Population screening of gambling behavior: Identifying key characteristics of at-risk players in Cyprus

Klavdia Neophytou, Georgia Panayiotou, Marios Theodorou, Christiana Theodorou & Tonia-Flery Artemi

Department of Psychology
University of Cyprus
P.O. Box 20537
CY 1678, Nicosia
Cyprus

Corresponding author:

Dr. Klavdia Neophytou

Department of Psychology

University of Cyprus

P.O. Box 20537

CY 1678, Nicosia

Cyprus

Neophytou.klavdia@ucy.ac.cy

Abstract

The increase of gambling availability and the inclusion of Gambling disorder as an addiction in DSM-5 highlight the importance of brief screening measures aiming to identify at-risk gamblers. The current study using a brief telephone survey assessed demographic characteristics and gambling behaviors in 2118 adults in the island of Cyprus. Questions were developed based on DSM-5 criteria for Gambling Disorder, and common assessment tools. A percentage of 6% was identified as at-risk gamblers. Male gender, low monthly income, high frequency of gambling behavior, large amounts of money spent and gambling to escape from everyday problems or for amusement, specifically for men, were found to be characteristics that can help in the early identification of at-risk gamblers. Gambling for financial gain and as a way to socialize, birth date (age range), and employment status were not significant predictors of gambling severity. This study shows that the above characteristics can be assessed easily through phone screening of large populations, aiding in prevention practices to reduce the problematic use of gambling activities.

Keywords: Gambling, risk characteristics, population screening, gender, motivation

Introduction

Increased availability of gambling opportunities and the expansion of legalized gambling, has been identified as an important public health concern (Shaffer & Korn, 2002) by many countries. The same is true for the Republic of Cyprus, a European country of 875,899 population. Increased prevalence of gambling in Cyprus is indicated by the fact that there are >506 betting stores, i.e. at least 1 per 1731 citizens, when considering only this form of gambling activity (personal communication, National Betting Authority). At the same time, the inclusion of Gambling Disorder as a Behavioral Addiction in DSM-5 (APA, 2013) instigated the need to understand the psychopathology of this condition and risk factors for its development, while many national authorities have focused their policy-making on enhancing healthy, regulated gambling versus pathological engagement with this behavior.

Only one unpublished epidemiological study, conducted with face-to-face interviews on a random sample of the population, examined gambling behavior in Cyprus (University of Nicosia, 2018), which was funded by the country's National Betting Authority, in an attempt to characterize and describe gambling in this country. The study was descriptive, providing initial frequency estimations of problematic gambling, and showing that 13% of Cypriots present probable problematic gambling behavior, with 6% identified as problematic gamblers based on a self-report questionnaire using DSM-5 criteria. The two most cited reasons why Cypriots engage in gambling activities in this study were for financial gain (60%) and amusement (49%). The three top choice gambling activities were the Cyprus government scratch lottery (79%), other lotteries (68%) and bingo (47%).

At the international level, in an effort to understand and respond better to this public health challenge, various individual characteristics including demographic, e.g. gender, age, socioeconomic status (e.g. Welte et al., 2004), comorbid psychopathology e.g. alcohol abuse, depression (e.g. Hing et al., 2016), cognitive distortions e.g. illusion of control (e.g. Toneatto et al., 1997), personality characteristics e.g. impulsivity (e.g. Mishra et al., 2010), frequency of gambling activities (e.g. Hodgins et al., 2012) and gambling motives (e.g. Canale et al., 2015) have been examined as factors that might best predict the development and/or maintenance of problematic gambling behavior (see review by Dowling et al., 2017). None of these dimensions have been previously examined in Cyprus, while even in the international literature much research remains to be done on the unique and interactive contribution of these factors in explaining gambling disorder risk.

