

WINNIPEG | OTTAWA www.pra.ca



Gambling Prevalence Study

March 2025 Prepared for: Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan

> 500-363 Broadway Winnipeg, MB, R3C 3N9 Phone: 204.987.2030 Fax: 204.989.2454 Toll-free (English): 1-888-877-6744 Toll-free (French): 1-866-422-8468 Email: <u>admin@pra.ca</u>

Table of Contents

Execu	utive	Summary	i
1.0	Lite	rature review	.1
	1.1	Introduction	1
	1.2	Methodology	2
	1.3	History of legalized gambling in Saskatchewan	2
	1.4	Epidemiological research on gambling in saskatchewan	3
	1.5	Responsible gambling initiatives across game types/venues	4
	1.6	Province-wide gambling awareness	12
	1.7	Promising practices for responsible gambling	14
2.0	Surv	vey	17
	2.1	Methodology	17
	2.2	Weighting	18
	2.3	Demographic profile of respondents	18
	2.4	Statistical tests	19
3.0	Sas	katchewan gambling	20
	3.1	Gambling in past 12 months	20
	3.2	Use of online app	22
	3.3	Satisfaction with gambling	23
	3.4	Awareness of responsible gambling programs	24
4.0	Gan	abling behaviors	25
	4.1	First age gambled	25
	4.2	Gambling behaviors in last 12 months	26
	43	Total types of gambling	30
	44	Intersection between forms of gampling	32
	45	Spending behaviors on gambling	32
	4.6	Reasons for gambling	34
50	Prol	blem gambling severity index	35
0.0	5 1	PGSI questions	35
	5.2	PGSI	37
	5.3	Comparison to 2002 Saskatchewan gambling study	40
6.0	Pos	itive Play Scale	43
••••	6.1	Honesty and control	44
	6.2	Pre-commitment	47
	6.3	Personal responsibility	50
	6.4	Gambling literacy	53
	6.5	Sub-scale comparison	55
	6.6	PPS Scores	56
7.0	Gan	nbling consequences	59
	7.1	Urge to gamble	59



9.0	Sur	vey key findings	66
	8.2	Recreational cannabis use	64
	8.1	Alcohol consumption	63
8.0	Oth	er behaviors	63
	7.2	Perceptions of problem gambling	60

Appendix A – Questionnaire
Appendix B – Call record
Appendix C – References
Appendix D – Total Types of Gambling



Executive Summary

Background

Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan hired PRA Inc. to conduct a survey to assess the prevalence of gambling among adults in Saskatchewan and assess differences to a previous study conducted in 2002.

Methodology

To conduct the survey, PRA and the LGS created a draft questionnaire to meet project scope and objectives. The survey was conducted using random-digit dialling with 1,800 Saskatchewan residents 18 and older from November 14, 2024 to January 29, 2025, yielding a theoretical error rate of ± 2.3% (based on a 95% confidence interval).

Gambling in the past 12 months in Saskatchewan

- Gambling behaviors in Saskatchewan. Overall, 58% of Saskatchewan residents have been involved in at least one of four gambling activities in Saskatchewan in the past 12 months, most commonly buying lottery tickets, either from a store or online at 50%. Among 7% of Saskatchewan residents who have gambled online in Saskatchewan in the past year, 24% have bet on PlayNow.com, which is approximately 2% of all respondents.
- Satisfaction with gambling in Saskatchewan. Among those who have gambled on various gambling activities in Saskatchewan in the past 12 months, satisfaction for gambling activities operated by Saskatchewan-based organizations tends to be higher for overall experience at Saskatchewan casinos (average rating of 3.7) than playing lottery tickets (average rating of 3.3), playing VLTs (average rating of 3.3), or using PlayNow.com (average rating of 3.3.). When assessing satisfaction only with gambling that is monitored or run by Saskatchewan organizations, the average satisfaction rating is 3.4 out of 5.
- Awareness of responsible gambling. Among those who have gambled on various activities in the past 12 months, respondents tend to be most aware of responsible gaming programs, features or services on *PlayNow.com* (average rating of 4.1) while *lottery ticket players in Saskatchewan* are least aware of responsible gambling programs (average rating of 3.0). Assessing awareness of responsible gaming among gambling monitored or run by Saskatchewan organizations, the average awareness score is 3.1 out of 5.

Gambling behaviors

- **First age of gambling.** The average age respondents first gambled was 19, although 20% indicate that they first gambled when they were under 18 years of age.
- Gambling behaviors in last 12 months. Assessment of 13 types of gambling over the past 12 months shows that purchasing *scratch/instant win tickets or lottery tickets in-person* is the most common gambling behavior, with 52% having done it in the past 12 months. Approximately 19% of Saskatchewan residents gamble on one or more types of gambling at least weekly, which includes 6% who gamble on two or more forms of gambling at least weekly.



PGSI

The Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) uses a set of nine questions to identify gamblers' potential problem with gambling by assessing them into four categories – non-problem gambler, low-risk gambler, moderate-risk gambler and problem gambler. Approximately 20% of gamblers and 15% of all residents are classified with at least some risk-level for problem gambling. This includes 2% of all residents who are classified as a problem gambler.

The table below shows the changes in PGSI from the previous study conducted in 2002 to the current study. Although the increase in problem gamblers is not a statistical change it may be considered a practical change. As the 2002 study indicates, approximately 5,600 to 13,200 residents could have a serious gambling problem, which could be approximately 17,000 residents based on current population estimates.

PGSI by gambling study

	Proportion of adult population				
	Non- gambler	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler
Current study (2025)	25%	60%	12%	2%	2%
Previous study (2002)	13%	71%	9%	5%	1%

Demographic groups. Those who identify as Indigenous (10%), with a mental health issue (10%), who speak English as an additional language (9%), or who have a disability (8%) show the highest propensity for problem gambling (moderate-risk or problem gambler). It should be noted that the proportion of Indigenous people who identify as moderate-risk gambler or problem gambler, decreased from 20% in 2002 to 10% in 2025.

Positive Play Scale

The Positive Play Scale (PPS) is a set of questions used measure responsible-gaming beliefs and behaviors among gamblers. The PPS includes four sub-scales: honesty and control, pre-commitment, personal responsibility, and gambling literacy. The graph below shows the scoring for the PPS on the four sub-scales. Saskatchewan gamblers are much more likely to score high on the PPS for Personal Responsibility and much lower for Gambling Literacy.







The average PPS scores for the sub-scales and the overall PPS are shown below. Those with high school or lower education, Indigenous people, and those who speak English as an additional language have the lowest average PPS, primarily driven by having lower Gambling Literacy scores.



The PPS score decreases as problem gambling increases, which is also consistent across the four subscales.

PPS scores by PGSI

	PPS	Personal responsibility	Honesty and control	Pre- commitment	Gambling literacy		
PGSI							
Problem gambler	75%	80%	74%	73%	72%		
Moderate-risk gambler	81%	87%	79%	79%	79%		
Low-risk gambler	93%	97%	93%	94%	89%		
Non-problem gambler	97%	99%	97%	96%	94%		
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.							

Gambling consequences

- **Urge to gamble.** Overall, 3% of gamblers say they have had the urge to gamble in the past 12 months when something painful happened in their lives. The proportion increases by PGSI from 1% of non-problem gamblers to 45% of problem gamblers.
- Perceptions of problem gambling. Among gamblers, 3% say they feel they might have a gambling problem. This also increases with higher PGSI from <1% of non-problem gamblers to 59% of problem gamblers.

Other behaviors

- Alcohol consumption. Those that gamble tend to be more likely to have consumed alcohol in the past week than those who do not gamble. There is strong evidence to suggest that the amount of alcohol consumed increases for those at higher risk for problem gambling as problem gamblers average approximately 7 drinks per week and moderate-risk gamblers average 15 drinks per week. This compares to about 3 to 4 drinks per week for low-risk gamblers and non-problem gamblers.
- **Cannabis use.** Problem gamblers (33%) are two to three times more likely than other gamblers to have used cannabis for recreational purposes at least weekly in the past year.



1.0 Literature review

1.1 Introduction

The development and regulation of gambling in Canada has transformed greatly since the 1970s when the federal government amended the Criminal Code to allow various forms of gambling to be offered and controlled by provincial and territorial regulatory bodies (Sheppard & Smith, 2006) and then expanded legalized gambling in 1985. Like many countries, Canadian policies and practices progressed further in the 1990s when several provinces expanded their regulated gambling industries, particularly with the introduction of casinos and Video Lottery Terminals (VLTs). The first legal casino opened in Winnipeg, Manitoba, in 1989, followed by other casinos in various provinces throughout the 1990s while becoming major sources of new revenue for provincial governments. Simultaneously, VLTs were introduced in bars and other venues across Canada (1993 in Saskatchewan). These developments laid the foundation for the modern Canadian gambling industry.

Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan (LGS) was established in 2023 to consolidate the conduct and management of gambling activities into one entity while regulation of gambling was retained by Saskatchewan Liquor and Gaming Authority (SLGA). LGS oversees the activities of multiple gambling operators in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation (SaskGaming), now a subsidiary of LGS, owns and operates two Saskatchewan casinos (Casino Regina and Casino Moose Jaw). The Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority (SIGA) is a First Nations nonprofit corporation which operates seven First Nation casinos in Saskatchewan on behalf of the Federation of Saskatchewan Indian Nations (FSIN). Slot machines in SIGA casinos are conducted and managed by LGS while SIGA operates table games under a charitable gaming license which is regulated by the Indigenous Gaming Regulators (IGR). Western Canada Lottery Corporation (WCLC) operates the VLTs located in province-wide licensed establishments. Sask Sport offers lottery products (via Sask Lotteries). Finally, PlayNow.com, operated by SIGA through an agreement with LGS, is Saskatchewan's only legal online gambling website. LGS conducts and manages these varied gambling activities to ensure they continue to economically benefit the province in a manner that is fair, sustainable, and socially responsible.

According to the Responsible Gambling Council (2025), responsible gambling (RG) refers to gambling that minimizes risk to players and occurs through the collective actions and shared responsibility among many stakeholders, including government, gaming operators, regulators, treatment providers, community groups, and individual gamblers. RG is a key element of sustainable, socially-responsible gaming operations in Saskatchewan. It is important to understand the current RG policies, strategies, tools, and resources being implemented in Saskatchewan and how effective they have been within the province. To ensure RG programming implemented in Saskatchewan remains effective, the current literature review examines key findings and themes from national and international research on responsible gambling that have direct and indirect implications for the activities of LGS's operators.

This review examines academic studies and related resources that provide a framework for better understanding responsible gambling and its impact on Saskatchewan residents. Current versus best practices are highlighted with the aim of ultimately informing RG strategies best suited to minimize gambling-related harms in Saskatchewan. The literature is organized into several key areas based on identified themes in the research. To conclude, recommendations for RG practices are discussed.



1.2 Methodology

The literature included in this review includes documents related to gambling (particularly those with a Canadian focus), responsible gambling strategies, and public health approaches aimed at addressing gambling-related harm. The documents primarily consist of academic journal articles but also includes research and technical reports and online resources. An emphasis was placed on gathering empirical research studies that have examined the effectiveness of various responsible gambling strategies. Most of these documents were gathered through non-systematic searches using academic databases (e.g., PsycInfo) and the Google search engine. Several combinations of the following terms were used in the searches: gamb*, responsible gamb*, campaigns, public messaging, psychoeducation, support services, gamb* legislation, gamb* policy, safer messaging, self-exclusion, staff training, pop-up messages, limit setting, player cards, public health, prevent*, etc. Inclusion of an * at the end of a search term would allow for all variants of the word with the addition of letters to the base word (e.g., gamb* would simultaneously use the search terms gamble, gambler, gamblers, gambling). Although the search was not limited to recently published materials, given the rapidly evolving nature of the gambling industry and responsible gambling practices, greater emphasis was placed on documents published since 2010.

1.3 History of legalized gambling in Saskatchewan

The Saskatchewan Lottery was introduced in the 1970s after the formation of Sask Sport Inc. in 1972 (Saskatchewan History Album, n.d.). The lottery, which aimed to help develop sports, culture, and recreation in Saskatchewan, achieved immediate popularity and set the stage for broader gambling reforms in the province. The success of the Saskatchewan Lottery continued into the 1990s when the province moved to regulate other forms of gambling, including video lottery terminals (VLTs) which were introduced in 1992. The SGC was established in under a Framework agreement in 1994 to oversee the development of casino gambling in the province and Casino Regina opened in 1996, followed by Casino Moose Jaw in 2002. In 2022, PlayNow.com was launched as the province's first regulated online gambling platform, offering casino gambling and sports betting (Saskatchewan.ca, 2022).

SIGA was created in 1995 after the Gaming Framework Agreement was established between the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations (FSIN) and the Government of Saskatchewan. SIGA operates seven casinos in Saskatchewan, with the first permanent casinos opening in 1996 (Bear Claw Casino¹ – White Bear Reserve near Carlyle, Golden Eagle Casino – North Battleford, Northern Lights Casino – Prince Albert, and Painted Hand Casino – Yorkton) and the most recent in 2018 (Gold Horse Casino – Lloydminster).

According to its most recent annual report, LGS recorded total revenues of \$585.6 million and a net income of \$191.1 million in 2023-24 (LGS, 2024). Revenues are distributed in many ways, including into the province's general revenue fund, dividends paid to Crown Investments Corporation, commissions paid to site contractors for VLTs, and charitable gaming grants. In addition, Sask Sport, Sask Culture, and the Saskatchewan Parks and Recreation Association receive funding directly from lotteries proceeds. In sum, the economic impact of gambling in Saskatchewan is substantial, with revenues from a wide range of gambling activities contributing to the provincial economy, the government, and programing each year.

Bear Claw casino first opened on White Bear First Nation in 1993 but was shut down. It re-opened in 1996 after an agreement was negotiated between the Federation of Sovereign Indigenous Nations and the Government of Saskatchewan.



¹

1.4 Epidemiological research on gambling in saskatchewan

Epidemiological studies on gambling in Canada show varying patterns of gambling participation across provinces and demographic groups. According to the Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) conducted in 2018, 66.2% of Canadians engaged in some form of gambling within the past year, with lottery tickets being the most common form of participation (Williams et al., 2021). In the same study, 73.3% of Saskatchewan residents reported gambling within the past year. The most common forms of gambling participation in Saskatchewan were lottery or raffle tickets (52.6%), instant lottery tickets (33.4%), and Electronic Gambling Machines (EGMs which include VLTs; 22.9%). Within Saskatchewan and several other provinces, EGMs are in taverns, restaurant lounges, and casinos. Some provinces have venues devoted exclusively to EGMs (e.g., community gaming centres in B.C.). EGMs have been linked to higher rates of problem gambling compared to other forms of gambling (Williams et al., 2012). Notably, there was a significantly higher rate of EGM participation in Saskatchewan and Manitoba compared to national EGM participation rates (22.9% versus 13.0% across Canada).

The Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) is a nine-item measure that assesses problematic gambling behaviour in the general population. In the 2018 CCHS, the PGSI was administered to all respondents who reported gambling at least once per month (Williams et al., 2021). The resulting scores were used to group respondents into one of three categories: non-problem gambler (0), at-risk gambler (1-4), and problem gambler (5 or more). Across Canada, 33.8% were categorized as non-gamblers (i.e., did not report gambling at least once per month and therefore did not complete the PGSI), 62.9% as non-problem gamblers, 2.7% as at-risk gamblers, and 0.6% as problem gamblers. In Saskatchewan, 26.7% were non-gamblers, 67.8% were non-problem gamblers, 4.6% were at-risk gamblers, and 0.8% were problem gamblers. These higher rates of problem gambling in Saskatchewan were also shown in an earlier survey conducted by the Canadian Centre for Substance Abuse (Wynne, 2002), which indicated that 4.7% of the population were identified as moderate-risk gamblers and 1.2% were problem gamblers. These differences suggest that, within Saskatchewan, rates of at-risk and problem gambling are higher than the national average.

Demographic variables are also important to consider when examining rates of problem gambling. A 2013 study on gambling in Saskatchewan used data from the 2007-2008 CCHS (Faregh & Derevensky, 2013) and found that men were more likely to experience gambling-related problems compared to women. The CCSA's 2002 study (Wynne, 2002) found demographic differences in gambling problems, with men, younger residents, those with higher education, those with lower income, and Indigenous residents showing higher rates of moderate-risk and problem gambling.

The study by Faregh and Derevensky (2013) also found a relationship between physical health and gambling risks, as individuals with more physical ailments were more likely to exhibit problem gambling. Unsurprisingly, the study also found smoking and alcohol dependence were significant predictors of gambling problems, as these associations have been demonstrated reliably in studies of risk factors for problem gambling (e.g., Welte et al., 2004) including meta-analyses (e.g., Allami et al., 2021; Lorains, 2011). On a positive note, the study suggested a possible decreasing trend in gambling problems within the province based on comparisons to earlier prevalence studies in Saskatchewan (Volberg, 1994; Wynne, 2002). The authors concluded that the downward trend in problem gambling within the province may indicate effective governmental intervention and problem gambling services. While many Saskatchewan gamblers tend to spend modest amounts of money on occasional gambling activities (Wynne, 2002), especially lottery tickets and charity raffles, epidemiological research reveals a relatively small but significant portion of the population experiencing negative consequences due to their gambling behavior. Financial hardships, strained relationships, criminality, and psychological issues such



as depression, anxiety, and suicidality are among the many individual challenges faced by problem gamblers (CAMH, n.d.). The impact of problem gambling extends beyond the individual, affecting families, workplaces, communities, and broader society.

The Saskatchewan government has implemented regulations, prevention measures, and treatment strategies to address gambling problems. From a community perspective, problem gambling adds additional strains to provincial social services and healthcare systems. Individuals experiencing severe gambling problems often require specialized addiction treatment services, which can be costly and resource intensive. Therefore, problem gambling must be viewed as a provincial public health issue requiring targeted resources with an emphasis on prevention (Korn & Shaffer, 2004). RG measures aimed to ensure gambling activities remain socially responsible is the most proactive and cost-effective approach to limiting gambling problems and their consequences. RG approaches must be grounded in solid empirical evidence and demonstrate clear effectiveness to accomplish their goals. A review of different RG approaches in Saskatchewan, Canada, and abroad allows us to evaluate the current state of RG and inform future evidence-based approaches for helping keep gambling in Saskatchewan a safe and sustainable activity.

1.5 Responsible gambling initiatives across game types/venues

Video Lottery Terminals (VLTs)

Given the number of VLTs in Saskatchewan (4,200 in more than 570 taverns and restaurant lounges across the province; LGS, 2024), data showing higher rates of VLT participation in Saskatchewan compared to other provinces (Williams et al., 2021) and research indicating a reliable association between VLT participation and greater risk for problem gambling compared to other forms of gambling (e.g., Williams et al., 2012, 2023), a review of RG initiatives related to VLTs is a key priority. In Saskatchewan, several responsible gambling (RG) initiatives related to VLTs have been implemented. VLT-related RG measures include age restrictions, ATM separation, prohibited credit advances, cash-out limits and auto-cash-outs, maximum cash deposits, maximum bet limits, staff training, and RG messaging.

