated or divorced; not graduated from high school or from college.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	horse bettors; EGMs
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49266">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49266</a>

<b>Location</b>	LOUISIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2002
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Vogel, R.J., & Ardoin, P. (2002). Gambling in Louisiana: 2002 Louisiana Study of Problem Gambling. Baton Rouge, LA: Nelson Mandela School of Public Policy, Southern University.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1353
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Modified stratified sample was designed that ensured that at least 100 adults in each region would be randomly interviewed.
<b>Survey Description</b>	gambling practices of Louisiana citizens
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	27,584 EGMs in 2002. Population in 2002 was 4,482,646. People per EGM = 163.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	Lifetime participation = 67.7%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.0% (3-4); 1.6% (5+); 4.6% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.7%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.6 * .72 * .51 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.7\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Density of gambling venues per capita.
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49267">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49267</a>

<b>Location</b>	LOUISIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2008
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Esters, I., Biggar, R., Lacour, J., & Reyes, M. (2008). 2008 Louisiana Study on Problem Gambling. Prepared for the Louisiana Office for Addictive Disorders.
<b>Sample Size</b>	2400
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	240 participants from each of 10 geographical regions; participants contacted randomly via telephone from a list of telephone numbers purchased for the study
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a random study of practices of Louisiana residents with regard to gambling"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	29,149 EGMs in 2008. Population in 2008 was 4,410,796. People per EGM = 151.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	Table 7.13. Frequency of Participation in Various Types of Gambling – State (p. 42) provides general participation by gambling format details.
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-L: 1.7% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 3.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.3%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$3.1 * .72 * .51 * 1.59 * .74 = 1.3\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	Information garnered from calls to the Gambling Helpline (n = 59,250 calls) and the Louisiana Problem Gambler Helpline Fiscal Year Report (2007) was also used to supplement the report; Responses from the Louisiana Caring Communities Youth Survey, a survey of 106,356 Louisiana students in grades 6, 8, 10 and 12, were incorporated as data into the present study.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49268">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49268</a>

<b>Location</b>	LOUISIANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2016
<b>Age</b>	21+
<b>Sources</b>	Biggar, R., Jr., Esters, I., Dick, S. J., Chen, J., Burstein, K, Bergeron, M., Cooper, R., & Zeahah, P. (2017). The impact of gambling in Louisiana: 2016 study of problem gambling. Lafayette, LA: University of Louisiana at Lafayette. Retrieved from <a href="http://picardcenter.louisiana.edu/sites/picardcenter/files/The%20Impact%20of%20Gambling%20in%20Louisiana_FINAL.pdf">http://picardcenter.louisiana.edu/sites/picardcenter/files/The%20Impact%20of%20Gambling%20in%20Louisiana_FINAL.pdf</a>
<b>Sample Size</b>	2,402
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Contracted by the University of Louisiana at Lafayette, Reconnaissance Market Research (ReconMR) conducted telephone surveys with a stratified sample of Louisiana residents. The survey instrument included questions regarding respondent's gambling behaviors, attitudes towards gambling, and awareness of resources for problem gambling. Potential respondents were screened to include only adults, 21 years of age or older, currently residing in Louisiana. Sample stratification ensured equal geographic sampling among ten parish-defined geographical regions (n=240 per region). 65% of interviews were to be completed using wireless telephone sampling frame and 35% using landline frame.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"We're conducting a survey of people in your community for the Louisiana Office of Behavioral Health and the University of Louisiana at Lafayette concerning the gambling habits of Louisiana residents."
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	Table 4.16. Frequency of Participation in Various Types of Gambling – State (p. 52) provides general participation by gambling format details.
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-L: 5.4% (3-4); 2.9% (5+); 8.3% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	

<b>Comments</b>	This prevalence study is the third in a series that began in 2002; The 2008 study include adults 18 and older to calculate rates, while the current study used adults 21 and older.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://picardcenter.louisiana.edu/sites/picardcenter/files/The%20Impact%20of%20Alcohol%20Use%20on%20the%20Health%20of%20Louisiana.pdf">http://picardcenter.louisiana.edu/sites/picardcenter/files/The%20Impact%</a>

<b>Location</b>	MARYLAND
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1988
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1994). The prevalence and demographics of pathological gamblers: Implications for public health. American Journal of Public Health, 84, 237-241.
<b>Sample Size</b>	750
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to proportionally represent county populations on the basis of 1980 census figures. Random-digit dialing and random selection of respondents within households were used.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"gambling practices of the citizens of Maryland"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	Refusal rate = 34%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	any lifetime gambling
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Maryland in 1999.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 89%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-L: 2.4% (3-4); 1.5% (5+); 3.9% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$3.9 * .72 * .60 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.0\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; non-White; lower education; unmarried
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	wagering on cards, horse and dog races, games of skill, dice games, and sports
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000">http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000</a>

<b>Location</b>	MARYLAND
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2010
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Shinogle, J., Volberg, R.A., Park, D., Norris, D.F., Haynes, D., & Stokan, E. (2011). Gambling Prevalence in Maryland: A Baseline Analysis. Baltimore, MD: Maryland Institute for Policy Analysis & Research.
<b>Sample Size</b>	5975
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to represent the population of the four regions of the state. Random-digit dialing and random selection of respondents within households were used.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"we are conducting a survey in the State of Maryland about people's views on gambling"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	18.6% (CASRO)
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, age, ethnicity
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled 5 or more times in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	1,500 EGMs in 2010. Population in 2010 was 5,773,552. People per EGM = 3849.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	70.6%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.9% (3-4); 1.5% (5+); 3.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$3.4 * 1.19 * .60 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	under 30 years of age; male; African Americans; lower income; lower education
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	EGMs, wagering on private games and sports, Internet gambling
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49269">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49269</a>

<b>Location</b>	MARYLAND
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2017
<b>Age</b>	
<b>Sources</b>	Tracy, J. K., Maranda, L., & Scheele, C. (2018). Statewide gambling prevalence in Maryland: 2017. Maryland Center of Excellence on Problem Gambling.
<b>Sample Size</b>	3,810
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/109870">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/109870</a>



<b>Location</b>	MASSACHUSETTS
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1989
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1994). The prevalence and demographics of pathological gamblers: Implications for public health. American Journal of Public Health, 84, 237-241.
<b>Sample Size</b>	750
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to proportionally represent county populations on the basis of 1980 census figures. Random-digit dialing and random selection of respondents within households were used.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"gambling practices of the citizens of Massachusetts"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	Refusal rate = 31%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	any lifetime gambling
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Massachusetts in 1999.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 90%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.1% (3-4); 2.3% (5+); 4.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.4 * .72 * .60 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.2\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; non-White; lower education; unmarried
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	wagering on cards, horse and dog races, games of skill, dice games, and sports
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000">http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1615000</a>

<b>Location</b>	MASSACHUSETTS
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2012
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Nelson, Sarah E., Kleschinsky, John H., LaPlante, Debi A., Gray, Heather M., & Shaffer, Howard J. (2013). A Benchmark Study For Monitoring Exposure to New Gambling Opportunities: Final Report. Boston, MA: Division on Addiction, Cambridge Health Alliance, a teaching affiliate of Harvard Medical School.
<b>Sample Size</b>	511
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Survey released to the 725 members of the MA Knowledge Panel who had not been part of the pre-test. Panelists received an email inviting them to participate and offering them an \$8 cash-equivalent incentive to complete the survey. Those who did not respond initially received a reminder email encouraging them to participate. The survey closed on December 26th after being active for three weeks. More than 70% of the Knowledge Panel completed the survey (n=511); Panel generally reflects the demographics of Massachusetts with a few exceptions, the low initial recruitment rate, and consequent increased chance of selection bias, limits our confidence that the rates we observed in our sample are state-representative.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	online panel
<b>Response Rate</b>	70.5%
<b>Weighting</b>	Not indicated.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in past year
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV (AUDADIS-IV Gambling Section)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	53.6%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.2% (3-4); 0.2% (5+); 2.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	not indicated
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	not indicated
<b>Comments</b>	Sample limited by its size and representativeness.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49608">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49608</a>