To inform policy makers both in Cyprus and elsewhere, and implement public policy strategies that safeguard the population from developing this addiction, it is important to be able to identify characteristics of at-risk players through fast, cost-effective population screening that can be repeated at regular time intervals, in order to implement measures when risky behaviors increase. Accurate screening can lead to improved care and reduced health care cost (Tiet, Finney, & Moos, 2008). A metanalysis by Dowling et al., (2019) underscores the importance of short screening population measures for gambling based on DSM-criteria. Extending these suggestions, the present study utilizes a large, telephone survey that incorporates demographics and individual traits, in addition to gambling disorder symptoms, so as to not only identify those who already experience symptoms but those at risk for developing them. Therefore, the study aims to enhance understanding of gambling behavior and contribute to the international literature by providing data that help in

the identification of key characteristics that describe at-risk players, and can be assessed using brief screening procedures.

Current study

The aim of the current study was to provide preliminary descriptive data on the gambling behavior of the adult population in Cyprus, through brief telephone screening and evaluate if these can be identified through brief population screening. Through examination of descriptive characteristics of individuals who self-report that their gambling behavior has been causing problems in their daily life, the study will contribute to the identification of important demographic predictors of those at-risk to develop serious dysfunction and gambling addiction.

The screening tool was constructed for purposes of this study, drawing from existing knowledge of risk factors for gambling addiction and DSM-5 diagnostic criteria. Based on the literature, demographic characteristics including male gender (Dowling et al., 2017), young age (Welte et al., 2004), low income (Grun & McKeigue, 2000), employment status (Albers & Hübl, 1997) are considered as risk factors for gambling severity. Additionally, it seems that higher gambling severity is characterized by high frequency of gambling as well as higher amounts of money spent (Hodgins et al., 2012). However, these characteristics increase risk when combined with particular motives for gambling. While typical, non-pathological gamblers seem to engage in this behavior for purposes of socialization, excitement, and amusement, problem gamblers seem to engage in gambling mainly for other reasons, including avoidance of problems and financial gain (Ricketts & Macaskill, 2004). We hoped to verify that motives, in combination with specific demographic characteristics, indeed differentiate between gamblers who experience gambling

related problems, as per their self-report, and those who do not, in this under-researched setting. In sum, the risk factors we examined were: a) gender, b) age based on date of birth, c) income, d) employment status, e) frequency of gambling behavior, f) amount of money spent on gambling, g) reasons for gambling. All were examined with a small number of questions, as part a short population screening tool.

Method

Participants:

The sample was comprised of all adults living in all regions under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Cyprus, over 18 years old, who had a telephone and could be reached via random number dialing. The telephone survey was conducted via NIPO/CATI software between November 2019 and early March 2020 and took about 10 minutes. For inclusion, participants had to answer ‘yes’ to the first question, which asked if they had played a gambling game at least once in their lifetime (a list of games was provided, including the option ‘other’ for the cases when none of the listed games were endorsed). People with zero involvement (i.e. who denied ever playing any gambling game) were excluded from participation but were asked if another adult in their household was present at the time who was over 18 and participated in gambling sometimes. A total of 25919 phone numbers were dialed, which were either selected randomly from phone directories (of mainly stationary numbers) or were randomly generated numbers of mobile phones. From this pool, 15223 people answered the phone call. From those who answered, a total of 2118 participated in the phone survey. The majority of those who answered the phone were excluded: Most, (12794) refused to participate when they were informed that they were called about a study, 58 refused when they were informed about the General Data Protection Regulation (i.e.

how anonymity would be kept), 14 were younger than 18 years old and 239 reported zero gambling behavior. The final sample was $N=2118$ (1242 male; $Mean_{age}=48$ years, $SD=15$, $Mode=36$). Seventy percent of them were employed, 15% retired, 9% unemployed, 4% students, 1.3% recipients of welfare and 0.4% were soldiers. Ten percent of the sample reported no income, 6% reported a gross monthly income <500 euro, 56% 500-3500 euro, 4% >3500 euro and 8% did not answer.

Measure:

Questions were developed based on DSM-5 criteria for Gambling Disorder, and lists of gambling activities derived from common assessment tools, i.e. the South Oaks Gambling Screen-Revised (Lesieur & Blume, 1987) and Gambling Commission website, adjusted for the cultural context. Questions pertained to demographics, gambling behavior, problems due to gambling and gambling motives (see Supplementary Table 1).

