



Convenience Advertising

QQR

ACN 056 122 662

QUALITATIVE & QUANTITATIVE SOCIAL RESEARCH

PO Box 12, Gungahlin ACT 2912
Ph: 02 6242 1008 Fax: 02 6242 1024
Email: qqsr@orac.net.au
Dr Stephen Mugford, Managing Director

Convenience Advertising of G Line Messages

Report on Field Work Findings

Dr Stephen Mugford

11.11. 1999

9911043

1 Summary of findings

Research was carried out with 202 respondents, divided between three locations—‘ethnic’ clubs (49), metropolitan (112) and non-metropolitan (41) general club locations. The latter two sets were also divided into male (79) and female (74) groups.

Respondents were adults who used locations in which Convenience Advertising placed material for G Line products in toilet facilities. QQSR designed the research and received and analysed the data for the report.

The sample proved to be:

- **A reasonable cross section of the community**—there were no striking differences between the distributions of age, marital status (etc) that were obtained vs. those that might have been expected;
- **Reasonably educated**—over 50% had attended school to Year 12/13 and over 50% had either obtained or were studying for some further qualification;
- **Employed and/or studying**—about 7% were unemployed, 2% on home duties;
- **English speaking**—although a quarter were interviewed in ‘ethnic’ locations, almost all of them spoke English at home and read the posters in English;
- **Comparable with problem gamblers**—as described in data on the BreakEven population.

With regard to exposure and recall:

- **The majority were regular users of the gambling locations**—two thirds used the locations several times a month or more; one third did so several times a week;
- **The vast majority had gambled on the day of interview**—over 90% had played the poker machines, although only small numbers had used Keno or TAB;
- **Under 10% had not been exposed to the material**—these being first time visitors who had not used the toilet facilities during their only visit;
- **Nearly two thirds had completely unprompted recall of seeing a message**—63% recalled seeing material, rising to about 75% when the prompt ‘gambling message’ was added and to over 90% when a modified poster was shown;
- **Basic recall did not vary greatly by category or respondent or location of interview**—unprompted recall was never less than 60% and, on prompt rose to at least 69% (well over 70% for most groups); *and*
- **Most respondents read at least some of the poster**—only a small percentage (15% of female respondents, less of others) saw but did not read the poster.

Their views of the method and campaign strongly showed strong support finding it:

- **An appropriate way to advertise**—close to 90% thought it a good idea to advertise G Line in this way;
- **Contained useful material**—less than a quarter said the material was not useful;
- **Had a reasonable chance of influencing problem gamblers to act on the message or take the Break Even card as well as of influencing significant others to take and pass on a Break Even card to a problem gambler**—less than a third thought there would be no impact, with greatest impact seen among male respondents, the least among those in ethnic club locations.

The Sample

As Table 1 shows, the sample consists of three sub-samples—those interviewed in 'ethnic' club locations, who amounted to 49 (all males), along with 79 males and 74 females interviewed in general locations. As the table shows, the large majority of all three groups were not using the location for the first time.

Table 1: Have you been here before? (number)

	<i>No</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	1	48
<i>Male</i>	14	65
<i>Female</i>	11	63

In turn, these latter samples included some metro and some non metro interviews (see Table 2). This allows an examination of reaction both by gender and by metro/non-metro (although not by the two independently of each other as cell sizes are too small to measure complex interaction effects).

Table 2: Metro/non metro interviews, male and female samples only (number)

	<i>Metro</i>	<i>Non-metro</i>
<i>Male</i>	57	22
<i>Female</i>	55	19

In the first two tables, raw numbers were shown in order to give a clear picture of the data and an understanding of sub-sample size. For the following tables, however, the raw numbers are converted to percentages because these offer a clearer comparative picture, one which is hard to ascertain with raw numbers. It must be noted that the numbers used are not always the full sub sample, since in some areas there is no response. Non-response is never a large proportion, however, and the general pattern based on percentages is a reliable and accurate guide both to the overall story and the few areas of inter-sample difference.

The Venue, Gambling and Exposure to the Posters

Table 3 examines the frequency of use of the venue. We can see two weak trends—first, those interviewed in the ethnic venues are somewhat more likely to be using the location weekly or more (63%, compared with 53% of the males and 41% of the females in the general venues). Second, as the 53/41 comparison makes clear, males are more regular users of the locations than females.

Table 3: How often do you visit this venue? (percent)

	<i>Daily</i>	<i>Several (W)</i>	<i>Weekly</i>	<i>Several (M)</i>	<i>Monthly</i>	<i>Less</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	8	31	24	18	10	6
<i>Male</i>	9	26	18	20	14	14
<i>Female</i>	4	22	15	15	15	15

Turning to table 4, the data show that while poker machines have been used by over 90% of the respondents, Keno and TAB have been used by very few.