- Age restrictions. Like all other provinces in Canada, minors are prohibited from playing VLTs. In most provinces, including Saskatchewan, the legal gambling age is 19 years (it is 18 years in Alberta, Manitoba, and Quebec). VLTs are in age-restricted areas of liquor-licensed taverns or lounges in Saskatchewan where they cannot be seen by individuals 18 years or younger. In addition, messages on the VLTs and signage in VLT areas clearly indicate that users must be 19 or older to play.
- Access to ATMs. Another straightforward RG measure is to require cash to play VLTs. In other words, individuals may not play VLTs on credit (including cash advances) and this regulation is common across provinces. In an increasingly cashless society, individuals who wish to play VLTs will often need a means to access cash. Accordingly, ATMs are typically available in licensed establishments, allowing patrons to withdraw cash to play VLTs. However, ATMs in Saskatchewan are strategically placed to increase social responsibility (e.g., away from the VLTs and not visible). Some provinces dictate the minimum distance that ATMs must be from the VLT area (e.g., 4.5 metres in Alberta and Manitoba) while other provinces, such as B.C., have no such regulations². Some researchers have argued for the complete removal of ATMs from VLT
- ² Note that B.C. uses the term "slot machines" to refer to EGMs in legal gambling venues (casinos, community gaming centres, and race tracks). EGMs are not allowed in pubs and bars in B.C. The Gaming



establishments and casinos (e.g., Blaszczynski et al., 2011; Wood et al., 2014) which would most effectively prevent players from withdrawing cash impulsively and spending beyond their intentions. Some empirical studies have examined the impact of removing ATMs from the gaming area with mixed results (e.g., Rodda, 2021).

- Cash out requirements. VLTs in Saskatchewan also feature limits on the amount players can accumulate, deposit, and bet on a machine. In Saskatchewan, if a player's VLT balance reaches \$1,750 they are automatically cashed out of the machine. In other words, after retrieving their balance (typically by submitting a paper receipt from the VLT in exchange for cash), the player would need to redeposit cash into the VLT to continue playing. This RG measure prevents (at least temporarily) players from "giving back" a large balance with persistent play after a large win and provides a "cooling off" period in which they are required to collect their winnings and make a new decision about whether to continue playing. The threshold of \$1,750 in Saskatchewan is higher than at least three other provinces (e.g., \$1,250 in Alberta and Manitoba; \$1,000 in Quebec). Lower thresholds are more conservative in that cash-outs will be triggered earlier and more often when the value is lower. Ostensibly, the lower the cash-out threshold, the more "disruptive" it will be for the player which should decrease the likelihood of risky play. However, there is no research demonstrating the effectiveness of mandatory cash outs nor the optimal threshold for triggering cash outs on VLTs.
- Maximum deposit. VLTs in Saskatchewan are also set to accept a maximum cash deposit of \$100, which is similar to other provinces but higher than the Atlantic provinces (NB, NS, PEI, NL) where it is \$60. A lower maximum cash deposit would theoretically result in more disruptions to play that requires the individual to decide to either end their gambling session or deposit more cash into the machine. Additionally, the maximum bet allowed per turn on VLTs in Saskatchewan is \$4 which is less than Alberta (\$6.25) but more than Manitoba, Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, PEI, and Newfoundland (\$2.50). Given the structural characteristics of VLTs allowing individuals to bet rapidly, limiting the amount of money bet per play is intended to slow down loss rates and curb excessive spending.
- Time limits. In Saskatchewan, VLT players must also preselect a time limit up to 60 minutes for their gambling session. Players are notified by a pop-up message when their time limit expires at which point they may choose to continue gambling. A second time session begins, and the player is automatically cashed out after their second time session expires. Players also have the option of setting up a "Player Services Management" account allowing them to set time and money limits per session, day, week, or month on VLTs. Similar time limit settings and/or player management accounts are available in most provinces.
- RG Training. Staff training is another standard RG measure for VLTs although the type of training varies by province. In Saskatchewan, VLT site operators are required to take an RG course which is valid for five years. This course provides instruction on how VLTs operate and address common VLT myths (e.g., VLTs "pay out" more on certain days). Additionally, "Serve it Right Responsible Beverage Program" training is required for all staff at VLT sites in Saskatchewan. Serve it Right training is primarily aimed to help staff better understand responsible service of alcohol (e.g., approaches for discontinuing alcohol service to intoxicated patrons) (Tourism Saskatchewan, n.d.). The training also helps staff understand how VLTs work, how to identify and address potential problem gambling behaviour, and learn about how to responsibly serve



Policy and Enforcement Branch of B.C. acknowledges at that there is no difference between a slot machine and a VLT (British Columbia Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch, 2012).

alcohol to individuals engaged in VLT play. This type of training for staff at VLT sites is common across provinces. Research demonstrates that these types of training programs for staff at VLT sites improve employee attitudes regarding problem gamblers and increases their knowledge about how to help individuals who show signs of gambling problems (Dufour et al., 2010). Most participants are satisfied with the training, have a better understanding of problem gambling, feel better able to detect problem gamblers and help them, and have a greater desire to help them. However, the study found that some of these benefits do not appear to be fully maintained several months after the training takes place, suggesting the need to regularly update this training rather than have protracted renewal periods (e.g., 5-year certifications).

The final type of VLT-related RG initiative to note is RG messaging displayed at operator sites and integrated into the VLTs. In Saskatchewan, only RG signage provided by LGS may be displayed at VLT sites. Additionally, RG messaging can be displayed on the top screen of VLT cabinets with information about gambling, safer gambling practices (e.g., how randomness works, the cost of play, setting time and money limits), and helplines. Brief educational videos have been tested to examine their effectiveness at encouraging RG practices. Wohl et al. (2013) developed three- and nine-minute versions of an animated educational video explaining how EGMs function (e.g., that the odds for each play are independent regardless of the outcome of the previous play). In a sample of EGM players, they found that both versions of the video helped reduce erroneous cognitions about EGMs and facilitated spending limit adherence during a subsequent gambling session. In a subsequent study, Hollingshead et al. (2019) recruited a community sample of EGM players to view the 3-minute version of the video before gambling at a casino. They found that players who viewed the video and were then asked to make an RG-related decision were more likely to express their intention to set a money limit while gambling during their forthcoming session at the casino. The authors concluded that these types of RG educational videos may be most effective at increasing players' intention to gamble responsibly when shown at the venue and prior to actual gambling sessions.

A more confrontational type of RG messaging that has been researched is the use of fear appeals in warning messages on VLTs akin to warning labels on tobacco products highlighting the potential negative outcomes associated with excessive use. Munoz et al. (2010) recruited 258 VLT players with varying levels of problem gambling severity and exposed them to threatening warnings about VLTs. Results showed that more threatening warnings (Strong threat: "Excessive gambling may drive you to intense distress and suicidal thoughts"; Moderate threat: "Excessive gambling may harm your family life, break down your couple and your home life") were more effective than less threatening warnings (Weak threat: "Beware of excessive gambling"; Control: "Gambling should remain a game") at enhancing depth of information processing which, in turn, increased attitude change and behavioural intentions. Furthermore, when the source was perceived as an outside medical source (i.e., "National Public Health Institute") versus the game provider, depth of information processing was also enhanced. These findings highlight the potential utility of using fear appeals with endorsement from expert sources as RG messaging strategies for VLTs.

VLTs also have pop-up message capabilities. Pop-up messages can be incorporated into VLT gameplay by presenting messages during gambling sessions to disrupt play, provide feedback on potentially risky play, and encourage reflection on gambling-related behaviours and thoughts. For example, a pop-up message may appear between bets that notifies the player how long they have played and how much money they have spent. There has been an abundance of research on the effectiveness of pop-up messages as an RG feature. Individual studies have examined the impact of different types of pop-up messages (e.g., disruptive, educational, personalized feedback, limit setting reminders) with varying parameters (e.g., timing, frequency, position, length) on various outcome measures (e.g., gambling persistence, gambling-related cognitions) (see Ginley et al., 2017 for a review). While the effectiveness



of pop-up messages has been mostly tested in laboratory settings, some research has examined their effects in real-world environments. For example, pop-up messages have been a mandatory feature on EGMs in New Zealand since 2009, and research has demonstrated a harm minimization effect of pop-up messaging since their introduction (e.g., Palmer et al., 2016).

Some studies have also examined the impact of pop-up messages in combination with other RG messaging. For example, a study by Wohl et al. (2013) explored the separate and combined effects of EGM pop-up messages targeting adherence to monetary limit setting and a nine-minute animated video aimed at correcting misconceptions about how EGMs function. They found that pop-up messages alone, the brief animation alone, and a combination of pop-up messages and animation were effective in helping gamblers stay within their preset monetary limits. However, there was no additive benefit to exposing participants to both types of RG messages. Reviews and meta-analyses provide helpful summaries of the effectiveness of pop-up messages as an RG tool. Ginley et al. (2017) conducted a systematic review of 31 studies on pop-up messages for EGMs. The review suggests that pop-up messages have greater potential to reduce gambling-related harm when the messages appear on the centre of the VLT screen, interrupt play, and require the player to actively remove them. Furthermore, pop-up messages are more effective when they are concise and direct. Bjørseth et al. (2021) conducted a meta-analysis of 18 studies that examined the efficacy of pop-up messages on gambling behaviour and cognitions. The short-term effects of pop-up messages were moderate for both gambling behaviours and cognitions and the authors concluded that pop-up messages are an important RG tool for VLT operators.

Casino gambling

Whereas VLTs are in licensed taverns and lounges where gambling is not the primary purpose of the establishment, casinos are brick-and-mortar buildings that are specifically intended to offer gambling. Accordingly, casinos have unique RG considerations. Similarly, regular patrons of casinos may be qualitatively different than regular VLT gamblers and therefore respond differently to casino-related RG initiatives. One study of 2808 Canadian casino EGM gamblers showed that they were generally aware of most RG measures and that this awareness was highest among at-risk and problem gamblers (Christensen et al., 2024). However, casino EGM gamblers generally felt that these RG measures had minimal effect on how much they spent on gambling nor their enjoyment of gambling.

- Self-exclusion. Self-exclusion is a form of "commitment device", which is a strategy that helps individuals adhere to their intentions. Voluntary self-exclusion programs are common RG measures offered in some form in virtually every casino across Canada. In Saskatchewan, all casinos offer voluntary self-exclusion which allows gamblers to ban themselves from all Saskatchewan casinos and PlayNow.com across the province, although banning from PlayNow.com does not automatically ban players from Saskatchewan casinos. When a gambler chooses to voluntarily self-exclude, their photo is shared with casino security, and they are placed on a list within a casino tracking system that bans them from the premises. This ban is facilitated by facial recognition software. An individual may choose to self-exclude for a period of six months up to five years.
- Limits. Casinos in Saskatchewan set limits on the size of bets allowed for different games. For example, there is a \$200 limit on roulette bets, \$1000 for blackjack, \$1500 for baccarat, and \$500 per spin on slot machines. These limits are moderate compared to other provinces. For example, they are lower than B.C. where the max bet limit per player position on main floor table games is \$2500 (players can bet up to \$50,000 per round in private rooms) and significantly lower than Ontario where the betting limit is \$100,000. The Saskatchewan limits are



higher than Alberta where the max bet limit is \$1,000, and higher than Nova Scotia where max bet limits also vary according to game (e.g., \$500 for blackjack, \$50 for roulette). When considering research and recommendations on low-risk gambling limits, the max bet size limits across all provinces are high. For example, a study by Currie et al. (2008) sought expert opinions on a tentative set of low-risk limits based on an empirical analysis of population gambling data. These low-risk limit guidelines suggest a maximum gambling frequency of two to three times per month, a maximum duration of 60 minutes per gambling session, maximum annual gambling expenditures of \$500-\$1000 per year, and a maximum percentage of gross income spent on gambling of 1%. Based on the population gambling data, exceeding these limits were reliably associated with a risk of gambling-related harm. The group of gambling experts, which included 171 researchers, clinicians and policy-makers in Canada and the United States, reviewed these guidelines and endorsed them as being valid and helpful in encouraging responsible gambling behaviour.

- Loyalty programs. Many casinos around the world offer loyalty rewards programs. Typically, these programs provide the gambler with a personalized card that tracks their play and offers incentives (e.g., gifts, free play) for certain levels of play. Some experts have argued that these types of rewards programs have the potential to be used as RG tools to help minimize gambling-related harms. For example, Wohl (2018) notes evidence that problem gamblers are more likely to join such loyalty programs, which could ultimately encourage more harmful gambling behaviour. Conversely, these programs could also facilitate harm minimization by allowing tracking of gambling behaviours leading to identification of risky levels of gambling and encouraging the use of RG tools. For example, Hollingshead and Wohl (2022) examined the effect of incentivizing gamblers to use RG tools by way of their loyalty program points. They found that casino loyalty program members who were willing to use RG tools if rewarded with loyalty points expressed both greater attitudinal loyalty to the casino brand and a greater willingness to use the RG tools. The authors concluded that rewarding RG tools through loyalty rewards programs may increase uptake of RG tools while having the added benefit of increasing positive attitudes about the casino.
- On-site RG. A common RG measure at Canadian casinos is the existence of on-site gambling information centres. In Saskatchewan, staff at *GameSense* centres can assist gamblers in enrolling in the "Game Break" program, retrieve player activity statements, teach casino patrons about how different gambling games work, offer informal counselling for patrons in distress, and provide referrals for help for gambling problems. There are also automated *GameSense* kiosks at casino sthat provide information about how gambling works and RG strategies. Player-facing casino employees are provided RG-related training which is aimed at helping staff understand the importance of RG, their role in maintaining an RG environment, and information about problem gambling. This type of training involves helping employees identify and respond to signs of high-risk gambling behaviour.

Relatively little publicly available research has been conducted to examine the extent and effectiveness of these types of casino-based RG training programs. One study showed that participants who have received this training demonstrate greater understanding of how gambling works and signs of gambling problems but that some of this knowledge is not well maintained at follow-up (Giroux et al., 2008). In another study, Christensen et al. (2022a) analysed employee surveys collected by an RG accreditation program ("RG Check" program operated by the Responsible Gambling Council of Ontario) to examine the actual level of RG training received and whether this training translated into meaningful RG behaviour towards patrons. They found that although nearly all casino employees received RG training, often the

8



training was relatively brief (i.e., one hour). However, over 80% of employees reported that they had applied this training by engaging in at least one RG interaction with a casino patron during their employment. In another study (Quilty et al., 2015), 130 casino employees reported on their experiences with RG training and responding to patrons showing signs of a gambling problem. The majority of employees reported that they regularly observed players exhibiting signs of gambling problems but generally felt that responding to those signs was challenging.

Online gambling

Online gambling in Canada has become increasingly popular over the past two decades. The percentage of Canadians who reported having gambled online in the previous year increased significantly from 1.0% in 2002 to 6.4% in 2018 (Williams et al., 2021). Regulated online gambling is relatively new to Saskatchewan, with PlayNow.com launching in 2022 as the province's first and only legally operating online gambling platform (Saskatchewan.ca, 2022). PlayNow.com, which is managed by LGS (through BCLC) and operated by SIGA, offers casino-style gambling (including online slot machines and table games), poker, instant lottery games, and sports betting. According to SIGA's 2023-24 annual report, PlayNow.com generated \$19.1 million in gambling revenue during the 2023-24 fiscal year (SIGA, 2024). Additionally, the report indicated that since its launch in November 2022, PlayNow.com has acquired more than 30,000 customers with approximately half from rural communities.

When online gambling emerged in the early 2000s, there were concerns from experts that it would be an inherently riskier form of gambling because it allows for greater accessibility, anonymity, event frequency, play immersion, disinhibition, and other factors related to harmful gambling behaviour (Griffiths, 2003). Subsequent research has shown that online gamblers tend to be more susceptible to gambling problems (e.g., Redondo, 2015) and that at-risk and problem gamblers participate in online gambling at higher rates compared to non-problem gamblers (e.g., Tomei et al., 2022). One Canadian study that looked at a sample of adolescents from three provinces, including Saskatchewan, found that adolescents who gamble online are far more likely to be problem gamblers (Wijesingha et al., 2017). Because these studies are cross-sectional, they can only demonstrate an association between problem gambling severity and online gambling. Although it is possible that participating in online gambling leads to more harmful gambling behaviour, it is also plausible that higher-risk gamblers are more attracted to online gambling. A comprehensive review of research on the relationship between online gambling and gambling problems suggests that online gambling itself does not cause problems, but that online gambling is more common among problem gamblers and that certain features of online gambling (e.g., convenience, ease of betting) may exacerbate existing problems (Gainsbury, 2015). Hubert and Griffiths (2018) compared a group of online and offline gamblers in Portugal. In that sample, online problem gamblers were more susceptible to the situational characteristics of online gambling (e.g., accessibility, anonymity) suggesting that online operators and regulators should target RG initiatives that address these characteristics (e.g., promoting the use of limit setting tools to dictate when individuals allow themselves to gamble online). Interestingly, Hubert and Griffiths found that online gamblers generally reported having more confidence and trust in RG measures (e.g., availability of self-exclusion options; access to betting history) compared to offline gamblers.

On Saskatchewan's PlayNow.com site, users are required to set a pre-commitment of maximum amount of money spent. There are also maximum deposit and transaction limits that vary across online games (e.g., LottoSpot app transactions are limited to \$30 per transaction and 10 transactions per day; PlayNow.com sets a maximum weekly deposit of \$100,000/week). Currently, personalized behavioural feedback alerts are not available for online gambling in Saskatchewan whereas they are available in B.C., Ontario, New Brunswick, P.E.I., and Newfoundland.



9



Because of the unique characteristics of online gambling, regulators are well positioned to implement RG measures that promote safer gambling behaviour. An online platform can more easily facilitate certain RG features compared to more traditional forms of gambling. For example, online gambling sites can accurately monitor the amount of time and money spent by users and target individuals with personalized feedback about their play if it reaches higher levels of risk. In one study, Murch et al. (2023) examined 9,145 adults in Quebec who had placed at least one real-money bet on the provincial government-run online gambling site. They found that monitoring behavioural markers of online gambling, especially betting frequency, betting variability, and repeated site engagement, could help accurately identify problem gamblers. Their results supported the use of a machine learning algorithm to detect at-risk gamblers based on their online gambling activity and highlight the potential effectiveness of implementing personalized harm prevention techniques.

In another study of users of a Swedish online gambling site, gambling behaviour was compared between 779 people who opted to receive behavioural feedback via an RG tool (*Playscan*) and a matched sample of 779 people who chose not to receive behavioural feedback (Wood & Wohl, 2015). As feedback, participants were colour-coded according to their risk rating (i.e., Green = no issues, Yellow = at-risk, Red = problematic). Results showed that this feedback was particularly effective for at-risk (yellow) gamblers, who significantly reduced their deposits and gambling expenditures compared to at-risk gamblers who did not receive feedback. This effect was maintained 24 weeks later suggesting that providing personalized behavioural feedback about an individual's online gambling, especially among those who exhibit at-risk gambling patterns, can encourage sustained safer gambling behaviour.

Online gambling sites also allow users to easily customize limit setting tools and implement voluntary self-exclusion. Wood and Griffiths (2015) found that gamblers reported that it was easier to stay within their preset betting limits for online games compared to similar games found in brick-and-mortar gambling venues. In a large Australian study of 26,560 online gamblers, Heirene and Gainsbury (2021) sent different types of messages to gamblers about the availability of deposit limit setting. There were three types of messages: one highlighted that most users who set deposit limits were better able to manage their spending (norm-based), another simply informed users about the availability of the feature, and the third promoted the potential benefits of using the limit setting. Gamblers who received any of these messages were more than eight times as likely to set a deposit limit within the next five days compared to those who did not receive the messages. However, it is important to note that the overall rate of setting deposit limits was very low, so the absolute difference in uptake between the message group (0.71%) and the non-message group (0.08%) is small. Among those who did set limits, there was a significant reduction in average wagers, the variance of wagers, net losses, and betting intensity.

