

Roberts Amanda (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-2889-9551)

Sharman Steve (Orcid ID: 0000-0001-9816-7981)

The ability of the UK population surveys to capture the true nature of the extent of gambling related harm

Amanda Roberts¹ Steve Sharman², Henrietta Bowden-Jones^{3,4}

¹School of Psychology, University of Lincoln, Brayford Pool, Lincoln, LN6 7TS, UK

²National Addiction Centre, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology, and Neuroscience, King's College London. 4 Windsor Walk, Camberwell, SE5 8AF, UK

³National Problem Gambling Clinic, 69 Warwick Road, Earls Court, London, SW5 9HB, UK

⁴Department of Psychiatry, University of Cambridge, Herchel Smith Building for Brain & Mind Sciences, Forvie Site, Robinson Way, Cambridge CB2 0SZ, UK

Corresponding author: Amanda Roberts, aroberts@lincoln.ac.uk

Declaration of interests: Amanda Roberts has received funding from the Society for the Study of Addiction (SSA), and the Gambling Research Exchange Ontario (GREO). Steve Sharman has received funding from the Society for the Study of Addiction (SSA), the King's Prize Fellowship Scheme funded by the Wellcome Trust Institutional Strategic Support Fund, and as part of the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre funding for the National Addiction Centre. Henrietta Bowden-Jones is the Director of The National Problem Gambling Clinic which receives funds from the National Health Service and GambleAware. After March 21st 2022, the clinic will only receive funds from the National Health Service. She is also board member of the International Society for the Study of Behavioural Addictions, President of the Royal Society of Medicine Psychiatry Section and Trustee of the RSM Elected Board of Science member at the British Medical Association.

Author Contributions: Amanda Roberts: Investigation, Henrietta Bowden-Jones: Conceptualization, Investigation, Steve Sharman: Investigation.

Key words: gambling, gambling harm, prevalence surveys, data capture

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/add.15864

The UK government is undergoing consultation to reform the UK 2005 Gambling Act. Gambling behaviour in the general population was measured via the British Gambling Prevalence Survey (BGPS), (1999, 2007, and 2010) [1], and since 2010, via the Health Survey England (HSE) and the Scottish Health Survey (SHeS) [2] and more recently by small telephone surveys carried out quarterly by the Gambling Commission (GC) [3].

The GC telephone surveys involve only a small non-representative sample and rely on respondents answering a number they do not recognise. Likewise, although BGPS, HSE data provide a cross-sectional snapshot of gambling behaviour, such surveys are subject to methodological limitations. For example, both surveys exclude persons who do not have a residential address, such as those who are experiencing homelessness, and also fails to include people who reside at institutional addresses such as hospitals, prisons, military barracks, and student halls of residence. Such populations are likely to have higher rates of gambling problems [4, 5]. As a consequence, both surveys are likely to significantly under-report gambling related harm. Such methodological limitations are not limited to gambling surveys; a recent article regarding measuring heroin use via general population surveys (the US National Survey on Drug Use and Health) drew the conclusions that such methodological limitations are likely to lead to significant underestimation of the disorder [6].

Likewise, prevalence surveys rely on subjective self-reports, and are prone to error [7], such as selective non-response, or selection bias [6, 8], and socially desirable responding [9]. Even the largest surveys have been shown to rely on the responses of a small number of the overall populace [6]. Research has shown that people may be less likely to take part in research, and to disclose problematic gambling for reasons such as stigma [10].

Furthermore, data collected by prevalence surveys is cross-sectional which does not capture the episodic nature of disordered gambling [11, 12], or the harms experienced beyond the individual. Gambling harms can impact the health and wellbeing of individuals, as well as families, communities and society as a whole [13]. Additionally, both surveys use the Problem Gambling Severity Index (PGSI), which has reliable properties for detecting Gambling Disorder, but is less appropriate for measuring individuals who are 'at-risk' of problematic gambling [14]. Yet at-risk gamblers are estimated to account for approximately 85% of the burden of gambling harm at population level [15, 16].

The primary focus of the BGPS was gambling behaviour; however, the number of gambling questions have been reduced in the broader HSE and SHeS [2]. Consequently, key topics which would provide vital evidence are lacking. In addition, the Health Surveys include the gambling questions towards the end of the survey which can reduce data quality due to decreases in concentration and enthusiasm towards latter sections of a questionnaire [17]. Likewise, positioning gambling questions at the end of a long survey to detect a population with high impulsivity levels is a significant issue as it is unlikely that respondents work their way

consistently to the end [18]. Gambling questions in health surveys have correspondingly been demonstrated to give a much lower prevalence than gambling specific questionnaires [19].