Data Analysis:

First, frequency analysis was done to characterize the sample's gambling behavior and motives. Second, to identify the subgroup of participants who are at risk for problem gambling a total score was derived from 5 items assessing DSM-5 based symptoms, with one question each: a) need for increased gambling, b) betting more money than one can afford, c) receiving criticism about one's gambling, d) experiencing problems or negative consequences due to gambling and e) having to lie about one's gambling. Items were assessed on a 0-3 scale (never experienced to almost always) or 0-1 (yes or no). Total scores on this *problem gambling index* ranged from 0-6, $M=1.12$, $SD=0.49$ (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.97$). To address questions about the characteristics of individuals at risk, participants who scored 2 and above (1

SD from the Mean; N=148 participants, representing 7% of the total sample) were considered as at-risk gamblers. Next, a comparison was done of at-risk gamblers to the rest of the sample (low-risk gamblers) on demographic variables, gambling behavior and gambling motives. Chi-square analyses were used where the dependent variable was dichotomous and Mann Whitney U test when the dependent variable was ordinal.

Results

Description of gambling behavior in Cyprus:

Twenty-three percent of participants reported gambling at least once a week, 24% at least once a month, 16% at least once every three months, 13% at least once every six months and 21% at least once a year (3% no answer). The largest amount of money participants reported betting in one day was: 53% 1-10 euro, 36% 10-100, 5% 100-1000, 1% 1000-10,000 and 0.4% >10,000 euro (4% no answer). To the question which games/betting activities they ever engaged in, (from a list of 15 activities, plus “other” category) the most frequently reported activities were: State scratch lottery by 86% of participants, other lotteries 83% and bingo 50%. These were followed by *kazanti* (traditional numbers game played at fairs) 46%, sports betting 25%, stock market 20.6%, participation in a draw 20.6%, casino games 20%, card games (e.g. poker) 19.5%, slot machines 17.5%, online sports betting 12.3%, horse races 8.6%, The three least frequently reported activities were: dice games 5%, skill games for money (e.g. basketball) 4.6% and online games, including online casino, 4%. No additional games were reported to the “other” option, with the few reported answers corresponding to sub-categories of the above 15 options.

Gambling motives:

To the question regarding reasons for gambling, participants could select multiple responses. The most frequently selected reasons were in order: Amusement 39%, financial gain 31%, socialization 3% and a way to escape everyday problems 2%. Thirty one percent also noted “other” reasons, which however largely overlapped with the above categories (e.g. ‘adrenaline’, ‘happiness’, ‘to pass time’).

Characteristics of gamblers reporting problem behavior:

Chi-square test of differences between at-risk and low-risk gamblers showed a significant effect of: a) *gender* $X^2 (1, N=2017) = 24.13, p < .0001$, b) reporting *amusement* as a reason for gambling $X^2 (1, N=2017) = 4.49, p < .05$ and c) reporting *escape from everyday problems* as a reason for gambling $X^2 (1, N=2017) = 20.52, p < .0001$.

However, group differences in reporting *financial gain* ($p=0.23$) and *socialization* ($p=.50$) as reasons for gambling were not statistically significant.

For those who mentioned amusement and escape as reasons for gambling, chi-square test of difference between at-risk and low-risk gambles showed a significant effect of gender separately for every reason: a) amusement $X^2 (1, N=784) = 8.38, p < .005$, b) escape from everyday problems, $X^2 (1, N=41) = 5.66, p < .05$. In both cases these motives were reported more frequently by men (see Table 2 for all the expected and count cells).

A Mann Whitney test showed that at-risk gamblers had significantly lower monthly income (Mdn=777) than then low-risk group (Mdn=942), $U=97023$, $p<0.0001$, $\eta^2=0.01$, were involved in gambling significantly more often (Mdn=1380 vs Mdn=970), $U=79770, p < 0.0001, \eta^2=0.03$, and spent significantly more money (Mdn=1398) than low-risk group (Mdn=966), $U=77105, p < 0.0001, \eta^2=0.07$.

However, there was no significant group difference on year of birth, $p=0.52$ or employment status, $p=0.62$.