As previously discussed, pop-up messaging is a well-researched area with many studies examining the effectiveness of pop-up messages as RG tools for EGMs (i.e., VLTs and slot machines). Pop-up messages applied specifically to online gambling contexts have also been researched. For example, Caillon et al. (2021) looked at the effectiveness of different types of gambling-related warning pop-up messages in a sample of 58 regular online gamblers. Participants were invited to a laboratory where they gambled with their own money on their preferred gambling website while researchers controlled pop-up messages that appeared on their screens. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three types of pop-up messages during the gambling sessions: 1) self-appraisal messages (n = 19), which encouraged reflection on gambling habits (e.g., "Do you need to think about taking a break?"), 2) informative messages (n = 16), which provided information about gambling risks and corrections of cognitive distortions (e.g., "All gambling games involve an element of chance"), or 3) control pop-ups (n = 23), which contained no content and had to be closed by the participant. Participants completed various gambling-related assessments (e.g., PGSI) before and after the session. In addition, their gambling



behavior (e.g., money spent, session duration) on their online gambling account was tracked before, during, and 15 days after the session to assess both immediate and follow-up effects of the pop-up messages. Participants' reactions to the pop-up messages were also qualitatively assessed. One key finding was that among at-risk gamblers, there was a significant decrease in the illusion of control at the 15-day follow-up for those in the information pop-up condition. Meanwhile, the self-appraisal messages led to a significant reduction in time spent gambling from pretest to the 15-day follow-up, compared to the control condition, but only for sports and horse bettors. Supplementary qualitative data showed that the pop-up messages were generally viewed negatively by participants. Over 80% of participants exposed to either type of message reported that the pop-ups had little to no effect on their gambling behaviour during the session, with many finding them irritating and frustrating. However, most participants acknowledged that the messages could potentially help reduce gambling risk.

Other research has examined the effect of varying emotional and cognitive aspects of pop-up messages. For example, one study recruited a sample of 59 online gamblers to explore the perceived efficacy of fear-based pop-up messages (Mutti-Packer et al., 2022). As participants viewed a pre-recorded video of online roulette play, they were randomly assigned to be exposed to fear-inducing messages related to either 1) social consequences of gambling (e.g., "Spending too much time gambling may harm your family and lead you to feel regret and despair"), or 2) financial consequences of gambling (e.g., "Spending too much to become bankrupt"). The results showed that participants rated high-threat, socially-based messages as being most effective. Collectively, findings from research on pop-up messages for online gambling highlight the limited impact of a "one size fits all" approach and suggest the need to vary message content and target particular messages according to game type and problem gambling status.

It should be noted that this review does not thoroughly address illegal online gambling sites (i.e., "offshore" sites that are not regulated or operated by any provincial government). A review of available RG tools on regulated and unregulated online gambling sites suggested that while some unregulated sites offer some of the same RG tools as regulated sites, several tools were less commonly found on unregulated sites (Sztainert, 2019). For example, unregulated sites were found to typically offer tools for self-limiting time and monetary expenditures and access to self-exclusion programs. However, two RG features that were not commonly offered by unregulated sites were third-party exclusion (i.e., concerned significant others of the gambler may initiate self-exclusion on the gambler's behalf) and selfimposed game restriction (i.e., the gambler can ban themselves from certain types of games on the website). Government agencies that oversee gambling activities could highlight a lack of RG standards by illegal sites in efforts to prevent these sites from operating within their jurisdictions. For example, Manitoba Liquor & Lotteries sought an injunction to ban an offshore gambling site from operating and advertising in Manitoba (Chang, 2025). This injunction, which was filed on behalf of the Canadian Lottery Coalition comprised of provincial gambling corporations in B.C., Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Quebec, and Atlantic Canada, alleges that the illegal gambling site falsely presents itself as legal, safe, and trusted. Government agencies are well positioned to argue that illegal sites not only siphon gambling revenues from government coffers (and, ultimately, funding for provincial services) but also do not offer the same consumer protections offered by regulated sites.



1.6 Province-wide gambling awareness

A common population-level approach to RG is the development and distribution of RG awareness messages and campaigns. These campaigns often consist of public service announcements (PSAs) and related materials disseminated through print, radio, television, and online media. All Canadian provinces offer some form of RG awareness messaging. In Saskatchewan, there are several different public initiatives to raise awareness about RG. SLGA offers "Gambling Responsibly" brochures which are available at gambling venues. Government websites (e.g., Saskatchewan.ca) provide resources for individuals who may need help for gambling problems (e.g., 24-hour Saskatchewan Problem Gambling Helpline, information about seeking counselling services, links to related services such as GAM-ANON and Gamblers Anonymous). Government-run gambling-related websites (e.g., SaskVLT.com, SIGA.ca) contain sections with information on RG, including GameSense resources about how gambling works, tools for calculating the cost of gambling, self-assessment questionnaires, and information about self-exclusion programs and other help services. Sask Lotteries also has an annual campaign during the holiday season discouraging the purchase of lottery tickets for children as gifts.

Many RG awareness campaigns use a "common sense" approach that generically advises people to gamble with care, but it is unclear how well they are working. Unfortunately, relatively few RG campaigns have been empirically tested for their effectiveness (Torrance et al., 2025). Future research should not only test the impact of these campaigns but also improve their effectiveness by identifying specific messages that result in objectively measured change. Newall et al. (2023) reviewed public health messaging campaigns aimed at reducing alcohol and tobacco use to guide research on effective messaging for gambling. They identified five key areas for RG messaging research: promoting safer gambling practices, addressing and correcting misconceptions about gambling, encouraging thoughtful decision-making, using norm-based messages, and incorporating emotional messages. They also emphasized the importance of a diverse messaging strategy, arguing that different groups of gamblers based on factors such as their level of involvement and reasons for gambling—will respond differently to responsible gambling messages. This approach contrasts with the "one size fits all" strategy typically used in responsible gambling campaigns, which often rely on simplistic and repetitive messages such as "gamble responsibly" or "know when to stop." Moreover, Newall et al. (2023) suggest that this type of advice is often ignored or may even backfire, as it places the burden on individuals to control their behavior. They argue that messages like "gamble responsibly" could provoke psychological reactance, where individuals feel their autonomy is being threatened and are motivated to do the opposite gamble excessively. A similar backfire effect has been observed with "drink responsibly" messages in the alcohol research literature.

Mills et al. (2023) argued against responsible gambling messages that emphasize personal responsibility (e.g., "You gotta know when to fold'em!"), as they may contribute to stigma. By framing gambling behavior as either "responsible/controlled" or "irresponsible/uncontrolled," Mills et al. suggest that individuals with gambling problems may internalize this binary distinction and view themselves as the problem, rather than recognizing gambling products as a potential source of harm. To address this issue, Mills et al. developed a disruptive advertising campaign called "Odds Are: They Win," which encourages gamblers to take a more critical perspective of the gambling industry. For example, one print advertisement in this campaign shows a poker chip with the word "Fixed" in the middle and text below it reading: "The main purpose of gambling companies is to maximise profit, generated through customer losses." While this example of an RG campaign may be viewed as provocative and perhaps excessively confrontational, it is worthwhile to study both the impact and perception of such messages to inform the development of more effective RG campaigns.



Another RG campaign was launched by the Liquor, Gaming, and Cannabis Authority of Manitoba (LGCA, 2024) in February 2024. The "Know My Gambling Limits" campaign includes advertisements providing corrective information about gambling (e.g., "There's no sure bet") and safer gambling advice (e.g., "Set a limit and stay within it"). One advertisement takes a more aggressive approach by highlighting deceptive marketing tactics used by some sportsbooks. The advertisement features two hands holding a basketball with the words "No bets are free" over the ball. Below the image, the text reads, "Sportsbook bonus credits could lead you to gamble more and lose more over time, so remember – nothing in life is free." This message refers to common promotional offers from online sportsbooks, which provide risk-free bets to individuals who sign up for new accounts. However, these offers often have conditions, such as requiring a deposit to claim the free bet. The goal of these promotions is to encourage signups, with the assumption that any sports book losses from the free bets will be offset by future gambler losses from continued betting. The "No bets are free" advertisement takes a disruptive approach by raising awareness of manipulation and deceptive marketing practices within the gambling industry.

Lemarié and Chebat (2013) argued that RG campaigns should target resistance to gambling promotion rather than trying to persuade people to gamble responsibly. Using inoculation theory to develop their argument, Lemarié and Chebat suggest that resistance to gambling advertisements could be strengthened by including two components: 1) a threat warning (e.g., "The dream can become a nightmare"), and 2) a refutational pre-emption (e.g., "Gambling advertisements make it seem like winning is easy, but the reality is..."). Torrance et al. (2025) experimentally tested the effectiveness of a novel inoculative intervention video (7.2 minutes long) for gambling advertising. In their study, 1200 UK-based gamblers aged 18 to 29 years were shown either an inoculative video (n = 595) or a neutral control video on healthy eating (n = 605). Participants in the inoculative video group showed an increase in resistance to gambling advertising and a reduction in self-reported engagement with promotional offers at one-month follow-up whereas the control group showed no changes on these measures. These findings are promising and highlight one of many different types of messages that can be incorporated into RG campaigns that go beyond straightforward advice to gamble responsibly.

On a broader level, there are several initiatives in Saskatchewan aimed at minimizing gambling-related harm in the province. The Gambling Awareness Program (GAP) is a Saskatchewan initiative under the Canadian Mental Health Association and funded by gambling revenues through the Community Initiatives Fund. GAP is focused on population-level and youth education on gambling and its connections with video gaming, social media, internet use, and mental health (Canadian Mental Health Association, 2022). The First Nations Addictions and Rehabilitation Foundation (FNARF) receives funds from SIGA revenues for programming dedicated to the promotion of RG (FNARF, n.d.). FNARF aims to make education, prevention, and treatment programs accessible to First Nations people with gambling problems. Finally, the Government of Saskatchewan Action Plan for Mental Health and Addictions 2023-2028 offers general societal support for mental health and addictions, including gambling problems (Government of Saskatchewan, 2023). The plan has three pillars of focus: building capacity for treatment, improving the system itself, and transitioning to a recovery-oriented system of care for addictions treatment.



1.7 Promising practices for responsible gambling

A longstanding approach to RG is known as the Reno Model, which acknowledges the potential harm that gambling can cause while placing responsibility on the individual to practice safe gambling behaviour (Blaszczynski et al., 2004). Some critics have argued that this approach shifts focus away from the gambling industry and onto its customers (e.g., Hancock & Smith, 2017). In other words, it frames problem gambling as an issue of individual weakness rather than an issue of the gambling environment designed to profit off players. For instance, the Reno Model places an emphasis on informing customers about how gambling works, the potential risks involved, and what to do if someone experiences problems with gambling (e.g., RG messaging that provides gambling helpline information) and assumes that gamblers will use this information to make more responsible decisions about gambling. Critics of this model advocate for a consumer protection approach which shifts the focus back to the industry and emphasizes the importance of creating a safer gambling environment that prevents fewer problems from occurring in the first place (Hancock & Smith, 2017). From a consumer protection standpoint, an RG priority should be transparently offering less addictive gambling products rather than knowingly offering addictive gambling products and responding when they lead to problems in a small proportion of users. Leaning into this approach could be beneficial for operators and regulators for at least two reasons: one, it will result in less problem gambling in the population and, two, it will demonstrate greater transparency and accountability on the part of operators and regulators about their role in the gambling industry, fostering greater societal trust and confidence.

The following recommendations for best RG practices emphasize a customer protection approach that recognizes the role of the gambling industry in contributing to gambling problems. Many of these recommendations are suggested by Hancock and Smith (2017).

- Avoid commonplace RG messages. As discussed, many RG messaging campaigns are framed in terms of individual responsibility (e.g., "Know when to draw the line"), which places the emphasis for behavior control on the individual without providing specific boundaries or guidelines. In contrast, it is recommended to include RG messages the promote specific and safe gambling practices that are associated with low levels of gambling-related harm (Newall et al., 2023). For example, messaging such as "If you're feeling upset or depressed, don't gamble" offers a clear behavior and guideline. RG messaging can be provocative and impactful if it emphasizes the reality of gambling as an activity that is not profitable in the long-term and raises awareness of industry manipulation (Mills et al., 2023).
- **Consider providing explicit information at gambling venues about the price of play**. Livingstone and Woolley (2007) suggest that messaging related to odds and price of play may not be properly understood by the typical gambler. For example, many do not understand messages related to price per pay (e.g., VLTs pay out 92%), and are often interpreted incorrectly. Providing messaging that is clearer to the average person about price per play and expected losses may help to reduce problem gambling.
- Wherever possible, reduce addictive facets of gambling products. Hancock and Smith (2017) make many suggestions aimed at reducing the impact of the addictive nature of gambling. These suggestions are most often related to the programming of EGMs. Their recommendations include reducing the intensity of EGMs by lowering maximum bet size, purposefully slowing the rate of play, and eliminating deceptive features of EGMs such as near-misses and losses disguised as wins.



- Consider removing ATMs from gambling venues altogether. Although the evidence for this recommendation is mixed due to limited empirical studies in this area, several researchers (Blaszczynski et al., 2011; Wood et al., 2014) argue for the removal of access to cash withdrawals in venues where EGMs are located.
- Consider making player tracking programs mandatory. Most jurisdictions have not implemented mandatory registration programs to gamble, but such a program could allow for the introduction of self-guided RG tools (e.g., limit setting), identification of high-risk gambling behaviour, and the application of harm-minimization interventions (Wood & Wohl, 2015). At onsite gambling (e.g., casinos, VLTs), a mandatory program could include player-guided RG tools that involve setting a spending limit before beginning play, implement a "hard lock option" in which players are prohibited from playing beyond their pre-committed limit versus a "soft lock option" in which they are permitted to continue playing. Research has shown the latter to be relatively ineffective at promoting RG (Wohl et al., 2024).
- Capitalize on player tracking programs to provide individualized feedback in online platforms. As noted, online gambling provides organizations access to real-time information on individual's gambling behaviors. The breadth and scope of this information can be used to create individualized messaging and information to gamblers. One key aspect is the use of pop-up messages that are specifically tailored to individuals to encourage self-awareness (Monaghan, 2009). Christensen et al. (2022b) suggested that messaging is highly effective when it provides context for what may be considered "normal behavior." For example, messaging such as "You spend more on gambling than 95% of other Saskatchewan residents who gamble" provides clear, individualized normative data that is more likely to impact behaviour. Newall et al. (2023) suggest using pop-up messages that are more inline with direct RG messaging suggested earlier. Taken further, several researchers (Lemarié & Chebat, 2013; Munoz et al., 2010; Torrance et al., 2025) suggest including fear-inducing content in pop-up messages that highlight the potential negative consequences of high-risk gambling similar to messaging used in campaigns for other potentially harmful behaviors (e.g., drinking and driving, smoking, speeding).
- Make concerted public efforts to ban all illegal online gambling websites within the province. Using a consumer protection framework, highlight the fact that government agencies set high RG standards that are often not met by unregulated sites which inherently make regulated sites safer and more trustworthy (Sztainert, 2019).
- Require ID for all patrons for on-site gambling venues. Although age restrictions are standard and straightforward approaches to prevent underage gambling, some research suggests being even more cautious. In a study by Wood et al. (2014), a group of responsible gambling experts, treatment providers, and recovered problem gamblers highly recommended that all patrons show ID to gain access to areas where gambling takes place. In doing so, an extra layer of protection would be added in which anyone who wants to enter an establishment where any form of gambling is available must be asked to produce valid ID to demonstrate that they are of legal age. While such an approach might be perceived as "overkill" when it is applied to older individuals who are unmistakably in the age of majority, it normalizes ID checking as a standard procedure which may lessen the burden of staff to selectively ID patrons who might be underage. Meanwhile, younger patrons of legal age may be less likely to feel unfairly targeted if everyone is being IDed.



- Consider expanding voluntary self-exclusion programs to include permanent bans. While limited voluntary self-exclusion can be an effective measure for individuals who want to temporarily prevent themselves from gambling in a casino, experts argue that there should be a permanent self-exclusion option. In Wood et al. (2014), RG experts, treatment providers, and recovered problem gamblers also highly recommended player-initiated permanent self-exclusion. Such an option ensures that at-risk and problem gamblers will not be tempted to reengage with casinos once their voluntary self-exclusion period has lapsed.
- Support and advance research that assesses the effectiveness of various RG measures in Saskatchewan. As noted, there is limited publicly available empirical evidence of the impacts of large-scale RG measures, such as population-wide campaigns. Most research has focused on the impacts of messaging at the individual level, and not the population level across critical outcome measures. Population-wide surveys can measure changes incidence rates (e.g., incidence of gambling problems, behavioural indicators such as money and time spent gambling, cognitive indicators such as erroneous gambling-related beliefs; Hancock and Smith, 2017) but may not be able to assess the direct impacts of RG measures.





2.0 Survey

2.1 Methodology

To conduct the survey, PRA completed the following steps.

- Survey review and testing. PRA and the LGS created a draft questionnaire to meet project scope and objectives. Once the LGS approved the questions, PRA pretested with 10 Saskatchewan residents by telephone (random digit) on November 13, 2024. In consultation with the LGS, PRA made slight changes to the questionnaire based on pretest results to improve the flow of the survey and participants' understanding of the questions. The final survey instrument can be found in Appendix A.
- **Survey.** PRA conducted the survey using random-digit dialling, including cellphone and landlines. Participants were given the option to complete the survey online for accessibility or refusal conversation, and could receive a link to the survey via email or text.

Table 1 below provides a summary of the methodology used for this survey. The call record can be found in Appendix B.

Pretest (telephone)	November 13, 2024
Survey dates	November 14, 2024 – January 29, 2025
Completed surveys	1,800 (1,771 telephone and 29 online)
Average completion time (minutes:seconds)	11:49
Median completion time (minutes:seconds)	11:36
Response rate	12%

Table 1: Methodology summary



2.2 Weighting

To correct differences for those surveyed and the Saskatchewan population, data was weighted by gender, age, and income. The weighting profile is outlined below. All results in this report are weighted.

Tahlo	2.	W/oid	nting	nrofile
Iavic	۷.	VVCIE	siiung	prome

	Population	Survey sample	Applied weight		
Gender (18 and older)					
Female	50.8%	54.9%	0.92		
Male	49.2%	44.6%	1.10		
Other gender identity	-	0.6%	-		
Age (years)					
18 to 34	28.0%	17.1%	1.63		
35 to 49	25.1%	22.8%	1.10		
50 to 64	24.2%	31.6%	0.77		
65 and older	22.8%	28.4%	0.80		
Household income					
< \$50,000	27.1%	24.7%	1.10		
\$50,000 to \$99,999	33.5%	32.6%	1.03		
\$100,000 to \$149,999	20.7%	22.1%	0.93		
\$100,000 or more	18.7%	20.6%	0.91		
Note: Non-responses were removed from age (3.1%) and income (29.9%) for weighting.					

2.3 Demographic profile of respondents

The table on the next page provides the demographic profile of respondents.



Table 3: Demographic profile

	Overall
	(n = 1,800)
Region	
Regina	26%
Saskatoon	31%
Other Saskatchewan	42%
People in household	
1	22%
2	35%
3	16%
4 or more	27%
Children 18 or younger in household	
Yes	72%
No	28%
Marital status	
Married/common-law	57%
Single	30%
Separated/divorced	6%
Widowed	7%
Employment	
Employed	57%
Not employed	43%
Education	
High school or less	32%
Some post-secondary	11%
College graduate	20%
University graduate or higher	36%
Other demographics	
Indigenous	15%
English as additional language	11%
Person with a disability	9%
Person with mental-health condition	7%
Note: Non-responses have been removed from the	calculations.

2.4 Statistical tests

Large sample sizes may inflate measures of statistical significance and may lead to false conclusions about the strength of association. In particular, the chi-square measure of association is susceptible to this possibility.³ PRA conducted Pearson's chi-squared tests to determine differences between groups on questions and scales throughout the survey. To deem an association statistically significant, the Pearson's chi-square must have a probability of a Type 1 error of less than .001.

For tests of means, ANOVAs were conducted. To deem a difference between means to be statistically significant, the ANOVA test must have a probability of a Type 1 error of less than .001.