Table 4: Which of the types of gambling have you used? (percent)

	<i>Pokies</i>	<i>Keno</i>	<i>TAB</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	90	4	2
<i>Male</i>	91	7	3
<i>Female</i>	96	4	0

Table 5 explores the issue of the proportion of times that respondents gamble when they use the facility. Here there is an interesting link to Table 4. According to the first set of data, there are few differences between the three samples—between 90 and 96 percent have used the poker machines on the day of interview. Yet when asked how often they gamble, the female respondents are more likely than the males to say they always gamble (77%/66%) and both are more likely than the ethnic location respondents (49%). It seems that this may be partially accounted for by actual difference (women do have the highest use of poker machines, but marginally so) and also by a different response set. That is, the three sets of respondents are more different in what they say than in measured behaviour. The safest conclusion from the two tables is that the *large majority of the respondents gamble (on poker machines) on the large majority of occasions that they use the location in which they were interviewed.*

Table 5: How often do you gamble when you come here?

	<i>Every time</i>	<i>Most times</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Never</i>	<i>DK/No ans</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	49	12	29	6	0
<i>Male</i>	66	14	16	3	2
<i>Female</i>	77	13	8	3	0

Tables 6 and 7 examine data relevant to exposure. Table 6 shows that about 70 percent had used the toilets on the day of interview. Table 7 shows that of those (non first time users) who had not used the toilet, most would usually do so. In short, *almost all (well over 90%) of the respondents had been exposed to the messages because of their use of the toilet facilities.*

Table 6: Have you used toilets here today? (percent)

	<i>Yes</i>	<i>No</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	73	27
<i>Male</i>	72	28
<i>Female</i>	70	30

Table 7: If not today, do you usually use toilets? (additional percent)

	<i>Every time</i>	<i>Most times</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	10	17	2
<i>Male</i>	4	13	6
<i>Female</i>	3	10	12

Recall and Respondent Evaluation of the Messages

If respondents were exposed, did they recall seeing the posters? This question was asked at three levels—a completely unprompted recall, a recall prompted by asking if they had seen gambling related messages and a recall assisted by showing a modified version of the poster. As Table 8 shows, the unprompted recall was over 60% for all three groups, and this rose when prompts were used. The prompts showed least rise for the ethnic location sample, but still to a substantial level.

For the other two groups, the rise was very large and came close to 100% recall. Overall, these are very good recall rates.

Table 8: Three levels of recall of poster? (percent)

	<i>Unprompted recall</i>	<i>Recall, verbal prompt</i>	<i>Recall, visual prompt</i>
<i>Ethnic sample</i>	63	69	73
<i>Male Sample</i>	62	78	96
<i>Female Sample</i>	63	81	94

Since a small number of respondents did not recall the messages, the following tables use those who did as the basis for calculating percentage responses.

Table 9 presents material on the extent to which respondents read the message. As may be seen, only a few said they read none of it. About half of the male sample and half of the ethnic location sample (also all males) claimed to have read all of it, while only one quarter of the female sample claimed to have read all of it. It is not possible to ascertain if this represents a real difference in reading or a response bias. Overall, however, it is reasonable to conclude that the large majority of respondents were exposed to the core message. Bearing in mind that problem gamblers are heavy users of gambling locations and thus likely to be exposed repeatedly to the posters it is a reasonable inference that *problem gamblers will definitely be exposed to the messages by this method.*

Table 9: How much of the poster did you read? (percent)

	<i>All</i>	<i>Some</i>	<i>None</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	51	43	6
<i>Male</i>	55	42	3
<i>Female</i>	25	56	15

One important feature to note is that despite the fact that one sample was interviewed in clubs identified as having an ethnic location, *all respondents reported reading the posters in English.*

Table 10 examines the extent to which respondents found the material useful. As the data show, there was a mixed response. Overall, about one third thought it very useful, just under half thought it somewhat useful and a minority thought it not useful. The male sample was the most positive, the ethnic location sample the most divided.

Table 10: How useful did you find the material? (percent)

	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all/DK</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	30	45	25
<i>Male</i>	47	47	7
<i>Female</i>	38	47	16

In table 11 (next page), data are presented concerning the extent to which people thought that problem gamblers would be motivated to contact G line as a consequence of seeing the poster. *Less than one quarter thought this very likely, but the majority thought there was some likelihood of this.* Again, the male sample was the most positive and the ethnic location sample the most divided.