Discussion

This study provides descriptive information on gambling behavior in Cyprus, using a brief and easy population screening approach. It helps estimate the percentage of Cypriots who engage in gambling activities, the games they usually play and the reasons for their gambling. Findings regarding demographic factors were largely similar to what was found in a previous epidemiological study (University of Nicosia, 2018), suggesting that valid descriptions of the gambling situation can be obtained through a brief, low-cost telephone survey. Importantly, this study compares at-risk gamblers with low-risk gamblers, based on established DSM-5 criteria, aiming to identify key parameters that might help identify problem gambling during large population screening, as way of early problem identification.

The number of participants who identified as at-risk gamblers (7%) is in agreement with the previous epidemiological study (University of Nicosia, 2018) which identified a 6% of participants as pathological/problematic gamblers; it also agrees with that study in terms of the most common gambling activities of Cypriots. In Europe problem gambling rates seem to be between 0.7% - 6.5% (Calado & Griffiths, 2016), which provides validation to the current estimate. It should be noted, that the obtained information, as intended, represents screening, showing some level of problematic consequences of gambling in a portion of the population, that can be used in prevention efforts. Percentages of individuals meeting clinical criteria for gambling disorder may be substantially lower and would require thorough individualized clinical assessment to be recognized. As noted in Calado & Griffiths'

(2016) review of worldwide prevalence, rates of pathological gambling are lower than the percentage of at-risk gamblers, around 1%, consistent with DSM-5 estimates.

From the present data, it appears, as would be expected from the previous literature, that male gender, low income, frequent gambling and spending more money on gambling best separate at-risk and low-risk gamblers. Male gender and high gambling frequency have been previously related with problem gambling (Hodgins et al., 2012; Johansson et al., 2009), while high income has been related to fewer gambling problems (Sassen et al., 2011). Additionally, it came as no surprise that spending higher amounts of money on gambling activities is an important risk factor, as one of the DSM criteria is the ‘need to gamble with increasing amounts of money in order to achieve the desired excitement’ (APA, 2013).

In contrast, year of birth (age range) and employment status did not differentiate significantly between at-risk and low-risk gamblers in this sample. Generally, age presents contradictory results in the literature, as it has been found as an important risk factor in some studies (Johansson et al., 2009) but not in others (Sassen et al., 2011). Employment status has also mostly yielded non-significant results in the literature, consistent with present findings (Albers & Hübl, 1997; Johansson et al., 2009; Sassen et al., 2011). Taken together, these data provide credibility to the fact that risk factors identified through a quick screening of the general population can reliably identify problematic gambling, similar to much more extensive surveys.

The second contribution of this study is to add to the existing evidence that specific types of gambling motives strongly differentiate between at-risk and low-risk gamblers. Gambling as a way of amusement characterized primarily low-risk, while

gambling as a way to escape from everyday problems characterized mainly at-risk gamblers. As noted in Ricketts & Macaskill (2004), “normal” gamblers were much more likely than problem gamblers to report finding alternative ways to improve negative emotions, and they also consistently reported gambling for entertainment, in accord with present results. Findings also agree with several studies showing that gambling is sustained by both positive and negative reinforcement, through increasing pleasant and decreasing unpleasant emotions (Mann et al., 2016; Khantzian, 1985; Wood and Griffiths, 2007), but these two pathways seem to characterize at-risk and low-risk gamblers to different degrees. Results of the current study suggest that using gambling as an escape from everyday problems may be a strong correlate of problem gambling, even more so that using this activity for amusement, a finding which agrees with a recent review, and a substantial body of recent studies, showing that problem gambling behavior is often maintained as an emotion regulation strategy, in the absence of more adaptive ways to cope (Neophytou et al., 2021).

Being able to identify this risk factor even within the context of a brief screening, adds to its validity as a potentially critical characteristic of at-risk populations, corresponding to criterion 5 of the DSM-5 description of gambling disorder. This finding highlights the role of dysfunctional emotion regulation and coping as an important factor to consider in public health measures, as it is documented by much emerging literature and contemporary models of gambling addiction, as a core component of the psychopathology of this disorder (Blaszczynski, & Nower, 2002; Rogier, & Velotti, 2018; Navas et al., 2019).

