# Risk of problem gambling in occupational groups

Per Binde, Associate professor



Ulla Romild, program coordinator, Swelogs



# **Objectives**

#### To find out:

- Which occupational groups have elevated risk for problem gambling?
- Why is the risk elevated?

#### Results are potentially useful for:

- Developing and directing preventive measures
- Understanding the social, cultural and situational correlates of problem gambling









# Data, measures and previous studies

- Data from Swelogs population study 2015 (n=9420)
- Main variable: SSYK 2012-category (Swedish Standard Classification of Occupations); registry variable collected by Statistics Sweden (n=2937)

Level/Code	SSYK 2012
Major group/Single-digit level	10
Sub-major group/Two-digit level	46
Minor group/Three-digit level	147
Unit groups/Four-digit level	429

- Main gambling variables:
  - Regular gambling (at least monthly)
  - **PGSI 1+** (indicating risk of problem gambling)
- Few previous studies on this topic, none seem to have used data as detailed as in this study

# Relevant theories and assumptions

regarding work-related factors that stimulate gambling and increase the risk of problem gambling

- Socio-Demographic Factors (SES)
- Social structures, income levels, perceived social mobility
- Opportunities to gamble in connection with work; limited supervision
- Structure of time for work and leisure
- Gambling is part of work culture
- Alienation

+ some other ...

Varying support for these theories and assumptions in previous research

Risk factors may be additive or multiplicative

## Main results, explorative analyses

(only categories n≥30 could be analyzed)

- *Very big differences* between SSYK-categories in gambling participation and risk
- Low participation and risk
  - E.g. Occupations requiring advanced level of higher education; university and high school teachers
- *High* participation and risk
  - Building and construction sector (e.g. 711 Carpenters, bricklayers and construction workers)
  - Metal and machinery workers (e.g. 722 Blacksmiths and tool-makers)
  - Delivery services, vehicle drivers (e.g. 833 Truck and bus drivers)
- Differences seem to mainly be caused by socio-demographic factors and associated norms and values, but occupation-specific factors also have an influence
- Some differences are no longer statistically significant when controlling for gender (men gamble more than women)

## **Analysis of merged groups**

## We merged selected 4-digit categories into three groups,

based on the results of the exploratory analyses and theories about factors increasing the propensity to gamble and/or risk for excessive gambling

## Group 1: Building & Construction

SES-factors, income levels, perceived social mobility, exposure to gambling, opportunities to gamble, limited supervision, gambling culture (n=169)

## Group 2. Vehicle drivers

SES-factors, perceived social mobility, exposure to gambling, opportunities to gamble, limited supervision, structure of time for work and leisure (shift work), (n=70)

## Group 3. Monotonous manual indoor work

SES-factors, perceived social mobility, structure of time for work and leisure (shift work), alienation (n=184)

# Selected results, merged groups

### Significantly above average

- Regular gambling
  - Group 1, building & construction
  - Group 3, monotonous and manual indoor work
- PGSI 1+
  - Group 1, building & construction
  - Group 2, vehicle drivers
  - Group 3, monotonous and manual indoor work

## When controlling for gender (regression analysis)

 As above, except group 3 no longer significantly above average PGSI 1+

We cannot say for certain why risk is elevated, but the results are in line with several theories

## Some other observations

- All three groups participate in **lotto** more often than average;
  possible reason a wish to win a life-changing amount of money
- All three groups prefer to **gamble alone** to a greater extent than average; possible reason a wish to keep the life-changing jackpot for oneself.
- Few have serious gambling problems, but this is a relatively small sample.
- We cannot tell from this study to what extent elevated risk might lead to significant harm
- Electronic gambling machines (**EGMs**) are of marginal importance, in contrast to what some other studies have found (e.g. taxi drivers gambling excessively)

# An example – buss driver



#### Kvinna från Älvsjö vann 10 miljoner på JätteTriss

22 augusti, 2007 / i Triss, Vinnare

JätteTriss har hittat en vinnare av de jättestora pengarna. En kvinnlig busschaufför från Stockholm köpte den första 10-miljonersvinsten, och trodde knappt det var sant. – Det är ofattbart, det var tydligen min tur nu, jag har inte landat riktigt ännu, säger hon.

Den lycklige storvinnaren stegade in på Vi Örbykiosken i Älvsjö förra veckan, inlockad av butikens skyltning för JätteTriss – och blev inte ett dugg besviken.

– Snygg lott var min första tanke och kände att två JätteTriss måste jag ha, säger hon. Jag köpte lotterna helt på reklamen, annars hade jag inte gått in i butiken.

Hon satsade 200 kronor, och fick mångfalt betalt. 10 000 000 kronor är tillräckligt mycket pengar för att den kvinnliga busschauffören ska ta ut en ny kurs i livet.

– Nu ska jag inte köra en meter buss till. Jag ska vidareutbilda mig och ge mig ut och resa, säger hon.

När det här skrivs finns fortfarande en JätteTriss värd 10 000 000 kronor kvar att köpa i butik. På svenskaspel.se finns två tiomiljonerslotter att hitta.

För mer information kontakta Johan Tisell på Svenska Spels informationsavdelning 070 – 322 55 21

Taggar: JätteTriss, vinster

#### **Exposure**

 Sees advertising for instant lottery at kiosk, feels urge to buy tickets

#### **Opportunity**

- Enters the kiosk and buys two lottery tickets

#### Perceived social mobility

- Low. Will immediately quit work driving bus, will instead study
- Will travel, will start a new life

#### Risk?

- Impulsively spends SEK200 on gambling

## **Closing remarks**

### A conceptual issue

- Theoretical point of view: interesting to isolate specific risk factors directly related to professions (regression analyses)
- Empirical point of view: work categories "are as they are" (low/high risk)
- Both points of view are of potential value for prevention.

#### **Conclusions**

- Very big differences in gambling risk across occupations
- Some differences are caused by socio-demographic factors and sociocultural values characterizing particular occupational groups
- Other differences seem to be caused by factors specific to an occupation
- Future research may say more about these factors



per.binde@globalstudies.gu.se ulla.romild@folkhalsomyndigheten.se