<b>Location</b>	MASSACHUSETTS
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2013-2014
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R. A., Williams, R. J., Stanek, E. J., Houpt, K. A., Zorn, M., Rodriguez-Monguio, R. (2015). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Massachusetts: Results of a Baseline Population Survey. Amherst, MA: School of Public Health and Health Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst.
<b>Sample Size</b>	9578
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Probability sample of all Massachusetts adults and allowed survey respondents to complete the survey online, on paper, or by telephone; most recent birthday method selected as survey respondent; over-sampling in Western MA.
<b>Survey Description</b>	survey of "health and recreation."
<b>Administration Method</b>	online panel; pen/paper; telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	36.6%
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, ethnicity
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in past year
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	CPGI; PPGM
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	72.2%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	CPGI: 8.1% (CPGI=1-4); 1.7% (CPGI=5+); PPGM: 7.5% (At-Risk Gambler); 1.7% (Problem Gambler)
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; blacks; lower education
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	online gamblers; horse race bettors; daily lottery games.
<b>Comments</b>	Baseline Population Survey for the SEIGMA project.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.umass.edu/seigma/sites/default/files/SEIGMA%20Baseline%20Report.pdf">http://www.umass.edu/seigma/sites/default/files/SEIGMA%20Baseline%</a>

<b>Location</b>	MICHIGAN
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1997
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Gullickson, A. R., & Hartmann, D. (1997). Compulsive Gambling in Michigan: Final Report. Report to The Michigan Department of Community Health.
<b>Sample Size</b>	3942
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random-digit dialing; imposition of a screen to increase male respondents (corrected the gender representation issue to within 1.9 percentage points); however, underrepresentation of African-American respondents, of the lowest educational category (less than high school education), lowest income category (household income below \$25,000)
<b>Survey Description</b>	a state-funded study of the gambling practices of Michigan residents
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	43%
<b>Weighting</b>	Both weighted (race; income; education -- See Table 8. - p. 62) and unweighted estimates were produced.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	9,167 EGMs in 1999. Unknown number of EGMs in 1997.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	76.9%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.1% (3-4); 1.3% (5+); 3.4% combined SOGS-L: 3.2% (3-4); 2.0% (5+); 5.2% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$3.4 * .72 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; non-whites; younger respondents
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	horse or dog race players; betting on cards, dice, or video poker outside of legal casinos
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48523">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48523</a>

<b>Location</b>	MICHIGAN
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1999
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Gullickson, A. R., Hartmann, D., & Wiersma, W. (1999). A Survey of Gambling Behaviors in Michigan, 1999. Report to The Michigan Department of Community Health.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1717
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random-digit dialing; imposition of a screen to increase male respondents; underrepresentation of African-American respondents, of the lowest education category (those with less than a high school education), and of the lowest income category (those reporting household incomes below \$25,000).
<b>Survey Description</b>	"The Michigan Legislature has asked us to survey Michigan citizens on gambling in the state"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	45%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	9,167 EGMs in 1999. Population in 1999 was 9,897,116. People per EGM = 1080.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	77.6%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.0% (3-4); 1.2% (5+); 3.2% combined SOGS-L: 3.1% (3-4); 1.8% (5+); 4.9% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.7%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$3.2 * .72 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.7\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	age (18-29) and race (Black)
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	horse or dog race players; people who bet on cards, dice, or video poker outside of legal casinos
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48520">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48520</a>

<b>Location</b>	MICHIGAN
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2001
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Gullickson, A. R., & Hartmann, D. (2001). A Survey of Gambling Behaviors in Michigan, 2001. Report to The Michigan Department of Community Health.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1211
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random-digit dialing; random selection within household; imposing a screen to increase male respondents; African Americans are underrepresented.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"the Michigan Legislature has asked us to survey Michigan citizens on gambling in the state"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	35% (The response rate for the special sample of persons with an interest in gambling was 42 percent.)
<b>Weighting</b>	No - "As we reported in the 1997 study, weighting does effect estimates of gambling problems in Michigan, though the magnitudes tend to be of a half a percentage point or less."
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	23,123 EGMs in 2002. Population in 2001 was 10,006,266. People per EGM = 433.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	71.9%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.8% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 2.8% combined SOGS-L: 2.8% (3-4); 1.7% (5+); 4.5% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.8 * .72 * 2.18 * .51 = 2.2\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	age (18-29) and race (Black)
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	cards, dice, or video poker outside of legal casinos
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48519">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48519</a>

<b>Location</b>	MICHIGAN
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2006
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Hartmann, D. J. (2007). A Survey of Gambling Behaviors in Michigan, 2006. Kalamazoo, MI: Kercher Center for Social Research at the Western Michigan University for the Michigan Department of Community Health.
<b>Sample Size</b>	957
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random-digit dialing; the statewide sample under-represents males, minorities, and the youngest, least educated, and poorest residents of the state.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"People spend or bet money on a variety of things including lottery, charitable games such as raffles or church sponsored bingo, horse races, casinos, sports, cards and dice. We will ask you about whether you have ever participated in these activities and whether you have participated in the past 12 months. We will ask about the extent of your participation and how gambling affects other aspects of your life."
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	29% (Refusal rate = 71%).
<b>Weighting</b>	No - A weighting procedure was used to produce a statewide sample of size 957 that is weighted to represent the adult population of Michigan at the county level; Weighted estimates are not reported because of their small effect and the lack of such practice in other studies.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	23,039 EGMs in 2006. Population in 2006 was 10,095,643. People per EGM = 438.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	70.9%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.1% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.0% combined SOGS-L: 2.7% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 4.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.0 * .72 * 2.18 * .51 = 1.6\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Age (18-29) and race (Black) appear to have some correlation to incidence of higher scores on the SOGS (Table 5. - Percent in SOGS Grouping by Demographic Categories - p. 17).

<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Table 6. Percent Distribution of Current SOGS Score by Gambling Type in the Past Year (p. 18) provides details. Note: "small numbers of respondents for particular gambling activities make several of the estimates unreliable."
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48518">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48518</a>



<b>Location</b>	MINNESOTA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1994
<b>Age</b>	18-74
<b>Sources</b>	Emerson, M.O., Laudergeran, J.C., & Schaefer, J.M. (1994). Adult Survey of Minnesota Problem Gambling Behavior; A Needs Assessment: Changes 1990 to 1994. St. Paul: State of Minnesota Department of Human Services, Mental Health Division.  Emerson, M.O. & Laudergeran, J.C. (1996). Gambling and problem gambling among adult Minnesotans: Changes 1990 to 1994. Journal of Gambling Studies, 12(3), 291-304. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01539324
<b>Sample Size</b>	1028
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Disproportionate random sample from the seven Twin Cities metro counties; ten counties total; Sample intentionally weighted to include 45% households from Twin Cities, 25% St. Louis County, 15% Clay County, 15% Olmsted County; Only one subject was interviewed per household contacted; random selection within household.
<b>Survey Description</b>	short survey concerning betting or games of chance in Minnesota
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	82%
<b>Weighting</b>	Yes - to compensate for oversampling of nonmetro residents and females.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in past year
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY (SOGS-M)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in Minnesota in 1994.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	65%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.2% (3-4); 1.2% (5+); 4.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	4.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.4 * .72 * 1.44 * 1.00 = 4.6\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	less well-educated; divorced; never married (partly due to younger age of respondent with high SOGS-M scores); male; Native Americans
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://archive.leg.state.mn.us/docs/2010/mandated/101576.pdf">http://archive.leg.state.mn.us/docs/2010/mandated/101576.pdf</a>