Pearson's chi-square tests whether the observed frequency distribution differs from a theoretical distribution.



³

3.0 Saskatchewan gambling

3.1 Gambling in past 12 months

Overall, 58% of Saskatchewan residents have been involved in at least one of four gambling activities, most commonly *buying lottery tickets, either from a store or online* at 50%.



Key demographic differences

The table on the following page shows several statistical differences among demographic groups.

- **Gender.** Men are almost three times more likely than women to have *bet online* in the past 12 months.
- Region. Those living outside of Regina or Saskatoon are more likely to have played VLTs.
- **Age**. Respondents 18 to 34 years old are least likely to have *bought lottery tickets*, but most likely to have *played VLTs* or *bet money online*. For the latter two, the proportion actually decreases by age.
- **Marital status**. Because younger respondents are more likely to report being single, those who are single are less likely than other marital groups to have *bought lottery tickets*, but most likely to have *bet money online*.
- **Indigenous**. Those who self-identify as Indigenous are most likely across all demographic groups to have visited a casino, played VLTs or bet money online.



	Proportion of adult population				
	Gambled in Saskatchewan	Bought lottery tickets	Visited a casino	Played VLTs	Bet money online
Gender					
Female	59%	51%	22%	13%	4%
Male	57%	49%	21%	16%	11%
Region					
Regina	58%	50%	23%	10%	6%
Saskatoon	55%	47%	17%	12%	7%
Other Saskatchewan	60%	52%	24%	19%	8%
Age					
18 to 34	48%	32%	21%	20%	14%
35 to 49	61%	53%	22%	17%	9%
50 to 64	68%	64%	25%	13%	3%
65 and older	59%	54%	18%	7%	1%
People in household					
1	55%	48%	20%	13%	7%
2	62%	57%	19%	13%	5%
3	63%	52%	29%	16%	7%
4 or more	53%	43%	22%	16%	9%
Children 18 or younger in household					
Yes	60%	51%	24%	19%	10%
No	58%	50%	20%	12%	6%
Marital status					
Married/common-law	61%	56%	21%	14%	5%
Single	53%	39%	23%	17%	13%
Separated/divorced	60%	53%	20%	14%	8%
Widowed	55%	51%	20%	9%	1%
Employment					
Employed	61%	51%	23%	16%	9%
Not employed	55%	49%	20%	11%	5%
Education					
High school or less	62%	53%	24%	18%	11%
Some post-secondary	59%	47%	21%	13%	7%
College graduate	61%	53%	22%	15%	6%
University graduate or higher	54%	48%	19%	10%	5%
Other demographics					
Indigenous	66%	55%	34%	27%	17%
English as additional language	52%	41%	20%	15%	12%
Person with a disability	68%	63%	24%	18%	5%
Person with mental-health condition	52%	47%	15%	13%	7%
Household income					
< \$50,000	61%	50%	24%	15%	12%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	60%	54%	21%	15%	6%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	62%	52%	20%	11%	5%
\$150,000 or higher	59%	51%	23%	19%	10%
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically sig	gnificant difference.				

Table 4: Gambling activities in Saskatchewan in past 12 months among demographic groups



3.2 Use of online app

Among those who gambled online, the most common apps or websites used were *PlayNow*, *Bet365*, *Stake*, *Jackpot City*, and *Poker Stars*. No other apps or websites were used by more than 4% of those who gambled online in the past 12 months. Although PlayNow accounts for 24% of online gamblers, this represents approximately 2% of all respondents.

Table 5: Online apps or websites used in past 12 monthsQ2. Which online apps or websites have you used in the past 12 months?

	Apps or websites used (n = 130)		
PlayNow	24%		
Bet365	23%		
Stake	11%		
Jackpot City	10%		
Poker Stars	5%		
888 Casino	4%		
Yukon Gold	4%		
Sports Interaction	4%		
Draft Kings	4%		
Lotto Spot	3%		
Captain Cooks	2%		
Zodiac Casino	2%		
Other apps/websites	23%		
Don't know	15%		
Note: Respondents could give more than one response; therefore, column will sum to more than 100%. BASE: Those who have bet online in the past 12 months.			

Key demographic differences

Due to the small sample size (n = 130), differences between demographic groups cannot be assessed with confidence.



22



3.3 Satisfaction with gambling

Among those who have gambled on various gambling activities in the past 12 months, satisfaction for gambling activities operated by Saskatchewan-based organizations tends to be higher for *overall* experience at Saskatchewan casinos (average rating of 3.7) than playing lottery tickets (average rating of 3.3), playing VLTs (average rating of 3.3), or using PlayNow (average rating of 3.3.). Comparing PlayNow to gambling activities on other websites/apps shows lower satisfaction – 3.3 versus 3.6.

When assessing satisfaction only with gambling that is monitored or run by Saskatchewan organizations (i.e., casinos, PlayNow, lottery tickets, VLTs), the average satisfaction rating is 3.4 out of 5.



Satisfaction with gambling

Q3 - Q7. On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied, please rate the following thinking about the past 12 months.

* Caution: Very small sample size.

Key demographic differences

- **Age.** Among age groups, respondents 35 to 49 years old (47%) are most likely to be satisfied (rating of 4 or 5 out of 5) with *overall experience playing lottery tickets*, while those 18 to 34 (34%) are least satisfied.



3.4 Awareness of responsible gambling programs

Among those who have gambled on various gambling activities in the past 12 months, respondents tend to be most aware of responsible gaming programs, features or services *on PlayNow* (average rating of 4.1) and least aware of programs for *lottery ticket players in Saskatchewan* (average rating of 3.0).

Assessing awareness of responsible gaming among gambling monitored or run by Saskatchewan organizations (i.e., PlayNow, VLTs, casinos, lottery tickets), the average awareness score is 3.1 out of 5.



* Caution: Very small sample size.

Key demographic differences

There are no statistically significant differences between groups and awareness of responsible gaming programs, features, or services.



4.0 Gambling behaviors⁴

4.1 First age gambled

Among all respondents, the average age respondents first started gambling⁵ was around 19 years old, although 20% indicate that they first gambled when they were under 18 years of age.

Key demographic differences

Several demographic groups show a propensity for gambling at a younger age, with many having an average starting age of under 18 including men, those under 50, those with four or more people in their household, those with children, those who are single, those who are employed, and those who speak English as an additional language.

	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	0.0
	% under 18	Average age
Overall (n = 1,800)	20%	19.3
Gender		
Female	14%	21.0
Male	25%	17.6
Region		
Regina	18%	19.5
Saskatoon	20%	19.3
Other Saskatchewan	20%	19.2
Age	·	
18 to 34	23%	15.0
35 to 49	23%	17.8
50 to 64	21%	19.9
65 and older	12%	25.5
People in household		
1	19%	20.8
2	17%	20.7
3	21%	18.9
4 or more	22%	16.5
Children under 18 in household		
Yes	24%	17.4
No	19%	20.0
Marital status	·	
Married/common-law	20%	19.9
Single	23%	16.2
Separated/divorced	22%	20.1
Widowed	7%	26.2
Employment		
Employed	23%	17.9
Not employed	16%	21.2

Table 6: Age first gambled by demographic groups

Q65. Now thinking back over your life, at what age do you think you first gambled?



⁴ Questions for this section included any gambling activity in any location in the past 12 months.

⁵ Gambling was defined as any gambling behavior shown in Section 4.2.

	% under 18	Average age					
Education							
High school or less	21%	19.0					
Some post-secondary	19%	19.6					
College graduate	20%	19.5					
University graduate or higher	19%	19.3					
Other demographics							
Indigenous	25%	18.0					
English as additional language	19%	15.9					
Person with a disability	29%	20.1					
Person with mental-health condition	28%	18.1					
Household income							
< \$50,000	21%	19.8					
\$50,000 - \$99,999	21%	19.4					
\$100,000 - \$149,999	21%	20.6					
\$150,000 or higher 27% 18.0							
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.							

4.2 Gambling behaviors in last 12 months

Assessment of 13 types of gambling over the past 12 months shows that *purchasing scratch/instant win tickets or lottery tickets in-person* is the most common gambling behavior, with 52% having done it in the past 12 months, including 12% who have done it at least once a week. No other form of gambling has more than 3% who do it at least once per week.

Table 7: Gambling behaviors in last 12 months (n = 1,800)

Q13 – Q25. First, we'd like to ask some questions about gambling activities you may or may not have participated in. For each of the following, please let me know how often you have typically gambled on these activities in the past 12 months. In the past 12 months, how often have you...

	Daily	Few times a week	Once a week	Monthly	At least once	Not in past 12 months	Never	Don't know
Purchased scratch/instant win or lottery tickets in-person	1%	4%	8%	19%	22%	26%	22%	<1%
Played VLTs at a bar, or restaurant lounge	<1%	1%	2%	4%	10%	36%	47%	<1%
Played slot machines at a casino	<1%	1%	1%	5%	14%	39%	41%	<1%
Played card games with family or friends for money	<1%	1%	1%	3%	10%	36%	50%	<1%
Bet money online, excluding sports betting	<1%	1%	1%	2%	2%	29%	65%	<1%
Played bingo for money	<1%	1%	1%	1%	4%	40%	53%	<1%
Bet money on sports online	<1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	28%	67%	<1%
Purchased charity raffle or fundraising tickets	<1%	<1%	1%	12%	40%	24%	23%	1%
Purchased lottery tickets online	<1%	<1%	1%	2%	3%	30%	64%	<1%
Played table games at casino	<1%	<1%	<1%	2%	5%	39%	54%	<1%
Bet money on games of skill with family or friends	<1%	<1%	<1%	2%	5%	32%	60%	<1%
Purchased Sport Select tickets	<1%	<1%	<1%	1%	2%	32%	64%	<1%
Bet on horse racing	<1%	-	-	<1%	1%	35%	64%	<1%



Key demographic differences

The tables on the following pages show differences by demographic groups by the proportion who report gambling on each activity at least weekly. Although there are many differences that meet the threshold for statistical significance, below we summarize the biggest differences between groups.

- Gender. Men are much more likely to bet on sports online than women.
- **Age.** Respondents 50 and older are more likely to **buy lottery tickets in person** weekly, while the proportion **betting on sports online** decreases by age.
- **People in household**. As the number of people in the household decreases, so does the frequency of **buying lottery tickets in person**.
- **Education**. Those with a high school degree or lower education are more likely than those with higher levels of education to **play VLTs** weekly.
- Indigenous. Among all demographic groups, those who self-identify as Indigenous are most likely to play VLTs, gamble online (excluding sports betting), and purchase charity tickets weekly.
- **Persons with a disability**. Those who self-identify as a person with a disability are most likely across all demographic groups to **play bingo** weekly.



Table 8: Gamble once a week or more by demographic groups

	Lottery	VLTs	Slots	Card	Online	Bingo		
Overall (n = 1.800)	12%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%		
Overall (n = 1,800) 12% 3% 2% 1% 2% 2% Gondor								
Female	10%	2%	1%	1%	1%	3%		
Male	14%	3%	3%	1%	3%	1%		
Region	IVIDE 1470 370 370 170 370 1%							
Regina	13%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%		
Saskatoon	10%	3%	2%	1%	3%	1%		
Other Saskatchewan	12%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%		
Ottici Jashallicwall 1270 370 270 170 176 276								
18 to 34	6%	4%	4%	1%	3%	1%		
35 to 49	9%	3%	1%	1%	3%	2%		
50 to 64	18%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%		
65 and older	15%	1%	2%	1%	<1%	2%		
People in household		· · · · ·	1		-			
1	16%	4%	2%	1%	2%	3%		
2	13%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%		
3	10%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%		
4 or more	9%	3%	2%	2%	1%	2%		
Children under 18 in household	I				1			
Yes	9%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%		
No	13%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%		
Marital status								
Married/common-law	12%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%		
Single	9%	4%	2%	1%	4%	2%		
Separated/divorced	14%	6%	6%	2%	3%	1%		
Widowed	19%	1%	1%	1%	-	4%		
Employment								
Employed	11%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%		
Not employed	13%	3%	2%	1%	2%	2%		
Education								
High school or less	16%	5%	4%	2%	2%	2%		
Some post-secondary	13%	2%	2%	-	4%	3%		
College graduate	10%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	1%		
University graduate or higher	8%	2%	1%	1%	1%	<1%		
Other demographics								
Indigenous	16%	6%	3%	2%	5%	5%		
English as additional language	13%	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%		
Person with a disability	16%	4%	2%	1%	4%	6%		
Person with mental-health condition	12%	5%	2%	1%	2%	2%		
Household income								
< \$50,000	17%	4%	3%	1%	4%	4%		
\$50,000 - \$99,999	12%	3%	1%	1%	1%	2%		
\$100,000 - \$149,999	8%	<1%	1%	1%	1%	1%		
\$150,000 or higher	9%	3%	3%	1%	1%	-		
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.								



Table 9: Gamble once a week or more by demographic groups (continued)

	Sports	Charity	Lottery	Table	Games	Sport	Horse
	online	tickets	tickets online	games	of skill	Select	racing
Overall (n = 1,800)	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Gender							
Female	<1%	2%	1%	<1%	<1%	<1%	-
Male	4%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Region		1					
Regina	3%	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Saskatoon	3%	2%	1%	1%	<1%	1%	-
Other Saskatchewan	1%	3%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	-
Age							
18 to 34	4%	2%	1%	2%	1%	<1%	<1%
35 to 49	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	-
50 to 64	1%	3%	2%	<1%	1%	2%	-
65 and older	<1%	1%	<1%	-	<1%	<1%	-
People in household							
1	2%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	2%	1%
2	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	-
3	2%	2%	1%	-	<1%	<1%	-
4 or more	2%	3%	1%	1%	1%	<1%	-
Children under 18 in household							
Yes	3%	3%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-
No	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Marital status							
Married/common-law	1%	2%	1%	<1%	1%	1%	-
Single	4%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	-
Separated/divorced	2%	2%	3%	3%	1%	4%	2%
Widowed	-	1%	-	-	-	-	-
Employment							
Employed	3%	2%	2%	<1%	1%	1%	-
Not employed	1%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	<1%
Education							
High school or less	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	<1%
Some post-secondary	1%	2%	1%	-	2%	-	-
College graduate	3%	1%	1%	-	-	<1%	-
University graduate or higher	2%	2%	2%	-	<1%	1%	-
Other demographics							
Indigenous	3%	6%	2%	1%	2%	1%	-
English as additional language	3%	3%	2%	-	3%	-	-
Person with a disability	1%	2%	2%	-	-	1%	-
Person with mental-health condition	2%	5%	-	-	1%	-	-
Household income							
< \$50,000	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	3%	2%	2%	<1%	<1%	<1%	-
\$100,000 - \$149,999	2%	2%	1%	-	1%	1%	-
\$150,000 or higher	3%	3%	2%	1%	1%	1%	-
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.							



4.3 Total types of gambling

Among the 13 types of gambling, approximately 19% of Saskatchewan residents gamble on one or more types of gambling at least weekly. Within this group, 1 in 4 (25%) Saskatchewan residents who gamble, have at least one form of gambling they do weekly. This includes 7% of gamblers who engage in two or more forms on a weekly basis.

Table 10: Number of forms of gambling done at least weekly

	Overall (n = 1,800)	Gamblers (n = 1,349)
None	81%	75%
1	14%	18%
2	4%	5%
3	1%	1%
4 or more	1%	1%
Don't know	<1%	-
Average number	0.3	0.4

As shown in the table on the next page, men, 50 to 64 year olds, those with less education, Indigenous, those with a disability, and lower income (although the difference by disability and household income does not meet the threshold for statistical significance) residents are most likely to engage in at least one form of gambling at least weekly. At least 24% in each of these groups gamble on at least one form of gambling weekly.


Table 11: Gamble on at least one form of gambling weekly

	% gambling on at least	Average number of
	one form of gambling	forms of gambling
	weekly	weekly
Overall (n = 1,800)	19%	0.3
Gender		
Female	14%	0.2
Male	24%	0.4
Region		
Regina	20%	0.3
Saskatoon	18%	0.3
Other Saskatchewan	19%	0.3
Age		
18 to 34	16%	0.3
35 to 49	17%	0.3
50 to 64	24%	0.3
65 and older	19%	0.2
People in household		
1	24%	0.3
2	19%	0.3
3	16%	0.2
4 or more	16%	0.3
Children under 18 in household		
Yes	17%	0.3
No	20%	0.3
Marital status		
Married/common-law	19%	0.2
Single	20%	0.3
Separated/divorced	15%	0.5
Widowed	23%	0.3
Employment		
Employed	18%	0.3
Not employed	19%	0.3
Education		
High school or less	26%	0.4
Some post-secondary	21%	0.3
College graduate	17%	0.2
University graduate or higher	13%	0.2
Other demographics		
Indigenous	29%	0.5
English as additional language	22%	0.4
Person with a disability	28%	0.4
Person with mental-health condition	20%	0.3
Household income	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
< \$50,000	26%	0.4
\$50,000 - \$99,999	19%	0.3
\$100,000 - \$149,999	15%	0.2
\$150,000 or higher	15%	0.3
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically sig	nificant difference.	



4.4 Intersection between forms of gambling

Average number of other forms of gambling

The below shows the proportion of those who gamble on at least one other form of gambling weekly by each of the 13 other forms of gambling. For example, among those who purchase lottery tickets weekly, 29% also gamble on at least one other form of gambling weekly. It should be noted that that many of the sample sizes are very small (< 25 respondents) and results should be reviewed with caution.

Gamble weekly	% gambling on at least one form of gambling weekly	Average number of forms of gambling weekly
Table games (n = 9)*	100%	3.9
Horse racing (n = 2)*	100%	5.0
VLTs (n = 51)	87%	2.1
Sport Select (n = 14)*	81%	2.5
Games of skills (n = 12)*	80%	3.0
Lottery tickets online (n = 20)*	75%	2.1
Card games (n = 19)*	74%	1.5
Slots (n = 36)	68%	1.9
Bingo (n = 32)	64%	1.2
Online gambling (n = 33)	60%	1.7
Sports online (n = 37)	54%	1.5
Charity tickets (n = 35)	36%	0.9
Lottery ticket (n = 62)	29%	0.5
* Caution: Very small sample size.		

Table 12: Gamble on at least one form of gambling weekly

Intersection with other forms of gambling

Assessing the relationship between various forms of gambling there are some notable relationships:

- EGMs. There is a strong relationship between VLTs and slots, with 35% of people who play VLTs weekly also playing slots weekly. Inversely, 49% of those who play slots weekly play VLTs weekly.
- Casino table games. Those who play table games weekly have a high propensity to gamble on other forms. Among weekly table games players, 100% play VLTs weekly, 79% play slots weekly, and 49% bet on online sports weekly.
- **Online play**. Online sports bettors (weekly) don't have overly high participation in other forms of gambling, with some relationship to VLTs (32% play weekly). However, online gamblers tend to play VLTs (45% weekly) more often as well as betting on sports online (30% weekly).
- Lottery ticket purchasers. Those who purchase lottery tickets in-person show almost no higher rates of weekly gambling on other forms of gambling; however, those who purchase online tickets weekly also play VLTs (31%), online gambling (20%), and sports online (22%) at somewhat higher rates.



4.5 Spending behaviors on gambling

Among those who gambled on the activity at least monthly, respondents were asked for their typical monthly spend and the highest single day spend per activity. Excluding horse racing (which has a very small sample size), *table games at casinos* have the highest average and median monthly spend, and the highest median daily spend (second highest average daily spend behind *slot machines at casinos*).

Table 13: Typical spend per month and highest spend per day in last 12 months

Q26, Q29, Q32, Q35, Q38, Q41, Q44, Q47, Q50, Q53, Q56, Q59, Q62. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend on.... Q27, Q30, Q33, Q36, Q39, Q42, Q45, Q48, Q51, Q54, Q57, Q60, Q63. What is the most you spent in a single day on...