Additionally, results show that gambling for amusement and escape from problems characterizes mostly at-risk men rather than at-risk women, in accordance with Francis, Dowling, Jackson, Christensen, & Wardle, (2015). This interactive

effect deserves further research however, as contradictory evidence exists, e.g. McGrath's et al. (2013) who found that women are more likely to gamble as way to regulate mood and escape problems and Steward and Zack (2008) who showed that coping motives for gambling were related mostly to women and enhancement motives to men. Flack and Steven (2019) instead found no difference between men and women with regards to gambling motives. Our finding, however, is consistent with the well-accepted evidence that men turn more frequently than women to substances to cope with difficulties (Karekla & Panayiotou, 2011; Panayiotou, Kokkinos & Kapsou, 2014) - more research is needed to validate if this holds reliably in the case of gambling. However, the imbalanced sample of participants (men, women) in favor of men in our current sample, may have affected results, suggesting some caution in interpreting this interaction.

Gambling as a way of socialization and financial gain did not significantly distinguish at-risk gamblers. Gambling for socialization has been found to be less strongly related with problem gambling previously (Flack & Morris, 2015). Gambling to win money was one of the popular motives of gambling involvement in the current study and has been listed as an important reason of problematic gambling in the literature (Tabri, Xuereb, Cringle, & Clark, 2020). Making money from gambling was viewed as desirable by both normal and problem gamblers in Ricketts & Macaskill (2004), but not as a credible outcome by the normal gamblers, suggesting that it is not the desire to earn financial gain that may distinguish problem gamblers, but the distorted perception of the likelihood of this happening, something that was not assessed in the current study. Findings agree with Flack and Morris, (2015), who showed that the most predominant gambling motives of problem gamblers are emotion-focused instead of directed at financial gain, although financial motives are

one of the most frequent self-reported motives, it is not the one which best identifies problematic patterns of gambling.

This study comes with some limitations which include the self-reported nature of questions and using a screening tool, developed for this study, which, however, relied on questions formatted after well-established measures and the DSM-5. Future studies need to consider a combination of established self-report questionnaires and clinician measures to further validate the utility of such short screening tools.

In spite of these shortcomings, this study shows that male gender, low monthly income, high frequency of gambling behavior, large amounts of money spent and gambling as escape and amusement specifically for men are characteristics that can help in the early identification of at-risk gamblers, and that these can be assessed easily through phone screening of large populations, so that prevention practices can be implemented to reduce the problematic use of gambling activities.

Funding: This study is part of the Understanding Gambling Behavior in Cyprus (URGAME-C) project, a project funded by National Betting Authority

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest

References

- American Psychiatric Association (2013). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders, 5th ed. Arlington: American Psychiatric Association. doi:10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596.529303
- Albers, N., & Hübl, L. (1997). Gambling market and individual patterns of gambling in Germany. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 13(2), 125-144.
- Blaszczynski, A., & Nower, L. (2002). A pathways model of problem and pathological gambling. *Addiction*, 97(5), 487–499. doi:10.1046/j.1360-0443.2002.00015.x
- Calado, F., & Griffiths, M. D. (2016). Problem gambling worldwide: An update and systematic review of empirical research (2000–2015). *Journal of behavioral addictions*, 5(4), 592-613
- Canale, N., Vieno, A., Griffiths, M. D., Rubaltelli, E., & Santinello, M. (2015). How do impulsivity traits influence problem gambling through gambling motives? The role of perceived gambling risk/benefits. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 29(3), 813
- Dowling, N. A., Merkouris, S. S., Greenwood, C. J., Oldenhof, E., Toumbourou, J. W., & Youssef, G. J. (2017). Early risk and protective factors for problem gambling: A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Clinical psychology review*, 51, 109-124
- Dowling, N. A., Merkouris, S. S., Dias, S., Rodda, S. N., Manning, V., Youssef, G. J., ... & Volberg, R. A. (2019). The diagnostic accuracy of brief screening instruments for problem gambling: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical psychology review*, 74, 101784

Flack, M., & Morris, M. (2015). Problem gambling: One for the money...?. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 31(4), 1561-1578

Flack, M., & Stevens, M. (2019). Gambling motivation: comparisons across gender and preferred activity. *International Gambling Studies*, 19(1), 69-84

Francis, K. L., Dowling, N. A., Jackson, A. C., Christensen, D. R., & Wardle, H. (2015). Gambling motives: Application of the reasons for gambling questionnaire in an Australian population survey. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 31(3), 807-823

Grun, L., & McKeigue, P. (2000). Prevalence of excessive gambling before and after introduction of a national lottery in the United Kingdom: Another example of the single distribution theory. *Addiction*, 95(6), 959-966.