<b>Location</b>	MINNESOTA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1990
<b>Age</b>	18-74
<b>Sources</b>	Laundergan, J. C., Schaefer, J. M., Eckhoff, K. F., & Pirie, P. L. (1990). Adult Survey of Minnesota Gambling Behavior: A Benchmark, 1990. St. Paul: State of Minnesota Department of Human Services, Mental Health Division.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1251
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Sample of 1,375 randomly selected households in the targeted areas was obtained from Survey Sampling, Inc.; Disproportionate random sample from the seven Twin Cities metro counties; Sample was intentionally weighted to include 45% households from St. Louis County, 10% Clay County, 45% Twin Cities Metropolitan Counties; nine counties total; one subject per household contacted; random selection within household.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"short research survey concerning betting or games of chance in Minnesota"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	91%
<b>Weighting</b>	Not indicated (other than to obtain stated percentages for geographic areas).
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in past year
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY (using the SOGS-M, which is a past-year measure with some wording changes to specific items: guilty -> bad; betting slips -> I. O.U.s; questions about borrowing altered to single question with open-end response)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Minnesota in 1990.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	64%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.6% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.5% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.6%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.5 * .72 * 1.44 * 1.00 = 2.6\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; non-whites; respondents under the age of 34
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	pull tabs; bought lottery tickets outside of Minnesota; bingo, bet on a sporting event, and left Minnesota for casino games
<b>Comments</b>	A separate adolescent prevalence survey took place at the same time.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://archive.leg.state.mn.us/docs/2010/mandated/101577.pdf">http://archive.leg.state.mn.us/docs/2010/mandated/101577.pdf</a>

Reference URL

<b>Location</b>	MISSISSIPPI
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1996
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R. A. (1997). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Mississippi: A Report to the Mississippi Council on Compulsive Gambling (Social Research Report Series 97-1). Mississippi State: Mississippi State University, Social Science Research Center.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1014
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random selection of households and random selection of respondents within households; actual sample substantially under-represented males and blacks in the population. The actual sample also slightly under-represented individuals under the age of 25 in the population.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a study of the gambling practices of the Citizens of Mississippi"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	70%
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, ethnicity
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	37,717 EGMs in 1999. Unknown number in 1996.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	49%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.8% (3-4); 2.1% (5+); 4.9% combined SOGS-L: 3.7% (3-4); 3.1% (5+); 6.8% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.9 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 3.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Lifetime: male, under the age 30, never married Past Year: under age 30, divorced or separated, employed; black
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	casino gambling, sports betting and wagering on card games not at a casino; pari-mutuel; bingo; illegal gambling (dice, EGMs)
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49229">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49229</a>

<b>Location</b>	MISSOURI
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1981
<b>Age</b>	18-96
<b>Sources</b>	Cunningham-Williams, R.M., Cottler, L.B., & Compton, W.M. (1998). Taking Chances: Problem Gambling and Mental Health - Results from the St. Louis Epidemiologic Catchment Area (ECA) Study. American Journal of Public Health. 88(7),1093-1096.
<b>Sample Size</b>	2,954 (50 cases omitted because of missing gambling screen data)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Multistage sampling; Representative household sample of St. Louis adults.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	Yes - to account for oversampling of African Americans, clustering and nonresponse.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-III-L (DIS-III)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Missouri in 1981.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	50.7% reported placing a bet or gambling at least twice in their lives.
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	5.45% (1+)
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; younger; separated or divorced; African American
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	Results very tentative because of the unknown weighting factor that should be applied to the DIS-III and the fact that DIS only has 4 questions, whereas the DSM-III has 8 criteria. This study is not included in the tables or the analysis.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1508270">http://www.pubmedcentral.nih.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=1508270</a>

<b>Location</b>	MONTANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1992
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1992). Gambling Involvement and Problem Gambling in Montana. Albany, NY: Gemini Research.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1020
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random selection of respondents within households; up to 5 attempts to contact each number; only difference between sample compared to the 1990 United States census is underrepresentation of Native Americans.
<b>Survey Description</b>	" gambling practices of Montana citizens"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	63%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in 1992.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	73% (noted as 74% in 1998 report)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.5% (3-4); 0.7% (5+); 2.2% combined SOGS-L: 2.3% (3-4); 1.3% (5+); 3.6% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.2 * .72 * 1.59 * .74 = 1.9\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	under the age of 30; noted as being more likely to be female than in any other state
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	more likely to have played EGMs and less likely to have wagered on sports or card games than problem and pathological gamblers in other states
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://archive.org/details/gambling1992involvem00volbrich">http://archive.org/details/gambling1992involvem00volbrich</a>

<b>Location</b>	MONTANA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1998
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Bureau of Business and Economic Research, University of Montana-Missoula. (1998). The 1998 Montana Gambling Study. Missoula, MT: Author. (Note: Print version contains technical appendices).
<b>Sample Size</b>	1227
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random-Digit Dialing; once household contacted selection procedure using a Kish grid used; Random cross-section of Montana adults; designed to ensure that the respondents represented a statistically accurate cross- section of Montana adults (17 hearing-impaired respondents received questionnaire in mail, 2 translators obtained for those who did not speak English).
<b>Survey Description</b>	"to gather information on gambling in Montana and its economic and social impacts"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	83%
<b>Weighting</b>	age, sex
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	ever spent or bet money on gambling activity in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	19,487 EGMs in 1999. Population in 1998 was 879,533. People per EGM = 45.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	78%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.0% (3-4); 1.6% (5+); 3.6% combined SOGS-L: 2.9% (3-4); 2.8% (5+); 5.7% combined DSM-IV-PY: 1.5% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 2.5% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $3.6 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.84\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $2.5 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 3.26\%$ Average = 3.0%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	American Indians; divorced or separated; equally likely to be male or female; lower educational attainment
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	EGMs, lottery, scratch tickets
<b>Comments</b>	Prevalence study part of a statewide gambling study; an additional sample of 108 American Indians living on the Flathead Reservation also surveyed.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://archive.org/details/1998montanagamb1998mont">http://archive.org/details/1998montanagamb1998mont</a>

<b>Location</b>	NEVADA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1975
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	U.S. Commission on the Review of the National Policy Toward Gambling. (1976). Gambling in America: Final Report. Washington, DC: Author.
<b>Sample Size</b>	296 (Nevada residents)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	"Before obtaining the interview in Nevada, the interviewer ascertained whether the respondent had lived in Nevada for less than 18 months or had moved to Nevada primarily because of the availability of legal gambling. If either of these conditions applied, the individual was not interviewed."
<b>Survey Description</b>	"One thing that facilitated the data collection was the organization of the interview itself. It began by questioning respondents about what they do for recreation, additionally eliciting how much they spent on recreation and vacations, thus acclimating them to provide financial information on an innocuous topic. They were then led to discuss their exposure to other people's gambling behavior ... Next they were asked about gambling laws in their state and their desire for or opposition to legalization of different games of chance, and only then were they questioned about what games they bet on, how often they bet, and how much money they wagered" (p. ix)
<b>Administration Method</b>	face-to-face residential interviews
<b>Response Rate</b>	70%
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, region
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	"Clinical analysis" based on a) the similarity of the respondent answered 18 questions relative to how 274 known compulsive gamblers answered the same questions; b) observations recorded by the interviewer at the end of each interview; c) betting patterns reported by the respondent.
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in Nevada in 1975
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	78%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	Nevada supplementary sample (n=296) = 2.6% "probable compulsive" (men=3.3%; women=2.0%); National sample (n=1,736) = 0.8% "probable compulsive" (men=1.1%; women=0.5%).
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	Nevada: 2.6% National: 0.8%