	N	Typical mo	nthly spend	Highest spend in a single day	
		Average	Median	Average	Median
Bet on horse racing*	4	\$6,962	\$8,229	\$743	\$600
Played table games at casino	40	\$1,402	\$123	\$742	\$150
Played slot machines at a casino	116	\$438	\$100	\$811	\$117
Bet money online, excluding sports betting	70	\$350	\$100	\$369	\$50
Played VLTs at a bar, or restaurant lounge	119	\$292	\$100	\$393	\$100
Purchased Sport Select tickets	34	\$274	\$60	\$143	\$25
Bet money on sports online	61	\$185	\$61	\$236	\$53
Played bingo for money	50	\$111	\$54	\$44	\$30
Purchased scratch/instant win or lottery tickets in-person	549	\$86	\$20	\$68	\$20
Bet money on games of skill	50	\$76	\$20	\$550	\$20
Purchased lottery tickets online	60	\$67	\$27	\$53	\$20
Purchased charity raffle or fundraising tickets	242	\$48	\$25	\$92	\$40
Played card games with family or friends for money	75	\$43	\$17	\$57	\$20
* CAUTION: Very small sample size					
BASE: Those who gamble on the activity at least monthly.					



4.6 Reasons for gambling

Respondents who report gambling on the activity at least monthly were also asked about the main reasons they take part in the gambling activity.⁶ The most common reasons (mentioned by at least 5%) are outlined below.

- Purchase lottery tickets from store or kiosk (n = 549). Most common reasons are to win money (53%), convenience (15%), for fun/entertainment (9%), and don't go online/prefer in person (6%).
- **Purchase charity raffle or fundraising tickets (n = 242)**. Most common reasons are *to support charity/causes* (86%) and to *win money* (12%).
- **Play VLTs at bar or lounge (n = 119)**. Most common reasons are for fun/entertainment (39%), win money (25%), reduce boredom/something to do (16%), feeling lucky (8%), to play with friends/family (8%), and part of a night out (6%).
- **Play slot machines at casinos (n = 116)**. Most common reasons are *for fun/entertainment* (49%), *win money* (32%), *reduce boredom/something to do* (13%), and *play with friends/family* (12%).
- Play card games with family or friends for money (n = 75). Most common reasons are for fun/entertainment (58%), to play with friends/family (37%), and makes activity more interesting (9%).
- Gamble online (n = 70). Most common reasons are for fun/entertainment (31%), win money (27%), convenience (12%), better odds (9%), reduce boredom/something to do (8%), feeling lucky (6%), and have skills/knowledge to win (5%).
- Bet on sports online (n = 61). Most common reasons are to win money (37%), makes watching game more exciting (29%), for fun/entertainment (13%), for excitement (10%), and have skill/knowledge to win (7%).
- **Purchase lottery tickets online (n = 60)**. Most common reasons are *convenience* (48%) and *to win money* (21%).
- Play bingo (n = 50). Most common reasons are for fun/entertainment (32%), to play with friends/family (31%), reduce boredom/something to do (21%), win money (19%), relax/reduce stress (9%), and to support charities/causes (6%).
- Bet on games of skill with friends or family for money (n = 50). Most common reasons are makes activity more interesting (36%), for fun/entertainment (35%), to play with friends/family (25%), to win money (17%), and to reduce boredom/something to do (7%).
- **Play table games at a casino (n = 40)**. Most common reasons are *for fun/entertainment* (49%), *feeling lucky* (12%), *win money* (11%), *to play with friends/family* (10%), *have skill/knowledge to win* (8%), and *try something new* (5%).
- Purchase Sport Select tickets (n = 34). Most common reasons are makes watching game more exciting (35%), for fun/entertainment (13%), to win money (11%), have skill/knowledge to win (9%), and feeling lucky (6%).
- Bet on horse racing (n = 4). Most common reasons for *fun/entertainment* (49%) and *addicted* (21%).

⁶ Q28, Q31, Q34, Q37, Q40, Q43, Q46, Q49, Q52, Q55, Q58, Q61, Q64. What is the main reason you...



5.0 Problem gambling severity index

The Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI) uses a set of nine questions to identify gamblers' potential problem with gambling by assessing them into four categories – non-problem gambler, low-risk gambler, moderate-risk gambler, and problem gambler.

5.1 PGSI questions

Assessing the nine PGSI questions shows that among those who have gambled in the past 12 months, residents are most likely to have **felt guilty about the way they gamble or what happens when they gamble** with 10% saying they feel this way at least sometimes. Conversely, just 2% said they have at least sometimes **borrowed money or sold anything to gamble**.



PSGI questions

Q66 - Q74. In the last 12 months, how often have you... (BASE: Gambled in past 12 months, n = 1,349)



When comparing results to the nine PGSI questions to the 2002 study by the CCSA, results show only very slight differences between 2002 and 2025 among gamblers.

Table 14: PGSI	questions com	parison to	2002	gambling	study
	questions com		2002	Samoning	scuuy

	Never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Always	Don't know	
Felt guilty						
Current study (2025)	89%	9%	1%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	90%	8%	<1%	1%	<1%	
Bet more than could afford to lose						
Current study (2025)	91%	6%	1%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	93%	5%	1%	1%	<1%	
Gone back another day to win back						
money	L	I				
Current study (2025)	91%	7%	1%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	93%	6%	<1%	<1%	<1%	
Gamble larger amounts for excitement						
Current study (2025)	93%	5%	1%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	95%	4%	1%	<1%	<1%	
Felt might have a problem with gambling		-				
Current study (2025)	95%	3%	1%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	96%	3%	<1%	1%	<1%	
People criticized betting or told had						
gambling program						
Current study (2025)	95%	3%	1%	<1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	96%	4%	<1%	<1%	<1%	
Gambling caused you health problems						
Current study (2025)	95%	4%	<1%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	97%	3%	<1%	<1%	<1%	
Gambling caused financial problems						
Current study (2025)	97%	2%	<1%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	97%	2%	<1%	1%	<1%	
Borrowed money or sold anything						
Current study (2025)	97%	2%	<1%	<1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	98%	2%	<1%	<1%	<1%	



5.2 PGSI

The PGSI is calculated by assigning each response a value of 0 (never), 1 (sometimes), 2 (most of the time), and almost always (3) for each question and summing the questions to receive a score between 0 and 27.⁷ Based on the total score, respondents are classified as the following:

- 0 = Non-problem gambler
- 1-4 = Low-risk gambler
- 5 7 = Moderate-risk gambler
- 8 or higher = Problem gambler

As shown in the graph to the right, approximately 20% of gamblers and 15% of all residents are classified with at least some risk-level for gambling. This includes 2% of all residents who are classified as a problem gambler.



Key demographic differences

As shown in the following table, assessing the demographic groups that show the highest proportions of problem gamblers, those who identify as Indigenous, who speak English as an additional language, or who have a disability show the highest propensity for problem gambling. Those with a mental health condition do as well, although the difference is just above the threshold for statistical significance. In these groups, 4% score as problem gamblers, and when extended to moderate-risk gamblers, it increases to 8% to 10% within each group.

Those who said 'prefer not to answer' were assigned a score of zero (0) to the question.



7

Table 15: PGSI among demographic groups

	Proportion of adult population				
	Non- gambler	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler
Gender					
Female	25%	62%	11%	2%	1%
Male	26%	57%	13%	2%	2%
Region					
Regina	26%	61%	10%	2%	1%
Saskatoon	28%	56%	13%	2%	1%
Other Saskatchewan	23%	61%	12%	2%	2%
Age					
18 to 34	33%	48%	14%	3%	2%
35 to 49	19%	64%	13%	2%	2%
50 to 64	19%	67%	11%	1%	1%
65 and older	28%	63%	9%	1%	<1%
People in household					
1	32%	50%	15%	1%	2%
2	22%	64%	11%	2%	1%
3	23%	65%	9%	3%	-
4 or more	26%	59%	12%	2%	2%
Children 18 or younger in household					
Yes	19%	67%	11%	2%	1%
No	28%	57%	12%	2%	2%
Marital status					
Married/common-law	20%	68%	10%	1%	1%
Single	33%	45%	16%	4%	2%
Separated/divorced	24%	61%	8%	5%	3%
Widowed	33%	54%	12%	-	1%
Employment					
Employed	22%	64%	12%	1%	1%
Not employed	30%	55%	11%	3%	2%
Education					
High school or less	26%	52%	15%	4%	3%
Some post-secondary	25%	58%	15%	2%	<1%
College graduate	22%	65%	12%	1%	1%
University graduate or higher	27%	65%	7%	1%	1%
Other demographics					
Indigenous	22%	48%	21%	6%	4%
English as additional language	37%	38%	17%	5%	4%
Person with a disability	18%	56%	19%	4%	4%
Person with mental-health condition	24%	52%	15%	6%	4%
Household income					
< \$50,000	29%	46%	20%	2%	3%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	25%	57%	13%	4%	2%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	17%	75%	7%	1%	-
\$150,000 or higher	18%	70%	8%	2%	2%
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically sig	gnificant difference.				





PGSI by weekly gambling behaviors

Assessing gambling behaviors for those who gamble at least weekly shows that across almost all gambling types, weekly gambling increases with the classified risk category on the PGSI increases with a few exceptions where moderate-risk gamblers have a higher percentage of weekly gambling. The most notable difference between moderate-risk and problem gamblers is **bingo** and **purchasing Sport Select tickets** where problem gamblers are about four times more likely than moderate-risk gamblers to gamble on these activities at least weekly.

Conversely, moderate-risk gamblers are about four times more likely than problem gamblers to have **bet money on sports online**.

Table 16: PGSI by weekly (or more often) gambling behaviors

	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler
Purchased scratch/instant win or lottery tickets in-person	13%	25%	27%	29%
Purchased charity raffle or fundraising tickets	2%	3%	10%	9%
Played VLTs	1%	10%	37%	38%
Bet money on sports online	1%	7%	24%	6%
Played slot machines at a casino	1%	5%	22%	14%
Played bingo for money	1%	5%	5%	21%
Purchased lottery tickets online	1%	3%	4%	7%
Played card games with family or friends for money	1%	2%	7%	8%
Purchased Sport Select tickets	1%	2%	3%	14%
Bet money on games of skill with friends or family	1%	1%	5%	11%
Bet money online, excluding sports betting	<1%	10%	8%	19%
Played table games at casino	<1%	1%	10%	11%
Bet on horse racing	-	-	-	7%
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.			·	





5.3 Comparison to 2002 Saskatchewan gambling study

Overall PGSI

Comparing the PGSI results from the current study to the previous study conducted in 2002 by the CCSA indicates some slight shifts, primarily an increase in low-risk and problem gamblers offset by fewer moderate-risk gamblers. However, it should be noted that the scoring criteria for the PGSI changed in 2013 (Currie, Hodgins & Casey, 2013) to expand the category for low-risk gamblers to scores from 1 to 4 and decrease the category for moderate-risk gamblers from 3 to 7 to 5 to 7.

Although the increase in problem gamblers is not a statistical change, it may be considered a practical change, as the 2002 study indicate approximately 5,600 to 13,200 residents could have a serious gambling problem, which could be approximately 17,000 residents based on current population estimates.⁸

Table 17: PGSI by gambling study

	Proportion of adult population						
	Non- gambler	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler		
Current study (2025)	25%	60%	12%	2%	2%		
Previous study (2002)	13%	71%	9%	5%	1%		

PGSI by demographic groups

Data from the 2002 survey was not available, so comparisons among demographic groups between the 2002 and the current study are made in this section where groups were comparable. This includes gender, region, marital status, and Indigenous people. However, it should be noted that without the survey data, comparisons are made for information purposes only, as statistical testing of differences could not be applied.

Tables 15 to 18 show only slight changes except for Indigenous respondents. In 2002, 20% were classified in as moderate-risk or problem gamblers compared to 10% in 2025.

Table 18: PGSI by gambling study by gender

	Proportion of adult population				
	Non- gambler	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler
Female					
Current study (2025)	25%	62%	11%	2%	1%
Previous study (2002)	14%	75%	8%	2%	1%
Male					
Current study (2025)	26%	57%	13%	2%	2%
Previous study (2002)	13%	67%	11%	7%	1%

⁸

Based on approximately 870,000 Saskatchewan residents 18 years and older, based on Statistics Canada 2021 Census information retrieved from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2021/as-sa/fogs-spg/alternative.cfm?topic=2&lang=e&dguid=2021A000247&objectId=1.



Table 19: PGSI by gambling study by region

	Proportion of adult population					
	Non- gambler	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler	
Regina						
Current study (2025)	26%	61%	10%	2%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	11%	69%	12%	8%	1%	
Saskatoon						
Current study (2025)	28%	56%	13%	2%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	15%	69%	7%	8%	2%	
Other Saskatchewan						
Current study (2025)	23%	61%	12%	2%	2%	
Previous study (2002)	14%	73%	9%	3%	1%	

Table 20: PGSI by gambling study by marital status

	Proportion of adult population					
	Non- gambler	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler	
Married/common-law						
Current study (2025)	20%	68%	10%	1%	1%	
Previous study (2002)	12%	76%	8%	4%	1%	
Single						
Current study (2025)	33%	45%	16%	4%	2%	
Previous study (2002)	16%	62%	14%	7%	2%	
Separated/divorced						
Current study (2025)	24%	61%	8%	5%	3%	
Previous study (2002)	9%	73%	9%	7%	1%	
Widowed						
Current study (2025)	33%	54%	12%	-	1%	
Previous study (2002)	22%	66%	10%	3%	-	

Table 21: PGSI by gambling study by Indigenous

	Proportion of adult population				
	Non- gambler	Non- problem gambler	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler
Indigenous					
Current study (2025)	22%	48%	21%	6%	4%
Previous study (2002)	18%	44%	19%	10%	10%



PGSI by weekly gambling behaviors

The table below compares weekly gambling behaviors by gambling type to the 2002 study for 11 of the 13 types of gambling (bet sports online or purchased lottery online were not asked in 2002). The changes among problem gamblers should be interpreted with caution, as sample sizes are small (n < 40).

Table 22: PGSI by weekly gambling behaviors

	Non- problem	Low-risk gambler	Moderate- risk gambler	Problem gambler		
Countrals (in atoms win on lattern stals to *	gambler					
Scratch/Instant win or lottery tickets*	120/	250/	270/	200/		
Current study (2025)	13%	25%	27%	29%		
Charity raffle or fundraising tickets	32%	39%	48%	43%		
Current study (2025)	2%	2%	10%	0%		
Previous study (2023)	1%	2%	5%	570		
VITs	170	270	570			
Current study (2025)	1%	10%	37%	38%		
Previous study (2023)	6%	15%	26%	61%		
Slot machines	0,0	2070		01/0		
Current study (2025)	1%	5%	22%	14%		
Previous study (2002)	2%	5%	10%	-		
Bingo		1				
Current study (2025)	1%	5%	5%	21%		
Previous study (2002)	22%	24%	31%	27%		
Card games with family or friends				-		
Current study (2025)	1%	2%	7%	8%		
Previous study (2002)	12%	6%	19%	67%		
Sport Select	-	-				
Current study (2025)	1%	2%	3%	14%		
Previous study (2002)	14%	20%	57%	50%		
Games of skill	1	1				
Current study (2025)	1%	1%	5%	11%		
Previous study (2002)	12%	20%	30%	50%		
Bet money online	1		1			
Current study (2025)	<1%	10%	8%	19%		
Previous study (2002)	-	-	-	-		
Table games at casino		1				
Current study (2025)	<1%	1%	10%	11%		
Previous study (2002)	5%	-	3%	33%		
Horse racing						
Current study (2025)	-	-	-	7%		
Previous study (2002)	7%	14%	25%	33%		
Table games at casinoCurrent study (2025)Previous study (2002)Horse racingCurrent study (2025)Previous study (2002)* The comparison to 2002 is for lottery ticket	<1% 5% - 7% s only. Instant wi	1% - - 14% p/scratch tickets v	10% 3% - 25% were asked separa	11% 33% 7% 33% tely.		



6.0 Positive Play Scale

The Positive Play Scale (PPS) was developed by Wood, Whol, Tabri, and Philander as a way to measure responsible-gaming beliefs and behaviors among gamblers. The PPS includes four sub-scales: honesty and control, pre-commitment, personal responsibility, and gambling literacy. These sub-scales help to identify areas where populations or segments may need targeted information or resources.

For each sub-scale, respondents are categorized into high, medium, or low PPS based on the following conditions:

- Low PPS: At least one sub-scale question is rated 3 or lower.
- Medium PPS: All questions rated 4 or higher, with at least one rated 4 or 5 out of 7.
- High PPS: All questions rated 6 or 7 out of 7.

For sub-scale scores, only those questions respondents provided an answer to are included in the categorization of low, medium, or high PPS.

Assessment of PPS by PGSI

This section assesses relationships between PGSI categories and PPS scores; however, it should be noted that the PGSI and PPS have to separate and exclusive functions. The PGSI is meant to assess the likelihood that an individual has or may develop a gambling problem, while the PPS measures an individual's knowledge and beliefs about gambling. A low PPS is not necessarily a sign of problem gambling and conversely a problem gambler may exhibit high PPS.

Therefore, the assessment of the relationship between them is to determine whether problem gamblers show higher rates of low PPS on sub-scales to determine where appropriate information and RG messaging may be most appropriate.





6.1 Honesty and control

Sub-scale questions

Honesty and control comprise the three questions shown in the graph below.



Sub-scale

The sub-scale score for Honesty and Control yields 87% of gamblers who are positive players (high).

Honesty and Control sub-scale

(BASE: Those who gambled in the past 12 months, n = 1,316)



Key demographic differences

Assessing the Honesty and Control sub-scale those who are either in the lowest income households (under \$50,000), Indigenous people, those who are widowed, or those with high school or lower education are least likely to have a High PPS score on this sub-scale.



Table 23: Honesty and Control sub-scale by demographic groups

	High	Medium	Low			
Gender						
Female	88%	6%	6%			
Male	85%	7%	8%			
Region		I				
Regina	85%	8%	7%			
Saskatoon	88%	7%	5%			
Other Saskatchewan	87%	5%	8%			
Age						
18 to 34	86%	8%	6%			
35 to 49	89%	5%	6%			
50 to 64	88%	6%	7%			
65 and older	85%	6%	9%			
People in household						
1	83%	6%	12%			
2	89%	5%	6%			
3	87%	7%	6%			
4 or more	89%	7%	4%			
Children 18 or younger in household						
Yes	88%	7%	5%			
No	86%	6%	8%			
Marital status						
Married/common-law	90%	5%	5%			
Single	83%	9%	8%			
Separated/divorced	85%	6%	9%			
Widowed	79%	5%	16%			
Employment						
Employed	89%	6%	5%			
Not employed	85%	7%	8%			
Education						
High school or less	81%	8%	11%			
Some post-secondary	89%	7%	4%			
College graduate	91%	5%	5%			
University graduate or higher	90%	6%	4%			
Other demographics						
Indigenous	78%	10%	12%			
English as additional language	78%	11%	11%			
Person with a disability	85%	9%	6%			
Person with mental-health condition	85%	7%	7%			
Household income	Household income					
< \$50,000	78%	8%	14%			
\$50,000 - \$99,999	85%	9%	6%			
\$100,000 - \$149,999	92%	5%	4%			
\$150,000 or higher	95%	2%	3%			
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.						



By PGSI

The proportion of respondents who classify as low on the PPS for Honesty and Control significantly increases the higher the PGSI score. In fact, problem gamblers are approximately 10 times more likely to have a low PPS for Honesty and Control than non-problem gamblers.