Hing, N., Russell, A., Tolchard, B., & Nower, L. (2016). Risk factors for gambling problems: An analysis by gender. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 32(2), 511-534

Hodgins, D. C., Schopflocher, D. P., Martin, C. R., el-Guebaly, N., Casey, D. M., Currie, S. R., ... & Williams, R. J. (2012). Disordered gambling among higher-frequency gamblers: who is at risk?. *Psychological medicine*, 42(11), 2433

Johansson, A., Grant, J. E., Kim, S. W., Odlaug, B. L., & Gøtestam, K. G. (2009). Risk factors for problematic gambling: A critical literature review. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 25(1), 67-92

Khantzian, E. J. (1985). The self-medication hypothesis of addictive disorders: focus on heroin and cocaine dependence. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 142(11), 1259–1264. doi:10.1176/ajp.142.11.1259

Lee, H. P., Chae, P. K., Lee, H. S., & Kim, Y. K. (2007). The five-factor gambling motivation model. *Psychiatry research*, 150(1), 21-32.

Lesieur, H. R., & Blume, S. B. (1987). The South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS): A new instrument for the identification of pathological gamblers. *American journal of Psychiatry*, 144(9)

Mann, K., Fauth-Bühler, M., Higuchi, S., Potenza, M. N., & Saunders, J. B. (2016). Pathological gambling: a behavioral addiction. *World Psychiatry*, 15(3), 297–298. doi: 10.1002/wps.20373

McGrath, D. S., Stewart, S. H., Klein, R. M., & Barrett, S. P. (2010). Self-generated motives for gambling in two population-based samples of gamblers. *International Gambling Studies*, 10(2), 117-138

Mishra, S., Lalumière, M. L., & Williams, R. J. (2010). Gambling as a form of risk-taking: Individual differences in personality, risk-accepting attitudes, and behavioral preferences for risk. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(6), 616-621.

Navas, J. F., Billieux, J., Verdejo-García, A., & Perales, J. C. (2019). Neurocognitive Components of Gambling Disorder. *Harm Reduction for Gambling*, 54–67. doi:10.4324/9780429490750-7

Neophytou, K., Theodorou, M., Artemi, T-F., Theodorou, C., & Panayiotou, G. (2021). A systematic review of the relationship between emotion regulation and coping strategies with gambling: the role of specific coping and emotion regulation strategies. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions (under submission)*

Rogier, G., & Velotti, P. (2018). Conceptualizing gambling disorder with the process model of emotion regulation. *Journal of Behavioral Addictions*, 7(2), 239–251. doi:10.1556/2006.7.2018.52

Sassen, M., Kraus, L., Bühringer, G., Pabst, A., Piontek, D., & Taqi, Z. (2011). Gambling among adults in Germany: Prevalence, disorder and risk factors. *Sucht*, 57(4), 249-257.

Shaffer, H. J., & Korn, D. A. (2002). Gambling and related mental disorders: A public health analysis. *Annual review of public health*, 23(1), 171-212

Stewart, S. H., & Zack, M. (2008). Development and psychometric evaluation of a three-dimensional Gambling Motives Questionnaire. *Addiction*, 103(7), 1110-1117

Tabri, N., Xuereb, S., Cringle, N., & Clark, L. (2020). Revisiting the role of financial motives in disordered gambling: A meta-analytic review

Tiet, Q. Q., Finney, J. W., & Moos, R. H. (2008). Screening psychiatric patients for illicit drug use disorders and problems. *Clinical psychology review*, 28(4), 578-591.