<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	This study is not included in the tables or analyses.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/41368">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/41368</a>

<b>Location</b>	NEVADA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2000-2001
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (2002). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Nevada. Report to the Nevada Department of Human Resources. Carson City, NV: Department of Human Resources.
<b>Sample Size</b>	2217
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	“two-phase probability sample”; The first phase involved identifying approximately 2,200 residential households with telephones in Nevada and selecting one eligible adult in each household (Kish grid) to respond to a brief screening interview. The second phase involved selecting a stratified random group of 733 respondents from the first phase for a lengthier interview. The sample is representative of the adult population of Nevada; instrument also translated into Spanish; up to 15 callbacks; achieved sample was representative of adult population of Nevada, as determined by Bureau of Census (2000).
<b>Survey Description</b>	“we are conducting a survey of people in your community for the State of Nevada about people’s attitudes toward gambling”
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	24% (CASRO method)
<b>Weighting</b>	Region, gender, age
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	198,232 EGMs in 1999. Population in 2000 was 1,998,257. People per EGM = 10.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	67.9%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.9% (3-4); 3.5% (5+); 6.4% combined DSM-IV-PY: 1.8% (3-4); 0.3% (5+); 2.1% combined DSM-IV-L: 3.0% (3-4); 2.1% (5+); 5.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.7%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $6.4 * .72 * 1.44 * .53 = 3.5\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $2.1 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.9\%$ Average = 2.7%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; adults 18 to 34; minorities; employed in gaming industry; high school education or less; annual household incomes under \$35,000; never married
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	EGMs, bingo, horse/dog races, cardrooms
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49238">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49238</a>

<b>Location</b>	NEW JERSEY
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1988
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. & Steadman, H.J. (1989). Prevalence estimates of pathological gambling in New Jersey and Maryland. American Journal of Psychology, 146(12), 1618-1619.  Volberg, R.A. (1994). The prevalence and demographics of pathological gamblers: Implications for public health. American Journal of Public Health, 84, 237-241.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1000
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified to proportionally represent county populations on the basis of 1980 census figures. Random-digit dialing and random selection of respondents within household.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"gambling practices of the citizens of New Jersey"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	Refusal rate = 36%
<b>Weighting</b>	no
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	any lifetime gambling
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in New Jersey in 1988.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 92%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.8% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 4.2% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.2 * .72 * .60 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.1\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; non-White; lower education; unmarried
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	wagering on cards, horse and dog races, games of skill, dice games, and sports
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://ajp.psychiatryonline.org/cgi/content/abstract/146/12/1618">http://ajp.psychiatryonline.org/cgi/content/abstract/146/12/1618</a>

<b>Location</b>	NEW JERSEY
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1990
<b>Age</b>	15+
<b>Sources</b>	Reilly, P. & Guida, F. (1990). Pathological Gambling Prevalence in New Jersey 1990 Final Report. Report to the New Jersey Dept of Higher Education. Piscataway, NJ: University of Medicine and Dentistry.
<b>Sample Size</b>	858
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Randomly selected computer generated telephone numbers provided by Survey Sampling, Inc.; stratified by county and sex based on 1987 census.
<b>Survey Description</b>	study of recreational behavior among citizens of New Jersey
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	29.6%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-L (uses 9 of the 10 questions proposed for the forthcoming DSM- IV; 6 of the 9 questions use the term 'ever')
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in New Jersey in 1990.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	5.8% (1+); 3.0% (2+)
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.4%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$5.8 * .45 * .60 * 2.18 = 3.4\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; earned less than \$15,000 per year; younger persons; older persons
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	lottery play; casino betting; slots; horse betting; playing cards.
<b>Comments</b>	Used a slightly younger age (15+) than many other prevalence surveys.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48480">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/48480</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	

<b>Location</b>	NEW JERSEY + PENNSYLVANIA (2-State Study)
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1984
<b>Age</b>	17+
<b>Sources</b>	Sommers, I. (1988). Pathological gambling: Estimating prevalence and group characteristics. <i>Substance Use &amp; Misuse</i> , 23(5), 477-490. doi: 10.3109/10826088809039213
<b>Sample Size</b>	534 (1,000 households – refusals = 534)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; random selection within household; age distribution of respondents was skewed toward younger persons.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	53.4%
<b>Weighting</b>	Gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	Inventory of Gambling Behavior & other questions to get a "hard signs" of gambling pathology (CCSM)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	30.6% ("31% represented the number of respondents who both perceived themselves as gamblers and were willing to disclose this in a telephone interview") [unclear as to time period for statement]
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	"potentially" pathological gamblers = 4.12%; "probable" pathological gamblers = 3.37%
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	17-34 age group; males; Catholics; single individuals; separated or divorced; annual household income less than \$20,000
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	The IGB method probably requires additional corrections for the sampling strategy (selected for self-defined "gamblers") and for the PG measure which is based on 28 items clustered into 5 "tests" with a positive score on any item in a "test" leading to a positive score on that test and the sum of the test scores yielding a respondent's total score. An odds ratio method, which expresses the odds in favor of being a PG for each total score, is used to estimate prevalence. Survey included adults residing in a nine-county area of southeastern Pennsylvania and southern New Jersey. This study is not included in the tables or analyses.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/10826088809039213">http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/10826088809039213</a>

<b>Location</b>	NEW MEXICO
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1996-1998
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	<p>New Mexico Department of Health &amp; University of New Mexico Center on Alcoholism Substance Abuse and Addictions. (1996). New Mexico Survey of Gambling Behavior. Santa Fe, NM: Author.</p> <p>Starling, R., Blankenship, J., May, P., &amp; Woodall, G. (2009). Problem Gambling in New Mexico: 1996 and 1998. International Journal of Mental Health &amp; Addiction, 7(1), 138-148. doi:10.1007/s11469-008-9163-3</p>
<b>Sample Size</b>	2674 (1,279 in 1996 and 1,395 in 1998)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified based on county population; random digit dialing; American Indians, possibly because of the low number of household phones, were under sampled by about 50%.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	no
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	Respondents were surveyed regarding their gambling behavior in the 30 days preceding the gambling survey
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	Mix of DSM-IV questions (13) and SOGS questions (4)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	6,300 EGMs in 1999. Population in 1998 was 1,733,535. People per EGM = 275.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	<p>Gamblers were categorized as experiencing “low/moderate problems” if they reported any of the following, but also reported no serious problems: (1) one or more low problems, (2) one moderate problem, or (3) two low problems with one moderate problem. Gamblers were categorized as experiencing “serious problems” if they reported any of the following: (1) one or more serious problems, (2) two or more moderate problems, or (3) three or more low problems in combination with one more moderate problems.</p> <p>8.2% were identified as having low/moderate problems, while 3.9% were identified as having serious problem gambling.</p>
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	younger, more college education, less likely to be married, disability/unemployment, Hispanic

<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	playing cards for money, dice gambling, and paper games
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11469-008-9163-3">http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11469-008-9163-3</a>