Table 24: Honesty and control sub-scale by PGSI

	High PPS	Medium PPS	Low PPS		
PGSI					
Problem gambler	43%	8%	49%		
Moderate-risk gambler	32%	39%	30%		
Low-risk gambler	75%	15%	10%		
Non-problem gambler	92%	4%	5%		
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.					



6.2 Pre-commitment

Sub-scale questions

Pre-commitment is comprised of the four questions shown in the graph below.



Sub-scale

The sub-scale score for Pre-commitment yields 85% of gamblers who are positive players (high).



Key demographic differences

Those in the lowest income households (under \$50,000), Indigenous people, or those whose first language is not English are more likely to have a low PPS than their counterparts.



Table 25: Pre-commitment sub-scale by demographic groups

	High	Medium	Low	
Gender				
Female	86%	8%	7%	
Male	84%	8%	8%	
Region				
Regina	86%	7%	7%	
Saskatoon	86%	10%	4%	
Other Saskatchewan	83%	7%	10%	
Age				
18 to 34	85%	10%	5%	
35 to 49	86%	8%	7%	
50 to 64	87%	6%	7%	
65 and older	82%	8%	10%	
People in household				
1	84%	7%	10%	
2	86%	7%	8%	
3	84%	10%	6%	
4 or more	86%	9%	5%	
Children 18 or younger in household	·			
Yes	84%	10%	6%	
No	85%	7%	8%	
Marital status	·			
Married/common-law	86%	7%	7%	
Single	85%	10%	5%	
Separated/divorced	82%	7%	11%	
Widowed	79%	6%	15%	
Employment				
Employed	86%	8%	6%	
Not employed	83%	8%	9%	
Education				
High school or less	80%	11%	9%	
Some post-secondary	86%	9%	6%	
College graduate	88%	5%	7%	
University graduate or higher	87%	6%	7%	
Other demographics				
Indigenous	74%	14%	12%	
English as additional language	69%	19%	11%	
Person with a disability	79%	10%	11%	
Person with mental-health condition	74%	16%	11%	
Household income				
< \$50,000	78%	12%	10%	
\$50,000 - \$99,999	80%	12%	8%	
\$100,000 - \$149,999	90%	5%	5%	
\$150,000 or higher	90%	4%	6%	
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.				



By PGSI

The proportion of respondents who classify as low on the PPS for Pre-commitment significantly increases as the PGSI score increases. In fact, problem gamblers are approximately sevsn times more likely to have a low PPS for Pre-commitment than non-problem gamblers.

Table 26: Pre-commitment sub-scale by PGSI

	High	Medium	Low		
PGSI					
Problem gambler	44%	14%	42%		
Moderate-risk gambler	28%	39%	33%		
Low-risk gambler	74%	18%	7%		
Non-problem gambler	90%	5%	6%		
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.					





6.3 Personal responsibility

Sub-scale questions

Personal Responsibility is comprised of the four questions shown in the graph below.



Sub-scale

The sub-scale score for Personal Responsibility yields 93% of gamblers who are positive players (high).





Key demographic differences

Assessing the Personal Responsibility sub-scale, those living alone, Indigenous people or those who speak English as an additional language have significantly higher low PPS scores than their counterparts.



Table 27: Personal Responsibility sub-scale by demographic groups

	High	Medium	Low	
Gender				
Female	94%	3%	3%	
Male	92%	4%	4%	
Region	5270	170	170	
Regina	93%	3%	4%	
Saskatoon	93%	5%	2%	
Other Saskatchewan	93%	4%	4%	
Age				
18 to 34	93%	3%	4%	
35 to 49	92%	5%	3%	
50 to 64	93%	4%	3%	
65 and older	94%	3%	3%	
People in household				
1	90%	4%	7%	
2	96%	2%	2%	
3	93%	5%	3%	
4 or more	94%	5%	2%	
Children 18 or younger in household		1		
Yes	93%	5%	2%	
No	93%	3%	3%	
Marital status				
Married/common-law	96%	3%	2%	
Single	90%	5%	5%	
Separated/divorced	89%	3%	8%	
Widowed	94%	2%	4%	
Employment				
Employed	95%	3%	2%	
Not employed	92%	4%	4%	
Education				
High school or less	92%	4%	4%	
Some post-secondary	95%	4%	2%	
College graduate	96%	3%	2%	
University graduate or higher	94%	4%	3%	
Other demographics				
Indigenous	86%	9%	5%	
English as additional language	83%	8%	8%	
Person with a disability	90%	4%	5%	
Person with mental-health condition	86%	7%	7%	
Household income				
< \$50,000	89%	5%	6%	
\$50,000 - \$99,999	93%	4%	3%	
\$100,000 - \$149,999	96%	1%	3%	
\$150,000 or higher	96%	2%	2%	
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.				



By PGSI

The proportion of respondents who classify as low on the PPS for Personal Responsibility significantly increases the higher their PGSI score. Just 1% of non-problem gamblers have a low PPS score for Personal Responsibility compared to 37% for problem gamblers.

Table 28: Personal Responsibility sub-scale by PGSI

	High	Medium	Low		
PGSI					
Problem gambler	38%	25%	37%		
Moderate-risk gambler	54%	20%	26%		
Low-risk gambler	87%	7%	6%		
Non-problem gambler	97%	2%	1%		
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.					



6.4 Gambling literacy

Sub-scale questions

Gambling Literacy is comprised of the three questions shown in the graph below.



* Questions are reversed scored (i.e., response of 7 = 1, 6 = 2, etc.)

Sub-scale

The sub-scale score for Gambling Literacy yields 75% of gamblers who are positive players (high).

Gambling Literacy sub-scale



Key demographic differences

Assessing the Gambling Literacy sub-scale shows many differences among demographic groups. Most notably men, 18 to 34 year olds, those who are single, those with high school or lower education, Indigenous people, those who speak English as an additional language, or those in the lowest household income group all have the lowest sub-scale scores.



Table 29: Gambling Literacy sub-scale by demographic groups

	High	Medium	Low			
Gender						
Female	80%	7%	13%			
Male	70%	11%	19%			
Region						
Regina	76%	7%	17%			
Saskatoon	74%	10%	16%			
Other Saskatchewan	75%	9%	16%			
Age						
18 to 34	64%	18%	18%			
35 to 49	79%	7%	14%			
50 to 64	80%	5%	15%			
65 and older	77%	4%	19%			
People in household						
1	74%	8%	18%			
2	78%	6%	16%			
3	75%	12%	14%			
4 or more	73%	11%	17%			
Children 18 or younger in household		· · · · · ·				
Yes	74%	10%	15%			
No	76%	8%	17%			
Marital status		· · · · ·				
Married/common-law	79%	6%	15%			
Single	69%	15%	16%			
Separated/divorced	70%	9%	21%			
Widowed	77%	2%	21%			
Employment						
Employed	77%	9%	14%			
Not employed	72%	8%	19%			
Education						
High school or less	64%	13%	23%			
Some post-secondary	72%	14%	15%			
College graduate	85%	4%	11%			
University graduate or higher	80%	6%	14%			
Other demographics						
Indigenous	58%	19%	23%			
English as additional language	54%	17%	29%			
Person with a disability	67%	10%	23%			
Person with mental-health condition	74%	9%	17%			
Household income						
< \$50,000	63%	13%	24%			
\$50,000 - \$99,999	73%	9%	19%			
\$100,000 - \$149,999	84%	7%	9%			
\$150,000 or higher	83%	9%	7%			
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.						



By PGSI

The proportion of respondents who classify as low on PPS scale for Gambling Literacy significantly increases the higher the PGSI score, with problem gamblers being more than three times more likely to classify as low gambling literacy on the PPS.

Table 30: Gambling Literacy sub-scale by PGSI

	High	Medium	Low		
PGSI					
Problem gambler	34%	17%	49%		
Moderate-risk gambler	34%	40%	26%		
Low-risk gambler	63%	13%	23%		
Non-problem gambler	79%	7%	14%		
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.					

6.5 Sub-scale comparison

Comparing the four sub-scales shows Saskatchewan gamblers are much more likely to score high on the PPS for Personal Responsibility and much lower for Gambling Literacy.







6.6 PPS Scores

An average score for each component and an overall average score were created using a simple sum of values for each component and then creating a percentage score, that is, each question is asked using a seven-point scale (1 - 7). If a respondent did not answer a question, the score was calculated out of the questions answered. For Gambling Literacy - two questions ("My chances of winning...", "If I gamble more often...") were reversed scored before creating the average.

- Honesty and Control Sum of three questions divided by 21 x 100
- Pre-Commitment Sum of four questions divided by 28 x 100
- Personal Responsibility Sum of four questions divided by 28 x 100
- Gambling Literacy Sum of three questions divided by 21 x 100
- Overall PPS Sum of 14 questions divided by 98 x 100



PPS Scores

(BASE: Those who gambled in the past 12 months, n = 1,349)

Key demographic differences

Assessing PPS scores by demographic sub-groups indicates the following:

- Gender. Men have a lower Gambling Literacy score than women.
- **Number of members in household**. Those who live alone tend to have lower scores for PPS and all sub-scales, but the difference is significant only for Personal Responsibility.
- **Education**. Those with high school or lower education tend to have lower PPS and sub-scale scores, but the difference is significant only for Gambling Literacy and overall PPS score.
- **Indigenous**. Indigenous respondents have a lower Gambling Literacy score than their counterparts, as well as a lower overall PPS score.
- English as an additional language. Respondents who speak English as an additional language have a lower Gambling Literacy score than their counterparts, as well as a lower overall PPS score.
- Household income. Those in the lowest income households (less than \$50,000) have lower scores for all sub-scales and the overall PPS, although it is significantly different for the overall PPS, Honesty and Control, and Gambling Literacy.



Table 31: PPS scores by demographic groups

		Dorconol	Honosty and	Dro	Compling		
	PPS	Personal	Control	FIE-	Litoroov		
Condon		Responsibility	Control	communent	Literacy		
Gender	06%	0.00/	0.6%	06%	0.4%		
Mala	90%	90%	90%	90%	94%		
Pagion	Ividie 95% 95% 95% 91%						
Region	0.5%	07%	0.4%	05%	0.2%		
Saskatoon	95%	97%	94%	95%	93%		
Other Sackatchowan	90%	90%	90%	90%	92/0		
	95%	90%	95%	94%	95%		
18 to 24	05%	08%	06%	06%	0.0%		
25 to 49	95%	98%	90%	90%	90%		
50 to 64	90%	98%	90%	90%	94%		
50 to 64	90%	90%	95%	90%	94%		
Poople in household	9370	5070	9470	9378	5570		
	0.49/	06%	0.2%	0.49/	0.2%		
2	94%	90%	95%	94%	92%		
2	90%	99%	90%	95%	94%		
	90%	<u> </u>	95%	90%	0.2%		
4 of more	90%	99%	97%	9770	9270		
Voc	06%	08%	07%	06%	0.2%		
No	90%	98%	97%	90%	92%		
Marital status	5570	5870	5576	5578	5570		
Married/common-law	96%	99%	96%	95%	94%		
Single	95%	97%	95%	96%	91%		
Single Separated/divorced	93%	95%	94%	91%	90%		
Widowed	95%	99%	92%	93%	93%		
Fmployment	3370	5570	5270	33/0	5576		
Employed	96%	99%	96%	96%	93%		
Not employed	95%	98%	95%	94%	92%		
Education	3370	50/1	5570	5170	5270		
High school or less	94%	97%	93%	94%	89%		
Some post-secondary	96%	99%	96%	96%	92%		
College graduate	97%	99%	97%	95%	95%		
University graduate or higher	96%	98%	97%	96%	94%		
Other demographics							
Indigenous	93%	97%	92%	93%	88%		
English as additional language	92%	96%	92%	91%	86%		
Person with a disability	94%	97%	96%	94%	91%		
Person with mental-health condition	94%	96%	95%	93%	92%		
Household income							
< \$50,000	93%	97%	92%	93%	89%		
\$50,000 - \$99,999	95%	98%	95%	95%	91%		
\$100,000 - \$149,999	97%	99%	97%	97%	95%		
\$150,000 or higher	97%	99%	98%	96%	96%		
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.							

57



By PGSI

The PPS score decreases as problem gambling increases, which is also consistent across the four subscales.

Table 32: PPS scores by PGSI

	PPS	Personal responsibility	Honesty and control	Pre- commitment	Gambling literacy
PGSI					
Problem gambler	75%	80%	74%	73%	72%
Moderate-risk gambler	81%	87%	79%	79%	79%
Low-risk gambler	93%	97%	93%	94%	89%
Non-problem gambler	97%	99%	97%	96%	94%
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.					





7.0 Gambling consequences

7.1 Urge to gamble

Among those who have gambled in the past 12 months, 3% said that they **had the urge to gamble when something painful has happened in their life**. When assessing by demographic groups, 11% of those who identify as having a mental health problem said they had the urge to gamble.

Table 33: Urge to gamble by demographic groups

Q89. If something painful happened in your life in the past 12 months, did you have the urge to gamble?

	Urge to gamble			
Gamblers (n = 1,349)	3%			
Gender	1			
Female	3%			
Male	3%			
Region				
Regina	4%			
Saskatoon	2%			
Other Saskatchewan	4%			
Age				
18 to 34	6%			
35 to 49	4%			
50 to 64	3%			
65 and older	1%			
People in household				
1	4%			
2	2%			
3	5%			
4 or more	5%			
Children under 18 in household				
Yes	3%			
No	4%			
Marital status				
Married/common-law	3%			
Single	5%			
Separated/divorced	8%			
Widowed	2%			
Employment				
Employed	3%			
Not employed	4%			
Education				
High school or less	7%			
Some post-secondary	2%			
College graduate	2%			
University graduate or higher	2%			
Other demographics				
Indigenous	6%			
English as additional language	8%			
Person with a disability	8%			
Person with mental-health condition	11%			



	Urge to gamble	
Household income		
< \$50,000	7%	
\$50,000 - \$99,999	3%	
\$100,000 - \$149,999	1%	
\$150,000 or higher	3%	
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.		

Urge to gamble by PGSI

As noted in the table below, the higher the PGSI, the greater the proportion who said **they have an urge to gamble when something painful happened in their life**.

Table 34: Urge to gamble by PGSI

Q89. If something painful happened in your life in the past 12 months, did you have the urge to gamble?

	Urge to gamble	
Gamblers (n = 1,349)	3%	
PGSI		
Problem gambler	45%	
Moderate-risk gambler	23%	
Low-risk gambler	7%	
Non-problem gambler	1%	
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.		

7.2 Perceptions of problem gambling

Among the 3% (n = 37), who said they **felt they might have a gambling problem**⁹, just 17% received professional help, while 16% thought about it, but did not try to access help. None indicated that they tried to seek help but are still waiting. Groups that tended to score higher on the PGSI (Indigenous, person with a disability, those who speak English as an additional language, and those with a mental health condition), also are those with the highest proportion who feel they might have a gambling problem (see table on the following page).



9

Q91. Did you try to get professional help for your gambling?

Table 35: Felt have a problem by demographic groups

Q90. In the past 12 months, have you felt that you might have a gambling problem?

	Felt had a gambling
	problem
Gamblers (n = 1,349)	3%
Gender	1
Female	2%
Male	4%
Region	·
Regina	2%
Saskatoon	2%
Other Saskatchewan	4%
Age	
18 to 34	3%
35 to 49	4%
50 to 64	3%
65 and older	1%
People in household	
1	3%
2	3%
3	2%
4 or more	3%
Children under 18 in household	1
Yes	4%
No	3%
Marital status	1
Married/common-law	2%
Single	4%
Separated/divorced	3%
Widowed	2%
Employment	1
Employed	2%
Not employed	4%
Education	
High school or less	5%
Some post-secondary	1%
College graduate	3%
University graduate or higher	1%
Other demographics	
Indigenous	7%
English as additional language	6%
Person with a disability	7%
Person with mental-health condition	8%
Household income	1
< \$50,000	7%
\$50,000 - \$99,999	2%
\$100,000 - \$149,999	1%
\$150,000 or higher	anificant difference





Felt had a problem by PGSI

As noted in the table below, the higher the PGSI, the greater the proportion who said **they feel they might have a gambling problem**.

Table 36: Felt had a problem by PGSI

Q90. In the past 12 months, have you felt that you might have a gambling problem?

	Urge to gamble	
Gamblers (n = 1,349)	3%	
PGSI		
Problem gambler	59%	
Moderate-risk gambler	20%	
Low-risk gambler	5%	
Non-problem gambler	<1%	
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.		



8.0 Other behaviors

This section examines the relationship between gambling and alcohol and cannabis use among survey respondents. As noted earlier in the report, studies have found relationships between alcohol dependence and problem gambling, although any casual relationship between them is unknown. Similarly, Canadian research has shown a co-occurrence of gambling and cannabis use, as well as a relationship to problem gambling (McGrath et al., 2023).

8.1 Alcohol consumption

Among all residents, 74% have consumed at least one drink containing alcohol in the past year, including 34% who consumed at least one drink per week. Among those who consumed alcohol (n = 1,331), the average number of drinks consumed in the past week was 3.2 with a median of 1.0.¹⁰



¹⁰ Q93. Thinking about the past seven days, how many drinks have you consumed?



Alcohol consumption by PGSI

Although there is a significant difference by PGSI for the frequency of alcohol consumption, it is primarily driven by the fact that non-gamblers are less likely to have consumed alcohol at least weekly relative to all gamblers. With that being said, there are observed differences in the amount of alcohol consumed, as problem and moderate-risk gamblers consumed significantly more alcohol on average relative to low-risk and non-problem gamblers.

Table 37: Alcohol consumption and average drinks per week by PGSI

	Consumed alcohol at least weekly	Average drinks consumed in past week
PGSI		
Problem gambler	42%	6.7
Moderate-risk gambler	37%	14.8
Low-risk gambler	33%	3.7
Non-problem gambler	40%	3.1
Non-gambler	20%	1.9
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant di	ifference.	

8.2 Recreational cannabis use

Among all residents, 22% have used cannabis for recreational purposes at least once in the past year, including 11% who use it at least once per week. Among those who have used cannabis for recreational purposes in the past year (n = 400), respondents have used 3.4 times on average in the past week with a median use of 1.0^{11}



Q95. Thinking about the past seven days, how many times have you used cannabis for recreational purposes?



11

Cannabis use by PGSI

Problem gamblers are two to three times more likely than other gamblers to have used cannabis for recreational purposes at least weekly in the past year. It should be noted that the sample size of recreational cannabis users is too small to assess differences in the amount of cannabis use in the past week.

	Used cannabis at least weekly	
PGSI		
Problem gambler	33%	
Moderate-risk gambler	17%	
Low-risk gambler	19%	
Non-problem gambler	10%	
Non-gamblers	8%	
Note: Bolded percentages indicate a statistically significant difference.		

Table 38: Cannabis use by PGSI



65



9.0 Survey key findings

Changes in gambling from 2002

Since the last provincial survey conducted by the CCSA in 2002, there has been a shift in problem gambling rates in the province. Although the proportion defined as problem gamblers increased from 1% to 2%, the proportion of moderate-risk gamblers decreased from 5% to 2%. In addition, the proportion of non-gamblers nearly doubled from 13% in 2002 to 25% in the current survey. Therefore, it appears that gambling may have become more polarized in Saskatchewan over the past 20 years.

The decline in overall gambling appears to primarily due to a decline in lottery ticket purchasing, as 63% of residents in 2001 had purchased lottery tickets in the past 12 months compared to 52% in the current survey, along with a decline in charity raffles (down from 64% to 52%). Other gambling behaviors were relatively unchanged including VLTs (18% in 2001 versus 17% in current survey), bingo (8% in 2001 versus 7% in current survey), and Sport Select (5% in 2001 versus 4% in current survey).

Key demographics

Throughout the survey there is consistent evidence that those who identify as Indigenous and those who do not speak English as their first language show higher propensity for problem gambling. In addition, these groups typically scored lower on all PPS sub-scales and also began gambling at younger ages.