Table 11: Do you think that people with gambling problems would be likely to contact G Line? (percent)

	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all/DK</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	12	45	42
<i>Male</i>	18	71	11
<i>Female</i>	25	60	15

In table 12, the data relate to whether a problem gambler would be likely to take the Break Even card. *The response is very positive—the large majority think this possible and a substantial group think it very likely.* Once again, the male sample was the most positive and the ethnic location sample the most divided.

Table 12: Do you think that people with gambling problems would be likely to take the Break Even card? (percent)

	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all/DK</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	34	36	30
<i>Male</i>	51	46	4
<i>Female</i>	43	38	19

Turning to the issue of whether people would take the card to give to a friend or relative who had a problem, Table 13 shows a familiar pattern—*substantial minorities think that this is very likely and majority think it possible.* Yet again, the male sample was the most positive and the ethnic location sample the most divided.

Table 13: Do you think that people with friends/relatives with gambling problems would be likely to take the Break Even card to give to that person? (percent)

	<i>Very</i>	<i>Somewhat</i>	<i>Not at all/DK</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	45	15	40
<i>Male</i>	34	60	6
<i>Female</i>	38	49	13

Asked the general question of whether the method was a good idea, a very clear and very large majority thought it was, as the data illustrate in Table 14.

Table 14: Do you think this is an effective way to advertise? (percent)

	<i>Yes, def</i>	<i>Yes, prob</i>	<i>Not sure/DK</i>	<i>No, prob</i>	<i>No def</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	59	25	6	6	3
<i>Male</i>	57	37	1	1	3
<i>Female</i>	51	42	0	7	0

Asked about why it might not be a good idea, as well as any other ideas they had about the problem, relatively few respondents had negative comments. Although negative comment was sought, many comments recorded were positive, saying the posters and the campaign were a good idea. These included:

- All people use toilet*
- Any advertising & support is good not just for gamblers but for friends & relatives*
- Everyone uses them—it's great*
- Good idea*
- Good ideas-gets people when they are gambling-may be offended or in denial this overcomes that problem*
- Good position over hand dryer*
- Good to have signs within gambling environment*
- Good way of advertising gambling is a big problem which needs more media attention*

Great idea people need to have free advise & options to deal with gaming addiction
 Have seen signs in many other venues - good idea
 Help line is a good service
 It's a necessity some impact is better than none
 Keep going as is
 Keep it up advertise when & where self help groups – i.e. GA are available
 More advertising its a difficult problem to admit. The cards are a good idea.
 More relevant to females as there seems to be more women spending hours on machines
 Nice – plain & simple
 Put up in more places
 Reaching people where the problem exists a lot of people are stuck in front of message
 Remembers signs from several venues thinks they have an anonymous feel and could be really useful
 Said people would probably seek help in their own time but this was helpful
 Signs are good as they provide privacy
 Signs are very noticeable
 Think gambling help services should be more widely promoted

The negative comments that were made are recorded below. As will be seen, there is a minor theme about people not being accessible to information and needing to take responsibility for themselves (which, true or not, is not really relevant to this campaign per se) and a scattering of other comments made by only one or two people.

Advertise in local papers
 Bigger
 But people have to acknowledge their own problem
 Campaign too soft, if you have a problem you can't escape the machines.
 Depends on the individual
 Don't think people look at it,
 Don't stand out. Outside venue/entry exit venue for people who don't notice signs
 Everyone with a gambling problem would argue that they didn't have a problem.
 The cards are good
 Get rid of machines
 Have signs near machines
 I have taken a card but I haven't called the numbers. It's good that it's there.
 Intoxicated patrons, out the Liberals
 It's a female problem but how do you stop people? (patron acknowledges having taken card)
 It's an individual problem - depends on the individual
 It's an individual thing people tend to talk to friends first
 It's hard to get help to them if they don't admit they have a problem
 It's hard to help people with these problems because they keep to themselves
 It's important not to make problem gamblers feel bad about themselves.
 It's just not going to do any good,
 It's up to people to be ready to help themselves, you can't do anything for them
 Limit the machines, have more help from the government. Do more.
 May not realise problem so focused on getting back what they've lost
 More advertising its a difficult problem to admit. The cards are a good idea.
 More TV ads
 Need bigger signs
 No, television would be more effective
 Not effective in gaming areas. Worthwhile but how effective?
 Not promoting cause right way, more media saturation explain easiness of access
 People come here to gamble,
 People have to be ready to help themselves, otherwise they'll block out information
 People won't take notice/this doesn't apply to me! Stop 24hr gaming facilities
 Put up in more places

education. This sample includes a wide range of educational levels. Hence comparisons between these data and problem gamblers are reasonable.