<b>Location</b>	NEW MEXICO
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2005-2006
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A., & Bernhard, B. (2006). The 2006 Study of Gambling and Problem Gambling in New Mexico. Report to the Responsible Gaming Association of New Mexico. Northampton, MA: Gemini Research.
<b>Sample Size</b>	2850
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random-digit dialing; minimum of 8 attempts to establish contact; questionnaire translated into Spanish; oversample of 589 Native American New Mexico residents aged 18 and over.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a survey in the State of New Mexico about people's attitudes toward gambling"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	47% ("completion rate"); 37% (more conservative approach)
<b>Weighting</b>	age, ethnicity
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS): gambled more than 5 times in lifetime; CPGI: Past year gambler
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS); CPGI
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	14,881 EGMs in 2006. Population in 2006 was 1,954,599. People per EGM = 131.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	68%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	CPGI: 2.2% (3-7); 0.6% (8+); 2.8% combined DSM-PY: 0.7% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 1.3% combined DSM-L: 1.1% (3-4); 1.1% (5+); 2.2% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	CPGI: $2.8 * .58 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.2\%$ DSM-PY: $1.3 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.2\%$ Average = 1.2%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	never married; disabled; unemployed; male, Hispanic; lower education; Native Americans
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Bingo; wager privately; sports bettors; casino gamblers
<b>Comments</b>	Interviewed a separate oversample of 589 Native American residents of New Mexico.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/44211">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/44211</a>



<b>Location</b>	NEW YORK
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1996
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1996). Gambling and Problem Gambling in New York: A 10-Year Replication Survey, 1986 to 1996. Report to the New York Council on Problem Gambling. Roaring Spring, PA: Gemini Research.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1829
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random selection of households and random selection of respondents within households; after completing 1,000 interviews, it was determined that the sample would not meet quotas for males or for population distribution in the state; began screening for male respondents in eligible households; post-stratification of sample to correct for population distribution; individuals with lower education underrepresented.
<b>Survey Description</b>	study of the gambling practices of the Citizens of New York State
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	72% (response rate among eligible respondents); 36% (response rate among eligible households).
<b>Weighting</b>	Yes - to ensure sample would be representative of the distribution of the population of the state; weighted by ethnicity, population distribution. Details available in Table 2 (p. 8).
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY (DSM-IV-MR)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in New York in 1999. Unknown number in 1996.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	80%; (Lifetime = 90%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.2% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 3.6% combined SOGS-L: 4.7% (3-4); 2.6% (5+); 7.3% combined DSM-IV-PY: 1.6% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.5% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.5%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $3.6 * .72 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.98\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $2.5 * .58 * 1.44 * .53 = 1.11\%$ Average = 1.5%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; under age 30; non-Caucasian; unmarried
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	continuous forms of gambling
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49244">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49244</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	

<b>Location</b>	NEW YORK
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1986
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. & Steadman, H.J. (1988). Refining prevalence estimates of pathological gambling. <i>The American Journal of Psychiatry</i> , 145(4), 502-505.  Volberg, R.A. (1996). <i>Gambling and Problem Gambling in New York: A 10- Year Replication Survey, 1986 to 1996</i> . Report to the New York Council on Problem Gambling. Roaring Spring, PA: Gemini Research.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1000
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; sample stratified to proportionally represent the counties of New York on the basis of 1980 census figures; instrument also translated into Spanish; lowest education levels somewhat underrepresented.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a study of the gambling practices of the Citizens of New York State"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	65%
<b>Weighting</b>	no
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in New York in 1999.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 84%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.8% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 4.2% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$4.2 * .72 * .60 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.1\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; under age 30; Black; Hispanic; lower incomes (less than \$25,000); less education (not graduated from high school)
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://ajp.psychiatryonline.org/article.aspx?articleid=164990">http://ajp.psychiatryonline.org/article.aspx?articleid=164990</a>

<b>Location</b>	NEW YORK
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2005-2006
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Rainone, G., Marel, R., Gallati, R. J., & Gargon, N. (2007). Gambling Behaviors and Problem Gambling among Adults in New York State: Initial Findings from the 2006 OASAS Household Survey. NYS Office of Alcoholism and Substance Abuse Services.
<b>Sample Size</b>	5100
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	Between 45% - 50%
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, age, region, ethnicity, nativity and employment status
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-PY (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	16,555 EGMs in 2006. Population in 2006 was 19,306,183. People per EGM = 1166.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	67%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.5% (3-4); 0.4% (5+); 0.9% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$0.9 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.2\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males; younger adults; Blacks; Hispanics; never married; employed full or part time
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	The survey methodology is described in a separate report, "2006 OASAS Household Survey Technical Documentation." (This report not available online).
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49270">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49270</a>

<b>Location</b>	NORTH CAROLINA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2005
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Division of Mental Health, Developmental Disabilities and Substance Abuse Services. (2007). Effects of the North Carolina State Lottery on the Incidence of Gambling Addiction.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1367
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Gambling questions included in random statewide telephone survey (North Carolina Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS)) of adults that collects information on health, health behaviors, and utilization of health services in all months of the year.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"We are gathering information about the health of North Carolina residents."
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	Yes
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	none
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	N/A -- The prevalence for problem gambling, or the percentage of the adult general population with a gambling problem, was based on a single question that asked respondents whether they were gambling more than they thought they should.
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	3,600 EGMs in 2004. Population in 2005 was 8,683,242. People per EGM = 2412.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	Past 6-months = 28.6%; Lifetime = 50.3%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.1% -- Based on a single question that asked respondents whether they were gambling more than they thought they should.
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	age 18-24; non-whites; high-school education; \$15,000-\$24,999 household income
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	This report presents findings on gambling behaviors among adult North Carolinians prior to the sale of the first lottery ticket on March 30, 2006
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://digital.ncdcr.gov/u?p249901coll22,71000">http://digital.ncdcr.gov/u?p249901coll22,71000</a>

<b>Location</b>	NORTH DAKOTA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1992
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. & Silver, E. (1993). Gambling and Problem Gambling in North Dakota. Report to the North Dakota Department of Human Services, Division of Mental Health. Albany, NY: Gemini Research.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1517
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random sample of telephone numbers proportional to working blocks of telephone numbers in state; random selection of respondents within households; demographic data from random sample compared to data from 1990 U.S. census; no significant differences in terms of ethnicity; respondents in sample were less likely to be male and under the age of 25 than the general population.
<b>Survey Description</b>	study of the gambling practices of the Citizens of North Dakota
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	65%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in North Dakota in 1992.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	73%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.3% (3-4); 0.7% (5+); 2.0% combined SOGS-L: 2.5% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 3.5% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.7%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.0 * .72 * 1.59 * .74 = 1.7\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Lifetime: under 30 years of age; lower than average household income. Current: under 30 years of age; non-White; somewhat less likely to earn \$25,000 or more annually.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	pull-tabs; bingo
<b>Comments</b>	Survey prior to the establishment of casinos in the state.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49254">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49254</a>

<b>Location</b>	NORTH DAKOTA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2000
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (2001). Gambling and Problem Gambling in North Dakota: A Replication Study, 1992 to 2000. Report to the North Dakota Office of the Governor. Bismarck, ND: Office of the Governor.
<b>Sample Size</b>	5002
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random selection of households and random selection of respondents within households; achieved sample was quite representative of the total adult population in North Dakota, as estimated by the Bureau of the Census.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	71% (CASRO method)
<b>Weighting</b>	Yes - the data were weighted to ensure that the results of the survey could be generalized to the adult population of North Dakota; The first set of weights (WT_SHORT) treated the selection process for Phase One as an equal-probability selection of eligible adults in North Dakota, except that male and female adults of different ages in each of the four regions of North Dakota had different probabilities of completing the screener. The second set of weights (WT_LONG) adjusted for both the differential probabilities of selection for the full interview based on gambling frequency, for differential non-response by region, age, and gender at Phases One and Two, and for differential non-response by gambling frequency at Phase Two.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambled in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	2,500 EGMs in 1999. Population in 2000 was 642,200. People per EGM = 257.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	69.8%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 0.7% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 2.1% combined SOGS-L: 2.0% (3-4); 1.8% (5+); 3.8% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.4% (3-4); 0.3% (5+); 0.7% combined DSM-IV-L: 0.5% (3-4); 0.4% (5+); 0.9% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $2.1 * .72 * 1.44 * .74 = 1.61\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $0.7 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .74 = .88\%$ Average = 1.2%