The primary difference between these groups is that Indigenous respondents tended to gamble more frequently on various types of gambling, specifically VLTs, online gambling, visiting casinos, and purchasing charity tickets. Conversely, those who speak English as an additional language did not indicate significantly higher frequency of gambling relative to other populations, but did score lower on all PPS sub-scales.

Gambling behaviors

There is some evidence that problem gamblers may be engaging with certain types of gambling more often than other types, specifically VLTs and bingo. For these three types of gambling, the proportion who gamble on each weekly increases approximately three to four times relative to low-risk and at least 1 in 5 problem gamblers take part weekly – 10% to 38% for VLTs and 5% to 21% for bingo. Conversely, lottery tickets seem to have less relationship with problem gambling, as the proportion of problem gamblers who purchase lottery tickets weekly is virtually the same as low-risk gamblers – 29% versus 25%.

There is also high co-morbidity among some gambling behaviors, with high rates of interaction between EGMs (i.e., VLTs and slots), as 49% of weekly slot players also play VLTs weekly. There is also some relationship with table game play at casinos and EGM play, with high rates of correlation in weekly play for table games players and EGMs.

Of interest, almost all frequency of gambling increases as the risk of problem gambling increases, with two notable exceptions – **bet money on sports online** and **play slot machines at the casino**. For slot machines, 22% of gamblers are moderate-risk, falling to 14% of gamblers exhibiting problem gambling behaviours. The change is greater for sport betting online where 24% of players are at moderate-risk but only 6% are classified as problem gamblers.


Responsible gambling

Although the mean PPS scores were high across all four categories (92% or higher), sub-scale scoring indicated higher rates of medium and low PPS for Gambling Literacy. Having lower Gambling Literacy scores is consistent with other Canadian research (Wood et al, 2017).



Appendix A – Questionnaire



LOTTERIES AND GAMING SASKATCHEWAN GAMBLING PREVALENCE STUDY

INTRO. Hello, my name is ______ and I am calling from PRA Inc. on behalf of Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan on Saskatchewan about a survey we are doing about residents' experiences with and attitudes towards gambling. Your response will help Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan develop new programs and services in the province.

The survey should takes a few minutes to complete, and all your responses are confidential. Do you have a few minutes to complete the survey with me?

Yes **[GO TO Q1]** Refusal

INTR1. Would you prefer to complete the survey online by receiving a link via email or text?

Yes, email [GO TO EML] Yes, text [GO TO TXT] No [END]

EML. May I please have your first name and email?

FIRST NAME:	
EMAIL:	

EML2. Thank you. You should receive an email in a few minutes with the subject line "Survey for Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan". We would appreciate if you could take a few minutes to complete it today. Have a good night.

TXT. May I please have your first name and the best number to text you a link?

FIRST NAME: ______

TXT2. Thank you. You should receive a text in a few minutes with a link to the survey. We would appreciate if you could take a few minutes to complete it today. Have a good night.

ONLINE INTRO

Thank you very much for your interest in this survey we are conducting for Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan on Saskatchewan residents' experiences with and attitudes towards gambling. Your response will help Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan develop new programs and services in the province. The survey should take about 10 to 15 minutes to complete, and all your responses are confidential. You can stop the survey at any time and return to the last question you were on using the link supplied to you in the email or text you received. Please click the button below to begin the survey.



PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS OF GAMBLING

1. In the last 12 months, which of the following have you done in Saskatchewan? Select all that apply.

Visited a casino Bought lottery tickets, either from a store or online Played Video Lottery Terminals (VLTs) Bet money online, either for gaming or sports None of the above [EXCLUSIVE] Don't know [EXCLUSIVE]

2. [ASK IF Q1 = BET MONEY ONLINE] Which online apps or websites have you used in the past 12 months?

PlayNow	
Other (specify):	
Don't know	

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied, please rate the following thinking about the past 12 months.

		Very dissatisfied				Very satisfied	Don't know
3.	[IF Q1=CASINO] Overall experience at	1	2	3	4	5	9
	Saskatchewan casinos						
4.	[IF Q1=LOTTERIES] Overall	1	2	3	4	5	9
	experience playing lottery tickets						
5.	[IF Q1=VLTS] Overall experience	1	2	3	4	5	9
	playing VLTs						
6.	[IF Q2=PLAYNOW] Overall experience	1	2	3	4	5	9
	using PlayNow						
7.	[IF Q2 IS NOT PLAYNOW] Overall	1	2	3	4	5	9
	experience with online gaming or						
	sports betting						

On a scale of 1 to 5, with 1 being not aware at all and 5 being very aware, how aware are you of responsible gambling programs, features or services for the following.

		Not aware at all				Very aware	Don't know
8.	[IF Q1=CASINO] In Saskatchewan	1	2	3	4	5	9
	casinos						
9.	[IF Q1=LOTTERIES] For lottery ticket	1	2	3	4	5	9
	players in Saskatchewan						
10.	[IF Q1=VLTS] For VLT players	1	2	3	4	5	9
11.	[IF Q2=PLAYNOW] On PlayNow.com	1	2	3	4	5	9
12.	[IF Q2 IS NOT PLAYNOW] For online	1	2	3	4	5	9
	gamblers and sports bettors						



GAMBLING BEHAVIORS

First, we'd like to ask some questions about gambling activities you may or may not have participated in. For each of the following, please let me know how often you have typically gambled on these activities in the past 12 months. In the past 12 months, how often have you...

	Daily	A few	Once a	Monthly	At least	Not in	Never	Don't
		times a	week		once	the past		know
		week				12		
						months		
13. Purchased scratch/instant win								
tickets or lottery tickets in-person								
14. Purchased lottery tickets online								
15. Purchased charity raffle or								
fundraising tickets, including charity								
lotteries and 50/50s								
16. Played bingo for money								
17. Played slot machines at a casino								
18. Played VLTs at a bar, or restaurant								
lounge								
19. Played table games at casino ¹²								
20. Bet money online, excluding sports								
betting								
21. Bet on horse racing, either live or								
off-track								
22. Played card games with family or								
friends for money								
23. Purchased Sport Select tickets to bet								
money on sports from a store or								
lottery kiosk								
24. Bet money on sports online ¹³								
25. Bet money on games of skill, such as								
pool, golf, darts or other games,								
with friends or family								



¹² Common table games include blackjack, roulette, poker, baccarat, or craps

¹³ Common sites include PlayNow, Bet365, Bodog

[ASK FOR EACH CORRESPONDING Q13 TO Q25 THAT IS MONTHLY OR MORE]

Thank you. We are now going to get a bit more detailed information about your gambling habits in the past 12 months.

LOTTERY TICKETS IN-PERSON

26. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend on purchasing scratch, instant win, or lottery tickets from a store or kiosk?
 RECORD: _____ [\$1 TO \$999,998]

RECORD.		 [JT IO	ככ,ככק
Less than	\$1		
Don't kno	W		

 What is the most you spent in a single day on lottery tickets purchased from a store or kiosk? RECORD: _____ [\$1 TO \$999,998]

Less than \$1 Don't know

28. What is the main reason you purchase lottery tickets from a store or kiosk?

Other (specify): _____ Don't know

LOTTERY TICKETS ONLINE

29. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend on purchasing lottery tickets online? RECORD: _____

Less than \$1 Don't know

30. What is the most you spent in a single day on lottery tickets purchased online?

RECORD: _____ Less than \$1 Don't know

31. What is the main reason you purchase lottery tickets online? Other (specify): ______ Don't know

CHARITY RAFFLE OR FUNDRAISING TICKETS

- 32. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend on charity raffle or fundraising tickets?
 RECORD: ______
 Less than \$1
 Don't know
- 33. What is the most you spent in a single day on charity raffle or fundraising tickets?

RECORD:	
Less than \$1	
Don't know	

34. What is the main reason you purchase charity raffle or fundraising tickets? Other (specify): ______ Don't know



BINGO

35. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend on bingo? RECORD: _____

Less than \$1 Don't know

36. What is the most you spent in a single day on bingo?

RECORD:	
Less than \$1	
Don't know	

37. What is the main reason you play bingo?Other (specify): ______Don't know

PLAY SLOT MACHINES AT CASINO

38. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend playing slot machines at a casino?

	_
Less than \$1	
Don't know	

39. What is the most you spent in a single day playing slot machines at a casino?

RECORD:	
Less than	\$1
Don't kno	w

40. What is the main reason you play slot machines at a casino? Other (specify): ______

Don't	know	

PLAY VLTs AT A BAR OR LOUNGE

41. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend playing VLTs at a bar or lounge?

RECORD:	
Less than	\$1
Don't kno	W

42. What is the most you spent in a single day playing VLTs at a bar or lounge?

RECORD:	
Less than \$1	
Don't know	

43. What is the main reason you play VLTs at a bar or lounge? Other (specify): ______ Don't know



PLAY TABLE GAMES AT A CASINO

44. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend playing table games at a casino? RECORD: ______

Less than \$1 Don't know

45. What is the most you spent in a single day playing table games at a casino?

RECORD:	
Less than	\$1
Don't kno	w

46. What is the main reason you play table games at a casino?
 Other (specify): ______
 Don't know

BET MONEY ONLINE

 47. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend gambling online, excluding sports betting? RECORD: _______
 Less than \$1

Don't know

48. What is the most you spent in a single day gambling online?

RECORD:	
Less than \$1	
Don't know	

49. What is the main reason you gamble online? Other (specify): _____

Don't know

BET ON HORSE RACING

50. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend betting on horse racing?

RECORD:	
Less than	\$1
Don't kno	w

51. What is the most you spent in a single day betting on horse racing?

RECORD:	
Less than	\$1
Don't kno	w

52. What is the main reason you bet on horse racing? Other (specify): _____

Don't know

PLAYING CARD GAMES WITH FAMILY AND FRENDS



54. What is the most you spent in a single day playing card games with family or friends? RECORD: ______

Less than \$1 Don't know

55. What is the main reason you play card games with family or friends for money? Other (specify): ______ Don't know

SPORT SELECT TICKETS – IN PERSON

56. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend purchasing Sport Select tickets? RECORD: _____

Less than \$1 Don't know

57. What is the most you spent in a single day purchasing Sport Select tickets?

RECORD:	
Less than	\$1
Don't kno	w

58. What is the main reason you purchase Sport Select tickets?

Other (specify):	•
Don't know	

BET MONEY ON SPORTS - ONLINE

59. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend betting money on sports online?

RECORD: _____ Less than \$1 Don't know

60. What is the most you spent in a single day betting money on sports online?

RECORD:	
Less than \$1	
Don't know	

61. What is the main reason you bet money on sports online?

Other (specify):	
Don't know	



7



GAMES OF SKILL

62. Thinking of a typical month, how much money did you spend betting on games of skill with friends or family?

RECORD: _____ Less than \$1 Don't know

63. What is the most you spent in a single day betting on games of skill with friends or family?

RECORD.	
Less than \$1	
Don't know	

64. What is the main reason you bet on games of skill with friends or family for money? Other (specify): ______

Don't know

FIRST AGE OF GAMBLING [ALL]

65. Now thinking back over your life, at what age do you think you first gambled? [PROMPT: By gambling, we mean the activities we just discussed]
 RECORD AGE: [RANGE 1 TO 100]

RECORD AGE:	[RANGE 1 TO 100
Have never gambled	
Don't know	

PGSI

[ASK THIS SECTION IF AT LEAST 1 OF Q13 TO Q25 BET IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS]

Thinking about your gambling, please indicate if you have experienced this never, sometimes, most of the time, or always in the past 12 months.

	Never	Sometimes	Most of	Always	No
			the time		response
66. Bet more than you could really afford to lose	0	1	2	3	9
67. Needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get	0	1	2	3	9
	-		_	_	
68. Gone back on another day to try to win back the money	0	1	2	3	9
you lost					
69. Borrowed money or sold anything to gamble	0	1	2	3	9
70. Felt that you might have a problem with gambling	0	1	2	3	9
71. People have criticized your betting or told you that you	0	1	2	3	9
had a gambling problem, whether or not you thought it					
was true					
72. Felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens	0	1	2	3	9
when you gamble					
73. Gambling caused you health problems, including stress	0	1	2	3	9
or anxiety					
74. Gambling caused financial problems for you or your	0	1	2	3	9
household					



POSITIVE PLAY

[ASK THIS SECTION IF AT LEAST 1 OF Q13 TO Q25 BET IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS]

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your gambling in the past month, using a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree. In the past month...

	Strongly disagree						Strongly agree	No response
BEHAVIOR – HONESTY AND CONTROL								
75. I felt in control of my gambling behaviour	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
76. I was honest with my family and friends about the amount of money I spent gambling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
77. I was honest with my family and friends about the amount of time I spent gambling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
BEHAVIOR – PRE-COMMITMENT								
78. I only gambled with money that I could afford to lose.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
79. I only spent time gambling that I could afford to spend.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
80. I considered the amount of money I was willing to lose before I gambled.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9
81. I considered the amount of time I was willing to spend before I gambled.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9

Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements about your gambling, using a scale from 1 to 7, where 1 is strongly disagree and 7 is strongly agree. I believe...

	Strongly disagree						Strongly agree	No response	
BELIEF – PERSONAL RESPONSBILITY									
82. I should be able to walk away from gambling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	
at any time									
83. I should be aware of how much money I	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	
spend when I gamble									
84. It's my responsibility to spend only money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	
that I can afford to lose									
85. I should only gamble when I have enough	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	
money to cover all my bills first									
BELIEF – GAMBLING LITERACY									
86. Gambling is not a good way to make money	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	
87. My chances of winning get better after I	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	
have lost									
88. If I gamble more often, it will help me to win	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	9	
more than I lose									



GAMBLING CONSEQUENCES

[ASK THIS SECTION IF AT LEAST 1 OF Q13 TO Q25 BET IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS]

89. If something painful happened in your life in the past 12 months, did you have the urge to gamble? Yes

No Don't know

90. In the past 12 months, have you felt that you might have a gambling problem?

Yes No Don't know

91. **[IF YES]** Did you try to get professional help for your gambling? [PROMPT: Counselling]

Yes, received professional help Yes, still waiting for help No, but thought about it No, did not try to get professional help Don't know

OTHER BEHAVIORS

For comparison purposes, we're going to ask about consumption of alcohol. When we use the word drink, it means:

- one 12 ounce bottle, can or glass of beer
- one 5 ounce glass of wine
- one straight or mixed drink with 1 and a ½ ounces of liquor
- 92. In the past 12 months, how often did you have a drink containing alcohol?

Daily
A few times a week
Once a week
Monthly
At least once in the past year
Not in the past 12 months
Never
Don't know

93. **[ASK IF ALCOHOL IN PAST YEAR]** Thinking about the past seven days, how many drinks have you consumed?

RECORD NUMBER: _____ [0 TO 997] Don't know



- 94. In the past 12 months, how often have you used cannabis for recreational purposes?
 - Daily A few times a week Once a week Monthly At least once in the past year Not in the past 12 months Never Don't know
- 95. **[ASK IF CANNABIS IN PAST YEAR]** Thinking about the past seven days, how many times have you used cannabis for recreation purposes?

RECORD NUMBER: _____ **[0 TO 997]** Don't know

DEMOGRAPHICS

Telephone. To close, I would like to ask you a few quick questions strictly for classification purposes. **Online.** To close, we have a few quick questions strictly for classification purposes.

96. What gender do you identify as?

Man
Women
Another gender identity (specify):
Prefer not to answer

- 97. What are the first three characters of your postal code? RECORD: ______ Prefer not to answer
- 98. In what year were you born? RECORD YEAR: ______ Prefer not to answer
- 99. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?
 RECORD: [1 TO 20]
 Prefer not to answer
- 100. [SKIP IF 1 IN HOUSEHOLD] Do you have any children under 19 years of age that live in your house? Yes No

Prefer not to answer

101. What is your current marital status? Married or common-law Single (not married) Separated or divorced



Widowed Prefer not to answer

- 102. What is your current employment status?
 Employed full-time
 Employed part-time
 Unemployed, looking for work
 Unemployed, not looking for work
 Student
 Retired
 Prefer not to answer
- 103. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
 Less than high school
 High school graduate
 Some post-secondary education
 Completed college or technical school
 Completed university undergraduate degree
 Completed university graduate degree or higher
 Prefer not to answer
- 104. What is your family's ethnic or cultural background? [PROMPT: In addition to being Canadian...] [DO NOT READ]
 Indigenous
 RECORD: _________

Prefer not to answer

- 105. Do you identify with any of the following groups?
 English as an additional language
 Person living with a disability
 Person living with a mental-health condition
 None of the above [EXCLUSIVE]
 Prefer not to answer [EXCLUSIVE]
- 106. Which of the following best describes your household's total income in the last 12 months? Under \$25,000
 \$25,000 to less than \$50,000
 \$50,000 to less than \$75,000
 \$75,000 to less than \$100,000
 \$100,000 to less than \$125,000
 \$125,000 to less than \$150,000
 \$150,000 to less than \$200,000
 \$200,000 or more Prefer not to answer





Appendix B – Call record



	Outcome	N	%
А	Total numbers attempted	96,695	
1.	Not in service	46,512	
2.	Fax	536	
3.	Business	963	
Remair	ning	48,684	
В	Total eligible numbers	48,684	
4.	Busy	964	
5.	Answering machines	14,972	
6.	No answer	8,390	
7/8.	Language/illness/incapability	890	
9.	Selected/eligible respondent not available	201	
Remair	ning	23,267	
С	Total asked	23,267	
10.	Household refusal	8,168	
11.	Respondent refusal	8,938	
12.	Qualified respondent break off	135	
Remair	ning	6,026	
D	Co-operative contacts	6,026	
13.	Disqualified	4,226	
14.	Completed interviews	1,800	
Refusa	l rate = (10+11+12)/C	17,241/23,267	74%
Respor	nse rate (D/B)	6,026/48,684	12%





