

**JOB SATISFACTION, SUBSTANCE USE, AND GAMBLING BEHAVIOUR  
OF NORTHERN ALBERTAN CASINO EMPLOYEES**

**LYNDSEY DANGERFIELD**  
**B. H. Sc., University of Lethbridge, 2002**

A Thesis  
Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies  
of the University of Lethbridge  
In Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree

**MASTER OF SCIENCE**

School of Health Sciences  
University of Lethbridge  
LETHBRIDGE, ALBERTA, CANADA

© Lyndsey Dangerfield, 2004

## **ABSTRACT**

Relatively little is known about Canadian casino employees. The present study is a broad-based investigation intended to shed some light on this population. There were several specific areas of investigation. These included job satisfaction, substance use and abuse, gambling behaviour, gambling attitudes and beliefs, and problem gambling status. Because of this high-risk group's excessive exposure to gambling, casino employees' gambling behaviour may be indicative of the general adult population's future gambling behaviour. Although there is some prior evidence of higher rates of problem gambling in this population, the causal direction of this relationship is not well established. That is, does working in a casino place employees at a higher risk for problem gambling, or does the industry actually attract problem gamblers?

The present study investigated the characteristics of 123 Canadian casino employees from two Alberta casinos. The study aimed to establish the actual impact of casino employment on substance use and gambling behaviour by means of a follow-up questionnaire that was distributed six months after the baseline questionnaire was collected. The results of the follow-up questionnaire tentatively suggest that problem gamblers are attracted to the casino industry, rather than the casino industry placing its employees at a higher risk for problem gambling. The study also found that Northern Albertan casino employees have higher rates of smoking, alcohol use, illicit drug use, medication use, gambling, and problem gambling than the general Albertan workforce.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract.....	i
Table of Contents.....	ii
List of Tables.....	v
Chapter 1.....	1
1 Overview.....	1
1.1 Introduction.....	1
1.2 Study Objectives and Significance.....	2
Chapter 2.....	5
2 Literature Review.....	5
2.1 Demographics of Gaming Employees.....	5
2.2 Benefits of Gaming Industry Employment.....	6
2.3 Casino Employees' Exposure to Secondhand Smoke.....	6
2.4 Prevalence of Smoking among Casino Employees.....	8
2.5 Impact of Casino Employment on Smoking Behaviour.....	9
2.6 Job Satisfaction of Casino Employees.....	10
2.7 Gaming Employees' Health and Safety Concerns.....	14
2.8 Prevalence of Problem Gambling and Alcohol Abuse among Casino Employees.....	16
2.9 Impact of Casino Employment on Problem Gambling and Alcohol Use.....	19
Chapter 3.....	23
3 Methods.....	23
3.1 Sample.....	23
3.1.1 Site Selection.....	23
3.1.2 Casinos.....	23
3.2 Survey Design.....	24
3.3 Baseline Questionnaire Administration.....	25
3.4 Follow-Up Questionnaire Administration.....	26
3.5 Research Questions and Hypotheses.....	27
Chapter 4.....	30
4 Results.....	30
4.1 Response Rates.....	30
4.2 Demographics.....	31
4.3 Employment and Job Satisfaction.....	34
4.3.1 Initial Motivation For Seeking Employment in the Casino Industry.....	34
4.3.2 An Overview of Casino Employees' Job Satisfaction.....	35
4.3.3 Analysis of Open-Ended Questions.....	37
4.3.4 Primary Sources of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction.....	37
4.4 Tobacco Use.....	39
4.4.1 Smoking Prevalence.....	39
4.5 Alcohol Use.....	40

4.5.1	Alcohol Consumption Frequency and Quantity.....	40
4.5.2	Prevalence of Alcohol Related Problems .....	41
4.6	Medication and Illicit Drug Use.....	42
4.6.1	Prevalence of Medication Use among Casino Employees and the General Albertan Adult Workforce in the Past Year.....	42
4.6.2	Prevalence of Illicit Drug Use among Casino Employees and the General Albertan Adult Workforce in the Past Year.....	43
4.6.3	Prevalence of Drug Related Problems.....	44
4.6.4	Prevalence of Mental Health Problems.....	45
4.7	Gambling Beliefs.....	45
4.7.1	Estimation of the Percentage of Problem Gamblers in the General Albertan Adult Population.....	45
4.7.2	Primary Causes of Problem Gambling / Motivations for Gambling.....	45
4.7.3	Most Common Demographic Characteristics of Problem Gamblers.....	47
4.7.4	Casino Employees' Perceptions of the Most Common Demographic Characteristics of Albertan Problem Gamblers Compared to the Demographic Characteristics of Albertan Problem Gamblers (Smith & Wynne, 2002).....	49
4.7.5	Beliefs About Gambling's Societal Impact.....	50
4.7.6	Susceptibility to Gambling Fallacies.....	51
4.7.7	Suggested Measures to Decrease Problem Gambling.....	51
4.8	Gambling.....	52
4.8.1	Gambling Prevalence.....	52
4.8.2	Motivations for Quitting Gambling.....	53
4.8.3	Gambling Frequency in the Past Six Months.....	54
4.8.4	Approximate Amount of Money Spent in a Typical Month on Gambling Activities.....	56
4.8.5	CPGI Categorization.....	57
4.8.6	Prevalence of Problem Gambling among Family Members.....	59
4.9	Impact of Casino Employment.....	59
4.9.1	Retrospective Estimate of Impact.....	59
4.9.2	Correlation between Length of Casino Employment at Baseline with Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction.....	61
4.9.3	Correlation between Length of Casino Employment at Baseline with Changes in Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction at Follow- Up.....	62