Toneatto, T., Blitz-Miller, T., Calderwood, K., Dragonetti, R., & Tsanos, A. (1997). Cognitive distortions in heavy gambling. *Journal of gambling studies*, 13(3), 253-266

University of Nicosia (2018). Quantitative method for identification, behavior and characteristics of gambling users. *Report prepared for the National Betting Authority*. Retrieved from <https://nba.gov.cy/wp-content/uploads/parousiasi19032018.pdf>

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

Wood, R. T. A., & Griffiths, M. D. (2007). A qualitative investigation of problem gambling as an escape-based coping strategy. *Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice*, 80(1), 107–125. doi:10.1348/147608306x107

Table 1: Screening questions and answers

1	<i>Gender:</i> Male / Female
2	<i>Year of birth:</i>
3	<i>Employment status:</i> Unemployed / Employed in the public spectrum / Employed in the private spectrum / Self-employed / Soldier / Student / Recipient of welfare support
4	<i>Monthly income (euro):</i> Less than 500 / 501-1000 / 1001-1500 / 1501-2000 / 2001-2500 / 2501-3000 / 3001-3500 / More than 3500 / No income / Do not know or want to answer
5	<i>'Which of these gambling games have you ever played in your life?' (A list of gambling activities was mentioned)</i> Casino games / Card games / Dice games / Government scratch lottery / Other lotteries / Sports betting / Horse races / Bingo / Kazanti (traditional game) / Online sports betting / Online casino / Slot machines / Skill games for money (e.g. basketball) / Participation in a draw / Stock market / Other
6	<i>'How often you were involved with gambling activities the last year?'</i> Once or more than once a week / Once or more than once a month / Once or more than once every three months / Once or more than once every six months / Once or more than once a year / Do not know or want to answer
7	<i>'How much money do you usually spend on gambling activities every month the last year?' (euro)</i> 1-30 / 31-100 / 101-1000 / 1001-10000 / more than 10000 / Do not know or want to answer
8	<i>'Have you ever felt the need to bet more money on gambling the last year?'</i> YES / NO / Do not know or want to answer
9	<i>'Have you even bet more money that you could afford the last year?'</i> Never / Sometimes / Most of the times / Almost always / Do not know or want to answer
10	<i>'The last year, have even been any cases where a family member or a friend has criticized you for your gambling behavior or told you that you are likely to engage in it to a degree that is problematic, regardless of whether you agreed or disagreed with that?'</i> Never / Sometimes / Most of the times / Almost always / Do not know or want to answer
11	<i>'Have you felt that your level of gambling has caused you problems or has a negative effect on you in the last year?'</i> Never / Sometimes / Most of the times / Almost always / Do not know or want to answer

12	<p><i>'Have you ever had to lie to people who are important to you in the last year about the amount of money you bet or the frequency which you gamble?'</i></p> <p>YES / NO / Do not know or want to answer</p>
13	<p><i>'What do you think that your involvement with gambling offers to you?'</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Entertainment b) Economic profit c) Way of socialization d) A way to escape from the problems of everyday life e) Other

Table 2: Level of gambling involvement: expected and count cells based on gender, reasons of gambling and their combination

Gender					
		Female		Male	
		Count	Expected	Count	Expected
Level of gambling Involvement	Risk	60	96	172	136
	Low risk	767	731	996	1032
Amusement					
		Mentioned		Not mentioned	
		Count	Expected	Count	Expected
Level of gambling Involvement	Risk	98	91	134	141
	Low risk	686	693	1077	1070
Way to escape from everyday problems					
		Mentioned		Not mentioned	

		Count	Expected	Count	Expected
Level of gambling	Risk	16	5	216	227
Involvement	Low risk	25	36	1738	1727
Mentioned Amusement as a reason for gambling					
		Female		Male	
		Count	Expected	Count	Expected
Level of gambling	Risk	26	39	72	58
Involvement	Low risk	287	273	399	412
Mentioned gambling as a way to escape from everyday problems					
		Female		Male	
		Count	Expected	Count	Expected
Level of gambling	Risk	1	4	15	12
Involvement	Low risk	10	7	15	18