<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	age 18 to 24; male; Native Americans; widowed, divorced or separated; less than a high school education; disabled or unemployed; annual household incomes between \$20,000 and \$25,000.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	horse race betting; casino table games; pulltabs, EGMs
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49264">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49264</a>

<b>Location</b>	OHIO
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1985
<b>Age</b>	
<b>Sources</b>	<p>Culleton, R.P. (1989). The prevalence rates of pathological gambling: A look at methods. <i>Journal of Gambling Behavior</i>, 5, 22-41. doi:10.1007/BF01022135</p> <p>Volberg, R.A. &amp; Banks, S.M. (1990). A review of two measures of pathological gambling in the United States. <i>Journal of Gambling Studies</i>, 6(2), 153-163. doi:10.1007/BF01013495</p>
<b>Sample Size</b>	801
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	Inventory of Gambling Behavior / Cumulative Clinical Signs Method (CCSM)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in Ohio in 1999.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	In Ohio, 2.5 % of all adults were described as "probable" and another 3.4% as "potential" pathological gamblers.
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	



<b>Comments</b>	<p>The IGB/CCSM probably requires additional corrections for the sampling strategy (selected for self-defined “gamblers”) and for the PG measure which is based on 28 items clustered into 5 “tests” with a positive score on any item in a “test” leading to a positive score on that test and the sum of the test scores yielding a respondent’s total score. An odds ratio method, which expresses the odds in favor of being a PG for each total score, is used to estimate prevalence. CCSM instrument also used in the following regional prevalence study: Culleton, R.P. &amp; Lang, M.H. (1985). The prevalence rate of pathological gambling in the Delaware Valley in 1984. Report prepared for People Acting To Help, Philadelphia, PA. This study is not included in the tables or analyses.</p>
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01022135">http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01022135</a>

<b>Location</b>	OHIO
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2012
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Massatti, R., Starr, S., Frohnapfel-Hasson, S. & Martt, N. (2015, February). 2012 Survey of At-Risk and Problem Gambling Prevalence Among Ohioans. Columbus, OH: Ohio Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services. <a href="http://mha.ohio.gov/Portals/0/assets/Research/Reports/2012-Survey-of-At-Risk-and-Problem-Gambling-Prevalence-among-Ohioans.pdf">http://mha.ohio.gov/Portals/0/assets/Research/Reports/2012-Survey-of-At-Risk-and-Problem-Gambling-Prevalence-among-Ohioans.pdf</a> ; Massatti, R. R., Starr, S., Frohnapfel-Hasson, S., & Martt, N. (2016). A baseline study of past-year problem gambling prevalence among Ohioans. <i>Journal of Gambling Issues</i> , 34, 32-54. doi: 10.4309/jgi.2016.34.3
<b>Sample Size</b>	3600
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Multistage random area probability sample for the state of Ohio; oversampling of 600 in each area where a casino will operate (Cuyahoga, Lucas, Franklin, and Hamilton Counties) and 1,200 surveys statewide. Sample was constructed by identifying zip codes and then by random selection of individuals within zip code.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a study on people's thoughts and feelings on gambling"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	"available upon request"
<b>Weighting</b>	age, race, and gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in past 12 months
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	CPGI
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	56.7%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.3% (3-7); 0.3% (8+); 0.6% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	Of the at-risk group, a majority are male and between the ages of 18-24 years old. In some areas of the state a slightly larger percentage of at-risk gamblers were African-American.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	casino gambling
<b>Comments</b>	Two items that measure community attitudes and perceptions of gambling problems were added to the survey instrument.

**Reference URL**

<http://mha.ohio.gov/Portals/0/assets/Research/Reports/2012-Survey-of-A>

<b>Location</b>	OKLAHOMA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2015-2016
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Paulson, R., & Chandler, M. (2016). Oklahoma gambling prevalence study. Prepared for Oklahoma Association for Problem and Compulsive Gaming and the Oklahoma Department of Mental Health and Substance Abuse Services. <a href="http://www.odmhsas.org/eda/OAPCG_SummaryReport_042016.pdf">http://www.odmhsas.org/eda/OAPCG_SummaryReport_042016.pdf</a>
<b>Sample Size</b>	2636
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Options for respondents to complete an online survey, a paper survey mailed with prepaid return envelope, or a telephone survey.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"...you will be asked questions about personal recreation, social gaming, gambling experiences you have had (including online), and awareness of gambling treatment in Oklahoma."
<b>Administration Method</b>	online panel; paper survey; telephone survey
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in past 12 months
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	PPGM; DSM-IV; DSM-V
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	56.4%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	PPGM: 3.5% (Problem / Pathological); DSM-IV: 1.0% (Severe); DSM-V: 0.9% (Severe).
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://www.odmhsas.org/eda/OAPCG_SummaryReport_042016.pdf">http://www.odmhsas.org/eda/OAPCG_SummaryReport_042016.pdf</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://public.tableau.com/profile/mark.a.reynolds#!/vizhome/OklahomaGa">http://public.tableau.com/profile/mark.a.reynolds#!/vizhome/OklahomaGa</a>

<b>Location</b>	OREGON
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1997
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1997). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Oregon. Northampton, MA: Gemini Research Inc.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1502
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	random selection of households and random selection of respondents within households; stratified sampling frame after completing approximately two-thirds of the interviews in order to obtain data from a representative sample of men and young adults.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a survey of people in your community for the State of Oregon concerning the gambling practices of Oregon citizens"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	51% (CASRO method)
<b>Weighting</b>	age
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY (DSM-IV-MR)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	8,848 EGMs in 1999. Unknown number of EGMs in 1997.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	51.6%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.9% (3-4); 1.4% (5+); 3.3% combined SOGS-L: 3.1% (3-4); 1.8% (5+); 5.1% combined DSM-IV-PY: 2.0% (3-4); 1.3% (5+); 3.3% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	3.4%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $3.3 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.60\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $3.3 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 4.30\%$ Average = 3.4%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; under the age of 30; non-White; divorced, separated or never married
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	illegal types of gambling, particularly sports, dice and games of skill; EGMs; card games; bingo
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49243">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49243</a>

<b>Location</b>	OREGON
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2000
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (2001). Changes in Gambling and Problem Gambling in Oregon: Results from a Replication Study, 1997 to 2000. Northampton, MA: Gemini Research Inc.  Moore, T.L. (2001). The Prevalence of Disordered Gambling among Adults in Oregon: A Secondary Analysis of Data. Salem, OR: Oregon Gambling Addiction Treatment Foundation.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1500
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	randomized telephone survey; stratified sampling; screening procedure was used to preferentially complete interviews with male respondents and with respondents under the age of 35; achieved sample was quite representative of the population in terms of gender, age and ethnicity
<b>Survey Description</b>	"survey of people in your community for the State of Oregon concerning the gambling practices of Oregon citizens"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	48% (CASRO method)
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY & DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	8,848 EGMs in 1999. Population in 2000 was 3,431,085. People per EGM = 388.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	47.1%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.4% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.3% combined SOGS-L: 2.7% (3-4); 1.9% (5+); 4.6% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.4% (3-4); 0.1% (5+); 0.5% combined DSM-IV-L: 0.9% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 1.5% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $2.3 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.81\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $0.5 * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 0.65$ Average = 1.2%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	minority populations (small sample); never married
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	