Akin to the foundation of the formulation of substance use policy, it is crucial that we quantify and recognise the extent of harms attributable to gambling. This is unlikely to be achieved by cross-sectional surveys alone. There is need for a gambling-specific, longitudinal, prevalence study that utilises more comprehensive and inclusive data collection methodologies, and better understands the true extent of wider gambling harms. This data can then be triangulated with existing large-scale datasets such as those held by the financial sector, health and social care records, and criminal justice systems. Although a large task with multiple obstacles, better cohesion across sectors is essential to move towards a better use of data that can support the identification, minimisation, and prevention of gambling related harms.

References

1. Wardle H, Moody A, Spence S, Orford J, Volberg R, Jotangia D, et al. British Gambling Prevalence Survey 2010. London (UK): National Centre for Social Research;2011. Available from: https://www.academia.edu/446044/Wardle_H_Moody_A_Spence_S_Orford_J_Volberg_R_Jotangia_D_Griffiths_M_Hussey_D_and_Dobbie_F_2011_British_Gambling_Prevalence_Survey_2010_London_The_Stationery_Office
2. Health Survey for England. Adult's health-related behaviours. Health and Social Care Information Centre;2018. Available from: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/health-survey-for-england/2018>
3. Gambling Commission. Gambling behaviour in 2021: Findings from the quarterly telephone survey; 2021. Available from <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/statistics-and-research/publication/year-to-March-2021>
4. Sharman S, Dreyer J, Aitken M, Clark L, Bowden-Jones H. Rates of problematic gambling in a British homeless sample: a preliminary study. *Journal of Gambling Studies*. 2015 Jun;31(2):525-32. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-014-9444-7>
5. Sharman S, Butler K, Roberts A. Psychosocial risk factors in disordered gambling: a descriptive systematic overview of vulnerable populations. *Addictive Behaviors*. 2019 Dec 1;99:106071. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2019.106071>
6. Reuter P, Caulkins JP, Midgette G. Heroin use cannot be measured adequately with a general population survey. *Addiction*. 2021 Oct;116(10):2600-9.
7. Rosenman R, Tennekoon V, Hill LG. Measuring bias in self-reported data. *International Journal of Behavioural and Healthcare Research*. 2011 Jan 1;2(4):320-32. <https://www.inderscienceonline.com/doi/abs/10.1504/IJBHR.2011.043414>

8. Cheung KL, Peter M, Smit C, de Vries H, Pieterse ME. The impact of non-response bias due to sampling in public health studies: a comparison of voluntary versus mandatory recruitment in a Dutch national survey on adolescent health. *BMC public health*. 2017 Dec;17(1):1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-017-4189-8>
9. Goldstein AL, Vilhena-Churchill N, Munroe M, Stewart SH, Flett GL, Hoaken PN. Understanding the effects of social desirability on gambling self-reports. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*. 2017 Dec;15(6):1342-59. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11469-016-9668-0>
10. Roberts A, Bowden-Jones H, Roberts D, Sharman S. Should GPs routinely screen for gambling disorders?. *British Journal of General Practice*. 2019 May 1;69(682):226-7. <https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp19X702329>
11. Reith G, Dobbie F. Gambling careers: A longitudinal, qualitative study of gambling behaviour. *Addiction Research & Theory*. 2013 Oct 1;21(5):376-90. <https://doi.org/10.3109/16066359.2012.731116>
12. Williams RJ, Hann RG, Schopflocher DP, West BL, McLaughlin P, White N, King K, Flexhaug T. Quinte longitudinal study of gambling and problem gambling. Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre; 2015. Available from: <https://hdl.handle.net/10133/3641>
13. Wardle H, Reith G, Best D, McDaid D, Platt S. Measuring gambling-related harms: a framework for action. Gambling Commission, Birmingham, UK; 2018. Available from <https://www.gamblingcommission.gov.uk/PDF/Measuring-gambling-related-harms.pdf>
14. Currie SR, Hodgins DC, Casey DM. Validity of the problem gambling severity index interpretive categories. *Journal of gambling studies*. 2013 Jun;29(2):311-27. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10899-012-9300-6>
15. Williams RJ, Volberg RA. The classification accuracy of four problem gambling assessment instruments in population research. *International Gambling Studies*. 2014 Jan 2;14(1):15-28. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2013.839731>
16. Browne M, Greer N, Rawat V, Rockloff M. A population-level metric for gambling-related harm. *International Gambling Studies*. 2017 May 4;17(2):163-75. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459795.2017.1304973>
17. O'Reilly-Shah VN. Factors influencing healthcare provider respondent fatigue answering a globally administered in-app survey. *PeerJ*. 2017 Sep 12;5:e3785. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3785>
18. Ioannidis K, Hook R, Wickham K, Grant JE, Chamberlain SR. Impulsivity in gambling disorder and problem gambling: a meta-analysis. *Neuropsychopharmacology*. 2019 Jul;44(8):1354-61. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-019-0393-9>
19. Williams RJ, Volberg RA. Impact of survey description, administration format, and exclusionary criteria on population prevalence rates of problem gambling. *International Gambling Studies*. 2009 Aug 1;9(2):101-17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14459790902911653>