Appendix C – References



- Allami, Y., Hodgins, D. C., Young, M., Brunelle, N., Currie, S., Dufour, M., Flores-Pajot, M.-C., & Nadeau, L. (2021). A meta-analysis of problem gambling risk factors in the general adult population. Addiction, 116(11), 2968-2977. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/add.15449</u>
- Bjørseth, B., Simensen, J. O., Bjørnethun, A., Griffiths, M. D., Erevik, E. K., Leino, T., & Pallesen, S. (2021). The effects of responsible gambling pop-up messages on gambling behaviors and cognitions: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, 11, 601800. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.601800</u>
- Blaszczynski, A., Collins, P., Fong, D., Ladouceur, R., Nower, L., Shaffer, H. J., Tavares, H., & Venisse, J.-L.
 (2011). Responsible gambling: General principles and minimal requirements. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 27(4), 565–573. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-010-9214-0</u>
- Blaszczynski, A., Ladouceur, R., & Shaffer, H. J. (2004). A Science-Based Framework for Responsible Gambling: The Reno Model. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, *20*(3), 301–317. <u>https://doi.org/10.1023/B:JOGS.0000040281.49444.e2</u>
- Blaszczynski, A., Shaffer, H. J., Ladouceur, R., & Collins, P. (2022). Clarifying responsible gambling and its concept of responsibility. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 20(3), 1398– 1404. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-020-00451-5</u>
- British Columbia Gaming Policy and Enforcement Branch (2012). *Information for B.C. bar and pub owners: Slot machines and VLTs in British Columbia*. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/sportsrecreation-arts-and-culture/gambling/gambling-in-bc/policy-slots-in-pubs.pdf
- Caillon, J., Grall-Bronnec, M., Saillard, A., Leboucher, J., Péré, M., & Challet-Bouju, G. (2021). Impact of warning pop-up messages on the gambling behavior, craving, and cognitions of online gamblers: A randomized controlled trial. *Frontiers in Psychiatry*, *12*, 711431. doi: 10.3389/fpsyt.2021.711431
- Centre for Addiction and Mental Health (nd). *Problem Gambling*. https://www.camh.ca/en/healthinfo/mental-illness-and-addiction-index/problem-gambling
- Canadian Mental Health Association (2022, January 4). *Gambling Awareness Program*. Canadian Mental Health Association, Saskatchewan Division. <u>https://sk.cmha.ca/programs/gambling-awareness-program/</u>
- Chang (2025, February 5). Manitoba Liquor & Lotteries asks courts to block offshore gambling site on behalf of gaming coalition. CBC News. <u>https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/manitoba/liquor-lotteries-offshore-gambling-site-bodog-1.7448882</u>
- Christensen, D. R., Nicoll, F., Williams, R. J., Shaw, C. A., Belanger, Y. D., el-Guebaly, N., Hodgins, D. C., McGrath, D. C., Smith, G. J., & Stevens, R. M. (2022a). Harm minimization training, knowledge, and behaviour of Canadian casino employees. *Journal of Gambling Studies*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-</u>022<u>-10128-4</u>
- Christensen, D. R., Nicoll, F., Williams, R. J., Shaw, C. A., el-Guebaly, N., Hodgins, D. C., McGrath, D. C., Smith, G. J., Belanger Y. D., & Stevens, R. M. G. (2022b). Responsible gambling in Canada: An analysis of the RG Check patron surveys. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 38(3), 905-915. <u>http://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-021-10052-z</u>
- Christensen, D. R., Roberts, A., Williams, R. J., Belanger, Y. D., Shaw, C. A., el-Guebaly, N., Hodgins, D. C, McGrath, D. S., Nicoll, F., Smith, G., & Stevens, R. M. G. (2024). Awareness and impact of casino responsible gambling/harm minimization measures among Canadian electronic gaming machine players. *International Gambling Studies*, 1-21. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2024.2339333</u>



- Currie, S. R., Hodgins, D. C., Wang, J., El-Guebaly, N., & Wynne, H. (2008). In pursuit of empirically based responsible gambling limits. *International Gambling Studies*, 8(2), 207–227. https://doi.org/10.1080/14459790802172265
- Dufour, J., Ladouceur, R., & Giroux, I. (2010). Training program on responsible gambling among video lottery employees. *International Gambling Studies*, *10*(1), 61–80. <u>https://doi/abs/10.1080/14459791003743037</u>
- Faregh, N., & Derevensky, J. (2013). Epidemiology of problem gambling in a Canadian community. *Community Mental Health Journal*, 49(2), 230–235. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/</u>s10597-012-9540-z
- Fiedler, I., Kairouz, S., & Reynolds, J. (2021). Corporate social responsibility vs financial interests: The case of responsible gambling programs. *Journal of Public Health*, *29*(4), 993–1000. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10389-020-01219-w
- First Nations Addictions Rehabilitation Foundation. (n.d.). *First Nations Addictions Rehabilitation Foundation*. https://www.fsin.ca/first-nations-addictions-rehabilitation-foundation/
- Gainsbury, S.M. (2015). Online gambling addiction: The relationship between Internet gambling and disordered gambling. *Current Addiction Reports, 2*, 185–193. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s40429-015-0057-8</u>
- Ginley, M. K., Whelan, J. P., Pfund, R. A., Peter, S. C., & Meyers, A. W. (2017). Warning messages for electronic gambling machines: Evidence for regulatory policies. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 25(6), 495–504. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2017.1321740</u>
- Giroux, I., Boutin, C., Ladouceur, R., Lachance, S., & Dufour, M. (2008). Awareness training program on responsible gambling for casino employees. *International Journal of Mental Health & Addiction, 6*, 594-601. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-008-9165-1</u>
- Government of Saskatchewan (2023). Action Plan for Mental Health and Addictions. https://publications.saskatchewan.ca/api/v1/products/122183/formats/141715/download
- Griffiths M. (2003). Internet gambling: issues, concerns, and recommendations. *Cyberpsychology & Behavior, 6*(6), 557–568. <u>https://doi.org/10.1089/109493103322725333</u>
- Hancock, L., & Smith, G. (2017). Critiquing the Reno Model I-IV international influence on regulators and governments (2004–2015)—The distorted reality of "responsible gambling." *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 15(6), 1151–1176. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-017-9746-y</u>
- Heirene, R. M., & Gainsbury, S. M. (2021). Encouraging and evaluating limit-setting among on-line gamblers: A naturalistic randomized controlled trial. *Addiction*, *116*(10), 2801–2813. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/</u>add.<u>15471</u>
- Hollingshead, S. J., Amar, M., Santesso, D., & Wohl, M. J. A. (2019). When should players be taught to gamble responsibly? Timing of educational information upregulates responsible gambling intentions. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 27(6), 507–514.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2018.1555818
- Hollingshead, S. J., & Wohl, M. J. A. (2022). Loyalty program rewards increases willingness to use responsible gambling tools and attitudinal loyalty. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-022-00905-y</u>



- Hubert, P., & Griffiths, M. D. (2018). A comparison of online versus offline gambling harm in Portuguese pathological gamblers: An empirical study. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 16(5), 1219–1237. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-017-9846-8</u>
- Korn, D. A., & Shaffer, H. J. (2004). Gambling and the health of the public: Adopting a public health perspective. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 20*(4), 239-254.
- Ladouceur, R., Shaffer, P., Blaszczynski, A., & Shaffer, H. J. (2017). Responsible gambling: A synthesis of the empirical evidence. *Addiction Research & Theory*, *25*(3), 225–235. https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2016.1245294
- Lemarié, L., & Chebat, J.-C. (2013). Resist or comply: Promoting responsible gambling among youth. *Journal of Business Research*, *66*(1), 137–140. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.</u>2012.09.005
- Liquor, Gaming and Cannabis Authority (2024). Know My Limits (Sports Betting). https://lgcamb.ca/public-education/know-my-gambling-limits-sports-betting/
- Livingstone, C., & Woolley, R. (2007). Risky business: A few provocations on the regulation of Electronic Gaming Machines. *International Gambling Studies*, 7(3), 361-376. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14459790701601810</u>
- Lorains, F. K., Cowlishaw, S., & Thomas, S. A. (2011). Prevalence of comorbid disorders in problem and pathological gambling: Systematic review and meta-analysis of population surveys. *Addiction*, *106*(3), 490-498. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1360-0443.2010.03300.xM</u>
- Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan (2024). 2023-24 Annual Report. <u>https://lgsask.com/pub/2023-24-lgs-annual-report.pdf</u>
- Lotteries and Gaming Saskatchewan (2024). Saskatchewan Responsible Gaming: Current State.
- McGrath, D.S, Williams, R.J., Rothery, B., Belanger, Y.D., Christensen, D.R., el-Guebaly, N., Hodgins, D.C., Nicoll, F., Shaw, C.A., Smith, G.J., & Stevens, R.M.G. (2023). Problem gambling severity, gambling behavior, substance use, and mental health in gamblers who do and do not use cannabis: Evidence from a Canadian national sample. *Addictive Behaviors, 137*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2022.107520</u>
- Mills, T., Grimes, J., Caddick, E., Jenkins, C. L., Evans, J., Moss, A., Wills, J., & Sykes, S. (2023). 'Odds Are: They Win': A disruptive messaging innovation for challenging harmful products and practices of the gambling industry. *Public health*, 224, 41–44. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhe.2023.08.009</u>
- Monaghan S. (2009). Responsible gambling strategies for Internet gambling: The theoretical and empirical base of using pop-up messages to encourage self-awareness. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 25(1), 202–7. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2008.08.008</u>
- Munoz, Y., Chebat, J.-C., & Suissa, J. A. (2010). Using fear appeals in warning labels to promote responsible gambling among VLT players: The key role of Depth of Information Processing. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 26(4), 593–609. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-010-9182-4</u>
- Murch, W. S., Kairouz, S., Dauphinais, S., Picard, E., Costes, J., & French, M. (2023). Using machine learning to retrospectively predict self-reported gambling problems in Quebec. Addiction, 118(8), 1569–1578. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/add.16179</u>



- Mutti-Packer, S., Kim, H. S., McGrath, D. S., Ritchie, E. V., Wohl, M. J. A., Rockloff, M., & Hodgins, D. C. (2022). An experiment on the perceived efficacy of fear-based messages in online roulette. *International Gambling Studies*, 22(3), 480–498. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2022.2038655</u>
- Newall, P. W., Rockloff, M., Hing, N., Thorne, H., Russell, A. M., Browne, M., & Armstrong, T. (2023). Designing improved safer gambling messages for race and sports betting: What can be learned from other gambling formats and the broader public health literature? *Journal of Gambling Studies, 39*, 913-928. <u>https://doi.org/10.</u>1007/s10899-023-10203-4
- Nightingale, T. (2024, December 10). FanDuel unveils new My Spend customer dashboard. Canadian Gaming Business. https://www.canadiangamingbusiness.com/2024/12/10/fanduel-my-spend-customer-dashboard/
- Palmer du Preez, K., Landon, J., Bellringer, M., Garrett, N., & Abbott, M. (2016). The effects of pop-up harm minimisation messages on Electronic Gaming Machine gambling behaviour in New Zealand. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 32*(4), 1115–1126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-016-9603-0
- Quilty, L. C., Robinson, J., & Blaszczynski, A. (2015). Responsible gambling training in Ontario casinos: Employee attitudes and experience. *International Gambling Studies*, *15*(3), 361–376. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2015.1056206</u>
- Redondo, I. (2015). Assessing the risks associated with online lottery and casino gambling: A comparative analysis of players' individual characteristics and types of gambling. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 13,* 584–596. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-014-9531-0</u>
- Responsible Gambling Council. (2021). *Responsible sports betting in Canada*. <u>https://www.responsiblegambling.org/wp-content/uploads/Sports-Betting-in-Canada-Exec-Summary-Report_final.pdf</u>
- Responsible Gambling Council. (2024). *Impact Action Drives Change: 2023-24 Impact Report*. <u>https://responsiblegambling.org/wp-content/uploads/RGC_AR_sep11_links.pdf</u>
- Responsible Gambling Council (2025). *Gambling Dictionary*. https://www.responsiblegambling.org/forthe-public/about-gambling/gambling-dictionary/
- Rotermann, M., & Gilmour, H. (2022). Who gambles and who experiences gambling problems in Canada. Report for Statistics Canada. <u>https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/75-006-</u> x/2022001/article/00006-eng.pdf?st=IZ9Ct-aT
- Rodda, S.N (2021). A scoping review of hard systems and tools that restrict money and cash for gambling. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions, 10(3),* 587-600.
- Saskatchewan.ca (November 3, 2022). SaskGaming celebrates the launch of the playnow.com online gaming platform. <u>https://www.saskatchewan.ca/government/news-and-media/2022/november/03/saskgaming-celebrates-the-launch-of-the-playnowcom-online-gaming-platform</u>

Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation. (2019). Annual report. Saskatchewan Gaming Corporation.

Saskatchewan History Album, n.d. Saskatchewan Lotteries. <u>https://www.saskhistory.ca/saskatchewan-lotteries/</u>



Saskatchewan Indian Gaming Authority (SIGA; 2024). Annual Report: 2023-2024. SIGA.

- Sheppard, R. R., & Smith, G. J. (2006, February 7). *Gambling*. The Canadian Encyclopedia. <u>https://www.thecanadianencyclopedia.ca/en/article/gambling</u>
- Sztainert (2019). Responsible gambling on regulated and unregulated online gambling websites. Gambling Research Exchange Ontario. <u>https://www.greo.ca/en/resources/Sztainert-2019-</u> <u>Responsible-gambling-on-regulated-and-unregulated-online-gambling-websites.pdf</u>
- Tabri, N., Wood, R. T. A., Philander, K., & Wohl, M. J. A. (2020). An examination of the validity and reliability of the positive play scale: Findings from a Canadian national study. *International Gambling Studies*, 20(2), 282–295. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2020.1732442</u>
- Tabri, N., Wood, R. T., & Wohl, M. J. (2024). Effects of personalized and normative feedback via the Positive Play Quiz on responsible gambling intention, self-efficacy and behavior: A randomized controlled trial. Addiction. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/add.16722</u>
- Thériault, É. R., Norris, J. E., & Tindale, J. A. (2018). Responsible gambling strategies: Are they effective against problem gambling risk in older Ontarians? *Journal of Gambling Issues*, *39*, 204–221.
- Tomei, A., Petrovic, G., & Simon, O. (2022). Offline and online gambling in a Swiss emerging-adult male population. Journal of Gambling Studies, 38(4), 1215–1228. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-022-10106-w</u>
- Torrance, J., Russell, A. M. T., Heath, C., & Newall, P. (2025). The effect of a brief intervention video on gambling advertising resistance: Results of a randomized, on-line experimental study. *Addiction*. <u>https://doi.org/10.1111/add.16732</u>
- Tourism Saskatchewan. (n.d.). Serve it Right Saskatchewan. Tourism Saskatchewan Canada Business Hub. <u>https://business.tourismsaskatchewan.com/courses-and-workshops/serve-it-right-saskatchewan</u>
- Volberg, R. A. (1994). Gambling and problem gambling in Saskatchewan. MA: Gemini Research.
- Walker, D. M., Litvin, S. W., Sobel, R. S., & St-Pierre, R. A. (2015). Setting win limits: An alternative approach to "responsible gambling"? *Journal of Gambling Studies*, *31*(3), 965–986. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-014-9453-6</u>
- Welte, J. W., Barnes, G. M., Wieczorek, W. F., Tidwell, M.-C. O., & Parker, J. C. (2004). Risk factors for pathological gambling. *Addictive Behaviors*, 29(2), 323–335. <u>https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2003.08.007</u>
- Wijesingha, R., Leatherdale, S. T., Turner, N. E., & Elton-Marshall, T. (2017). Factors associated with adolescent online and land-based gambling in Canada. *Addiction Research & Theory*, 25(6), 525– 532. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/16066359.2017.1311874</u>
- Williams, R. J., Belanger, Y. D., & Prusak, S. Y. (2016). Gambling and problem gambling among Canadian urban Aboriginals. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry / La Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie*, 61(11), 724–731. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743716661990</u>
- Williams, R. J., Leonard, C. A., Belanger, Y. D., Christensen, D. R., el-Guebaly, N., Hodgins, D. C., McGrath, D. S., Nicoll, F., & Stevens, R. M. G. (2021). Gambling and problem gambling in Canada in 2018: Prevalence and changes since 2002. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry / La Revue Canadienne de Psychiatrie*, *66*(5), 485–494. <u>https://doi.org/10.1177/0706743720980080</u>



- Williams, R. J., Shaw, C. A., Belanger, Y. D., Christensen, D. R., el-Guebaly, N., Hodgins, D. C., McGrath, D. S., & Stevens, R. M. G. (2023). Etiology of problem gambling in Canada. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 37(3), 483–498. <u>https://doi.org/10.1037/adb0000843</u>
- Williams, R. J., Volberg, R. A., & Stevens, R. M. (2012). The population prevalence of problem gambling: Methodological influences, standardized rates, jurisdictional differences, and worldwide trends. *Journal of Gambling Studies, 28*(4), 413-429.
- Wohl, M. J. A. (2018). Loyalty programmes in the gambling industry: Potentials for harm and possibilities for harm minimization. *International Gambling Studies*, *18*(3), 495–511.
- Wohl, M. J. A., Davis, C. G., & Tabri, N. (2024). Setting a hard (versus soft) monetary limit decreases expenditure: An assessment using player account data. *International Gambling Studies*, 24(1), 19–35. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2023.2183974</u>
- Wohl, M. J. A., Gainsbury, S., Stewart, M. J., & Sztainert, T. (2013). Facilitating responsible gambling: The relative effectiveness of education-based animation and monetary limit setting pop-up messages among electronic gaming machine players. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 29(4), 703–717. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-012-9340-y
- Wohl, M. J. A., Santesso, D. L., & Harrigan, K. (2013). Reducing erroneous cognition and the frequency of exceeding limits among slots players: A short (3-minute) educational animation facilitates responsible gambling. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*, 11(4), 409–423. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-012-9424-z</u>
- Wood, R. T. A., & Griffiths, M. D. (2015). Understanding positive play: An exploration of playing experiences and responsible gambling practices. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 31(4), 1715–1734. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-014-9489-7</u>
- Wood, R. T. A., & Wohl, M. J. A. (2015). Assessing the effectiveness of a responsible gambling behavioural feedback tool for reducing the gambling expenditure of at-risk players. *International Gambling Studies*, 15(2), 1–16. <u>https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2015.1049191</u>
- Wood, R. T. A., Shorter, G. W., & Griffiths, M. D. (2014). Rating the suitability of responsible gambling features for specific game types: A resource for optimizing responsible gambling strategy. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction, 12*, 94-112. <u>https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-013-9473-y</u>
- Wood, R. T. A., Wohl, M. J. A., Tabri, N., & Philander, K. (2017). Measuring responsible gambling among players: Development of the Positive Play Scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <u>https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00227</u>
- Wynne, H. J. (2002). *Gambling and problem gambling in Saskatchewan*. Ottawa. Ontario: Canadian Centre on Substance Abuse.



Appendix D – Total Types of Gambling



	% gambled at least weekly								
	Lottery tickets	VLTs	Slots	Card games	Online	Bingo			
Gamble at least weekly on the following									
Lottery ticket (n = 213)		11%	5%	5%	3%	8%			
VLTs (n = 22)	44%		35%	8%	29%	7%			
Slots (n = 10)	29%	49%		12%	11%	5%			
Card games (n = 10)	51%	22%	23%		5%	10%			
Online gambling (n = 6)	18%	45%	11%	3%		12%			
Bingo (n = 16)	51%	11%	6%	6%	12%				
Sports online (n = 8)	22%	32%	17%	-	27%	-			
Charity tickets (n = 9)	25%	13%	6%	7%	9%	13%			
Lottery tickets online (n = 13)	64%	31%	17%	13%	20%	9%			
Table games (n = 4)	40%	100%	79%	-	30%	-			
Games of skills (n = 5)	42%	52%	36%	15%	39%	17%			
Sport Select (n = 11)	75%	39%	33%	-	14%	6%			
Horse racing (n = 2)	100%	100%	100%	-	-	-			

Note: **Bolded** percentages indicate a significant difference between those who gambled on the form of gambling at least weekly and those who bet on it less frequently (i.e., monthly or less in the past 12 months).

	% gambled at least weekly								
	Sports online	Charity tickets	Lottery tickets online	Table games	Games of skill	Sport Select	Horse racing		
Gamble at least weekly on the following									
Lottery ticket (n = 213)	4%	4%	6%	2%	3%	5%	1%		
VLTs (n = 22)	23%	9%	12%	17%	13%	11%	4%		
Slots (n = 10)	17%	6%	10%	20%	13%	13%	6%		
Card games (n = 10)	-	12%	14%	-	10%	-	-		
Online gambling (n = 6)	30%	10%	12%	8%	15%	6%	-		
Bingo (n = 16)	-	14%	6%	-	7%	3%	-		
Sports online (n = 8)		3%	12%	12%	14%	10%	-		
Charity tickets (n = 9)	4%		4%	2%	3%	-	-		
Lottery tickets online (n = 13)	22%	8%		-	14%	9%	-		
Table games (n = 4)	49%	8%	-		28%	32%	23%		
Games of skills (n = 5)	41%	9%	23%	20%		13%	-		
Sport Select (n = 11)	24%	-	13%	20%	11%		14%		
Horse racing (n = 2)	-	-	-	100%	-	100%			

Note: **Bolded** percentages indicate a significant difference between those who gambled on the form of gambling at least weekly and those who bet on it less frequently (i.e., monthly or less in the past 12 months).