In Table 17, the data show that a substantial proportion have obtained post school qualification, although only a minority have obtained or are studying for a degree (male sample highest at 25 percent obtained or currently studying).

Table 17: Educational Qualifications (percent)

	<i>Deg Study</i>	<i>Degree</i>	<i>TC* Study</i>	<i>TC</i>	<i>Other Study</i>	<i>Other Qual</i>	<i>DK/No ans</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	8	14	10	24	2	6	32
<i>Male</i>	6	19	1	14	0	25	25
<i>Female</i>	4	9	1	5	8	20	50

*Trade certificate

Table 18 shows that the large majority are employed, although in line with the community generally the pattern for females includes a higher proportion of part time workers and a lower proportion of full time workers than in the other two samples.

Table 18: Employment Status (percent)

	<i>FT</i>	<i>PT</i>	<i>Study</i>	<i>Study + PT</i>	<i>Study + FT</i>	<i>Home Duties</i>	<i>Unemp.</i>	<i>Other</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	54	8	2	2	0	0	14	18
<i>Male</i>	68	8	0	5	0	1	8	8
<i>Female</i>	47	20	1	8	5	4	3	9

BreakEven data indicate that unemployment levels are higher among the problem gambler population than among the general population. In this regard, the current survey data are more nearly like the general population than problem gamblers. On the other hand, these data do include unemployed people who are gambling.

Table 19 shows that only about one fifth of the sample have never been married (de fact and/or de jure) yet less than half of the sample are currently living in a relationship. This pattern is cross linked with age—the never married are clustered in the younger ages, the separated/divorced in the older ages. Nonetheless, the rate of currently partnered people may be a little on the low side (it is very hard to calculate exactly what pattern to expect on a random selection basis).

Table 19: Marital Status (percent)

	<i>Never M</i>	<i>De Facto</i>	<i>Married</i>	<i>Sep/Div</i>	<i>Other</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	22	8	38	10	18
<i>Male</i>	18	7	36	12	6
<i>Female</i>	22	6	23	16	5

BreakEven data indicate that problem gamblers are disproportionately unlikely to be currently in a marital relationship. As noted above, part of the reason for there being non married people in this sample is a result of the age distribution. In so far, however as there is some evidence of a high rate of non-married people, this would fit with the problem gambler profile. *There is, therefore, some reason to suppose that there is some element of the problem gambler profile to be found among these respondents—some may be problem gamblers, others at risk of becoming problem gamblers.*

Varied proportions of respondents have children (again age related) and the pattern is probably in line with expectations for a community sample. If there is any deviation, it would be in the direction of a lower than expected rate of parents, especially in the female sample.

The data in tables 18 and 19 offer a hint of a familiar pattern—problem behaviours (like gambling, illicit drug use, etc) are more commonly found with those with lower levels of social ties and commitment to ‘conventional’ life styles. It would, however, be premature to conclude firmly from this smallish sample that this factor is at work here, although the parallels with the problem gambler, BreakEven data would also point that way.

Table 20: Number of Children (percent)

	<i>None</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2 or more</i>	<i>DK No ans</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	40	10	48	2
<i>Male</i>	34	12	32	1
<i>Female</i>	30	14	27	1

Table 21 examines language spoken at home. As noted earlier in regard to the language in which the posters were read, although one sample was interviewed in ethnic club locations, the vast majority of each sub sample speak English at home. It is quite possible that those with good enough English to be interviewed are second (or later) generation migrants which links with both the fact that English was spoken at home and that the posters were read in English.

Table 21: Language spoken at home (percent)

	<i>Ital</i>	<i>Chinese</i>	<i>Greek</i>	<i>Arabic</i>	<i>Viet'ese</i>	<i>English</i>	<i>Other</i>
<i>Ethnic</i>	0	0	2	0	4	88	4
<i>Male</i>	2	0	1	0	0	70	1
<i>Female</i>	0	0	1	0	1	74	1

Metro vs. Non Metro

Table 22 examines the metro/non metro split within the female and male samples. The data indicate little variation in the pattern of recall—it is slightly higher in the non-metro area, but the differences are unlikely to be significant.

Table 22: Recall rates for Metro/Non Metro, combined male and female samples (percents)

	<i>Unprompted recall</i>	<i>Recall, verbal prompt</i>	<i>Recall, visual prompt</i>
<i>Metro</i>	61	78	98
<i>NonMetro</i>	66	82	87