<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49241">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49241</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49242">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49242</a>

<b>Location</b>	OREGON
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2005
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Moore, T. (2006). The Prevalence of Disordered Gambling among Adults in Oregon: A Replication Study. Portland, OR: Oregon Gambling Addiction Treatment Foundation.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1554
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	The design and methodology for the replication study was consistent with the initial baseline study conducted in 1997 and the replication study conducted in 2001; minorities and ages 18 – 44 were under-represented in the sample.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	Age
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime?
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-L (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	14,218 EGMs in 2004. Population in 2005 was 3,626,938. People per EGM = 255.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	64.5% (weighted)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.7% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 2.7% combined SOGS-L: 2.4% (3-4); 1.9% (5+); 4.3% combined DSM: not reported
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $2.7 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.1\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	under the age of 45; non-Whites; divorced or separated; employed
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	Replication study; NODS prevalence rates not reported.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49240">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49240</a>



<b>Location</b>	OREGON
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2015
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Moore, T. L., Volberg, R. A. (2016). Oregon adult gambling behavior 2016: preliminary report. Wilsonville, OR: Oregon Council on Problem Gambling.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1,512
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Replication study; a purchased sample of 19,904 phone numbers (31.5% land lines; 64.4% cell) randomly distributed across the state.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	12.90%
<b>Weighting</b>	some weighting was necessary to achieve proportional sample sizes in three of the age/gender groups due to the over sampling of males in the 35 year and older group.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	PGSI; DSM-IV (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	56.60%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="https://www.oregonpgs.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/OREGON-ADU">https://www.oregonpgs.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/08/OREGON-ADU</a>

<b>Location</b>	PENNSYLVANIA + NEW JERSEY (2-State Study)
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1984
<b>Age</b>	17+
<b>Sources</b>	Sommers, I. (1988). Pathological gambling: Estimating prevalence and group characteristics. <i>Substance Use &amp; Misuse</i> , 23(5), 477-490. doi: 10.3109/10826088809039213
<b>Sample Size</b>	534 (1,000 households – refusals = 534)
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; random selection within household; age distribution of respondents was skewed toward younger persons.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	53.4%
<b>Weighting</b>	Gender
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	Inventory of Gambling Behavior & other questions to get a "hard signs" of gambling pathology (CCSM)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	30.6% ("31% represented the number of respondents who both perceived themselves as gamblers and were willing to disclose this in a telephone interview") [unclear as to time period for statement]
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	"potentially" pathological gamblers = 4.12%; "probable" pathological gamblers = 3.37%
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	17-34 age group; males; Catholics; single individuals; separated or divorced; annual household income less than \$20,000
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	The IGB method probably requires additional corrections for the sampling strategy (selected for self-defined "gamblers") and for the PG measure which is based on 28 items clustered into 5 "tests" with a positive score on any item in a "test" leading to a positive score on that test and the sum of the test scores yielding a respondent's total score. An odds ratio methods, which expresses the odds in favor of being a PG for each total score, is used to estimate prevalence. Survey included adults residing in a nine-county area of southeastern Pennsylvania and southern New Jersey. This study is not included in the tables or analyses.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/10826088809039213">http://dx.doi.org/10.3109/10826088809039213</a>

<b>Location</b>	PUERTO RICO [U.S. Territory]
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1997
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	<p>Volberg, R.A., &amp; Vales, P.A. (1998). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Puerto Rico [Juegos de azar y el problema de juego en Puerto Rico]. Report to the Puerto Rico Treasury Department.</p> <p>Volberg, R.A., Vales, P.A. (2002). Prevalence estimates of pathological gambling in Puerto Rico [Estimados de prevalencia sobre el juego patológico en Puerto Rico]. Revista Puertorriqueña de Psicología 13, 71-98.</p>
<b>Sample Size</b>	1506
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Stratified household sampling; 3 metropolitan municipalities, 3 large towns and 8 small towns were randomly selected from the 78 municipalities in Puerto Rico; different socio-economic areas selected within the urban and rural locations of each municipality; survey conducted in Spanish; random selection within household. Obtained sample was nonsignificantly different from the Puerto Rico population in terms of gender, age and urban/rural distribution.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"gambling practices among residents of Puerto Rico"
<b>Administration Method</b>	Residential face-to-face interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	97%
<b>Weighting</b>	"Since the sample was so similar to the Puerto Rico population in terms of size of municipality, urban-rural distribution, gender and age, it was not necessary to use post-stratification weights" (p. 9).
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	4,440 EGMs in 1999. Unknown number in 1997.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	88%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 4.4% (3-4); 6.8% (5+); 11.2% combined SOGS-L: 6.4% (3-4); 7.4% (5+); 13.8% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	8.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$11.2 * .72 * 1.00 = 8.1\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; between the ages of 21 and 54; divorced or separated; employed; annual household incomes over \$50,000

<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	“continuous” types of gambling, characterized by rapid cycles of play. These include wagering on horse races and cockfights, “bolita,” illegal EGMs, at casinos, on sports, on card games not at a casino and on games of skill.
<b>Comments</b>	"There was no effort made in the survey to separate questions about wagering on horse races and cockfights. This was done in order to maintain comparability with questions about parimutuel wagering in other jurisdictions. In retrospect, and given the large role that these types of gambling appear to play in the prevalence of problem and pathological gambling in Puerto Rico, it would have been preferable to separate these two activities."
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/45031">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/45031</a>
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/45032">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/45032</a>

<b>Location</b>	SOUTH DAKOTA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1991
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A., Stuefen, R.M., & Madden, M.K. (1991). Gaming in South Dakota: A Study of Gambling Participation and Problem Gambling and a Statistical Description and Analysis of its Socioeconomic Impacts. Vermillion: University of South Dakota, Business Research Bureau.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1560
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Sample stratified to proportionally represent county populations on the basis of 1990 census figures. Random sampling of households with listed telephone numbers and random selection of respondents within households. Up to 7 attempts were made to contact each number and up to 5 callbacks were made to complete an interview with each selected respondent.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a study of the gambling practices of the Citizens of South Dakota"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	78%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY (6-months) & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in 1991.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	(Lifetime = 86%)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 0.8% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 1.4% combined SOGS-L: 1.8% (3-4); 1.0% (5+); 2.8% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.5%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$1.4 * .72 * 1.44 * 1.00 = 1.5\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	unmarried; household income less than \$25,000; non-White, under age of 30
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	Bingo; sports betting. Problem and pathological gamblers in South Dakota are just as likely as those in other states to have wagered on gambling machines, horse and dog races, card games and dice games.
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/47803">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/47803</a>

<b>Location</b>	SOUTH DAKOTA
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1993
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. & Stuefen, R.M. (1994). Gambling and Problem Gambling in South Dakota: A Follow-up Survey. Vermillion: University of South Dakota, Business Research Bureau.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1767
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Sample stratified to proportionally represent county populations on the basis of 1990 census figures; Random sampling of households with listed telephone numbers and random selection within households; up to 7 attempts to contact each number; up to 5 callbacks to complete interview. Males, Native Americans, individuals under the age of 30 and those with less than a high school education underrepresented in sample.
<b>Survey Description</b>	"a study of the gambling practices of the Citizens of South Dakota"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	80%
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY (6-months) & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Casino first opened 1989. Unknown number of EGMs in 1993.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	65% (Past 6-months)
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 0.7% (3-4); 0.5% (5+); 1.2% combined SOGS-L: 1.4% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.3% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$1.2 * .72 * 1.44 * 1.00 = 1.2\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; over the age of 30; married
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	pull-tabs; video lottery games; socially with friends; card or dice games.
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/451">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/451</a>

<b>Location</b>	TEXAS
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1992
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Wallisch, L.S. (1993). Gambling in Texas: 1992 Texas Survey of Adult Gambling Behavior. Austin: Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse.
<b>Sample Size</b>	6308
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; Certain geographical areas oversampled to provide minimum sample of 650 respondents in each of 8 regions of the state; Spanish-language version of the survey instrument was produced. Approximately 6 percent of the adults asked to be interviewed in Spanish.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	67%
<b>Weighting</b>	age, race/ethnicity, region
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in 1992.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	49%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.7% (3-4); 0.8% (5+); 2.5% combined SOGS-L: 3.5% (3-4); 1.3% (5+); 4.8% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.5 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.0\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	males, non-whites, young adults (18–24), divorced or never married, lower educational levels, blue-collar workers, Catholics and people who are not Protestant or Jewish
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	betting on cards or dice in casinos or at card parlors and other betting establishments, bingo, games of skill, and sports at a sports book or with a bookie
<b>Comments</b>	The information given by all respondents generally reflects gambling that occurred before the Texas Lottery, except where indicated; Study also included a separate sample of 924 adolescents aged 14 through 17.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49251">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49251</a>

<b>Location</b>	TEXAS
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1995
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Wallisch, L.S. (1996). Gambling in Texas: 1995 Surveys of Adult and Adolescent Gambling Behavior. Austin: Texas Commission on Alcohol and Drug Abuse.
<b>Sample Size</b>	7015
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Minimum of 400 adults from each of the 11 Texas Department of Health and Human Services planning regions; certain age groups and racial/ethnic groups were oversampled; obtained sample representative in terms of gender, age, racial/ethnic and regional distribution as the Texas population.
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	70% (noted as "cooperation rate")
<b>Weighting</b>	gender, race/ethnicity, age, region
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in 1995.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	68%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 2.2% (3-4); 0.8% (5+); 3.0% combined SOGS-L: 3.6% (3-4); 1.8% (5+); 5.4% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.4%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$3.0 * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 2.4\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	younger age; African American or Hispanic; never married; high school dropouts; less likely to be in the labor force because they were instead in school or disabled; lowest household incomes
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	illegal activities, followed by bingo, games of skill, and casino games
<b>Comments</b>	Follow-up / replication study; Study also included a separate sample of 3,079 adolescents aged 14 through 17.
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49250">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49250</a>



<b>Location</b>	WASHINGTON
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1992
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. (1993). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Washington State. Report to the Washington State Lottery.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1502
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; random selection of respondents within households; sample slightly underrepresents Asians, young adults and the elderly, individuals who have never married, low income households
<b>Survey Description</b>	study of the gambling practices of the citizens of Washington State
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	60% (Upper Bound method)
<b>Weighting</b>	no
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in 1992.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	80.1%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.9% (3-4); 0.9% (5+); 2.8% combined SOGS-L: 3.5% (3-4); 1.5% (5+); 5.1% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.4%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$2.8 * .72 * 1.59 * .74 = 2.4\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male; under the age of 30, non-White; unmarried
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	wagering on sports events with friends or co-workers; lottery's Daily Game
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/514">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/514</a>

<b>Location</b>	WASHINGTON
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1998
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Volberg, R.A. & W.L. Moore. (1999). Gambling and Problem Gambling in Washington State: A Six-Year Replication Study, 1992 to 1998. Olympia, WA: Washington State Lottery.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1501
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random selection of households and random selection of respondents within households; "soft screening" respondents in eligible households in order to obtain adequate representation of young men. Soft screening entails first asking for the man in the household under age 35, then any male, and then the adult with the next birthday. As a result of this screening procedure, the sample is fully representative of the population aged 18 and over in Washington State in terms of gender (male/female) and age (18-34 and 35+).
<b>Survey Description</b>	"survey of people in your community for the State of Washington concerning the gambling practices of Washington citizens"
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	50% (CASRO method)
<b>Weighting</b>	no
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	gambling in lifetime
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	SOGS-PY & SOGS-L; DSM-IV-PY (DSM-IV-MR)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	No EGMs in 1998.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	74.4%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	SOGS-PY: 1.8% (3-4); 0.5% (5+); 2.3% combined SOGS-L: 3.7% (3-4); 1.3% (5+); 5.0% combined DSM-IV-PY: 0.9% (3-4); 0.6% (5+); 1.5% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.9%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	SOGS-PY: $2.3\% * .72 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.81\%$ DSM-IV-PY: $1.5\% * 1.19 * 1.44 * .76 = 1.95\%$ Average = 1.9%
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	male, under the age of 25, non-White or Hispanic; never married
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	bingo, the instant and daily lottery games, EGMs, horse or dog races
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49271">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49271</a>

<b>Location</b>	WASHINGTON
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	2003-2004
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Mancuso, D., Gilson, M., & Felver, B. (2005). The 2003 Washington State Needs Assessment Household Survey. Department of Social and Health Services (DSHS), Division of Alcohol and Substance Abuse (DASA).
<b>Sample Size</b>	6713
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing + phone numbers from Food Stamps client lists, school lists, birth certificate records, and ethnic surname sampling of listed telephone numbers. The interview offered in 6 languages: English, Spanish, Russian, Chinese, Korean, and Vietnamese. Stratified sampling; over sampling young adults, poorer persons and members of ethnic and racial minority groups; An advance letter with a brief description of the survey and a one dollar bill was sent to sampled households with available address information; minimum number of 20 callbacks.
<b>Survey Description</b>	Part of an omnibus survey on several topics
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	50% (69% "cooperation rate")
<b>Weighting</b>	Yes - to U.S. Census population counts.
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	Not indicated. Seemingly Gambling in past year.
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV-PY (NODS)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	16,923 EGMs in 2004. Population in 2004 was 6,203,788. People per EGM = 367.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	54%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.7% (3-4); 0.4% (5+); 1.2% combined
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	2.1%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$1.2 * 1.19 * 1.44 = 2.1\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	aged 25 to 44 years; 45 to 64 years; rural counties; American Indian or Alaska Native adults; adults who endorsed more than one race; Blacks.
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49260">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49260</a>

<b>Location</b>	WISCONSIN
<b>Year Study Conducted</b>	1995
<b>Age</b>	18+
<b>Sources</b>	Thompson, W.N., Gazel, R., & Rickman, D. (1996). The Social Costs of Gambling in Wisconsin. Wisconsin Policy Research Institute Report, 9(6),1-44.
<b>Sample Size</b>	1000
<b>Sampling Strategy</b>	Random digit dialing; 3 call back attempts; the 1,000 respondents were a close match of the general Wisconsin adult population
<b>Survey Description</b>	
<b>Administration Method</b>	telephone interview
<b>Response Rate</b>	
<b>Weighting</b>	No
<b>Threshold for PG Questions</b>	None
<b>Assessment Instrument</b>	DSM-IV(slight modification)
<b>Gambling Availability</b>	Unknown number of EGMs in 1995.
<b>Past-Year Gambling Prevalence</b>	65.1%
<b>Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	0.9% (3+)
<b>Standardized Problem Gambling Prevalence</b>	1.3%
<b>Standardization Calculations</b>	$0.9 * 1.19 * 1.59 * .74 = 1.3\%$
<b>Demographic Correlates of PG</b>	
<b>Game Correlates of PG</b>	casino gambling
<b>Comments</b>	
<b>Reference URL</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49232">http://hdl.handle.net/1880/49232</a>