Chapter 5.....	64
5 Discussion.....	64
5.1 Job Satisfaction.....	64
5.2 Substance Use and Abuse.....	66
5.3 Gambling and Problem Gambling.....	69
5.3.1 Beliefs and Attitudes about Gambling and Problem Gambling.....	73
5.4 Impact of Casino Employment.....	74
5.5 Study Limitations.....	82
5.6 Conclusion.....	85
References.....	87
7 Appendices.....	91
7.1 Casino Alberta A Baseline Questionnaire.....	91
7.2 Casino Alberta B Baseline Questionnaire.....	103
7.3 Follow-Up Questionnaire.....	114
7.4 Description of the Canadian Problem Gambling Index (CPGI).....	126
7.5 The Canadian Problem Gambling Index.....	127
7.6 Primary Sources of Job Satisfaction.....	128
7.7 Primary Sources of Job Dissatisfaction.....	132
7.8 Additional Comments.....	136

## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1	Shaffer et al. (2002) Respondents Participating in All Three Assessments' Prevalence of Past-Year Gambling and Drinking...21	
TABLE 2	Casino Alberta A and B Baseline and Follow-Up Response Rates.....31	
TABLE 3	Demographic Characteristics of Canadian Gambling Workers, and Casino and AADAC Employee Survey Respondents.....32	
TABLE 4	Initial Motivation for Seeking Employment in the Casino Industry.....34	
TABLE 5	Job Satisfaction.....36	
TABLE 6	Primary Sources of Job Satisfaction.....38	
TABLE 7	Primary Sources of Job Dissatisfaction.....39	
TABLE 8	Smoking Prevalence.....39	
TABLE 9	Alcohol Consumption Frequency and Quantity in Casino Employees and the General Albertan Workforce.....39	
TABLE 10	Prevalence of Alcohol Related Problems.....40	
TABLE 11	Prevalence of Medication Use in the Past Year.....41	
TABLE 12	Prevalence of Illicit Drug Use in the Past Year.....42	
TABLE 13	Prevalence of Drug Related Problems.....44	
TABLE 14	Casino Employees' Perception of the Primary Causes of Problem Gambling Versus Moderate Risk and Problem Gamblers' Reported Motivations for Gambling (Smith & Wynne, 2002).....44	
TABLE 15	Most Common Demographic Characteristics of Problem Gamblers as Identified by Casino Employees.....47	
TABLE 16	Demographic Profile of Albertan Problem Gamblers.....48	
TABLE 17	Beliefs About Gambling's Societal Impact.....49	
TABLE 18	Susceptibility to Gambling Fallacies.....50	
TABLE 19	Suggested Measures to Decrease Problem Gambling.....51	
TABLE 20	Gambling Prevalence.....53	
TABLE 21	Gambling Frequency in the Past Six Months.....55	
TABLE 22	Casino Employees' Participation in Gambling Activities Versus the General Albertan Adult Population's Participation in Gambling Activities.....56	
TABLE 23	Canadian Problem Gambling Index (CPGI) Scores.....58	
TABLE 24	Prevalence of Problem Gambling among Family Members.....59	
TABLE 25	Casino Employees' Perceived Impact of Employment on Tobacco Use, Substance Use, and Gambling Behaviour.....60	
TABLE 26	Impact of Casino Employment on Attitude Towards Problem Gambling and Problem Gamblers.....60	
TABLE 27	Correlation Between Length of Casino Employment and Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction.....61	
TABLE 28	Correlation Between Length of Casino Employment and Change in Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction from Baseline to Six Month Follow-Up.....62	

## CHAPTER 1

### 1 Overview

#### 1.1 Introduction

Gambling has evolved to be both a widely accessible and socially acceptable form of entertainment in Canadian society since government-run lotteries were first introduced in 1969. In 2002, three-quarters of adult Canadians participated in some form of gambling in the past year (The Daily, 2003, December 12). Gambling enthusiasts, however, do not appear to be evenly distributed throughout the country. In 2001, the average yearly expenditure varied from a low of \$105 in the three territories to a high of \$604 in Alberta (The Daily, 2003, April 22). Correspondingly, Alberta is among the most dependent of the Canadian provinces on gambling with an estimated 5% of the province's 2003-2004 revenue deriving from gaming (Alberta Government, 2004).

The Canadian gambling industry has consistently surpassed the growth of most other industries year after year gaining its greatest momentum in the 1990s when provincial governments began to legalize permanent casinos and video lottery terminals (VLTs) (Marshall, 1998). Impressively, net revenue from government-run lotteries, VLTs, and casinos exceeded \$10.7 billion in 2001 – four times the revenue generated in 1992 (The Daily, 2002, July 18).

In the past decade, casinos eclipsed lotteries as the primary generator of gambling revenue. In 1992, casinos generated a mere 1% of the total gambling revenue, but by 1998 casinos accounted for a full 38% of the total revenue (The Daily, 2000, March 8). However, this percentage has since dropped marginally due to the proliferation of gaming machines in lounges and racetracks: In 2002, casinos accounted for 34% of all non-charity gambling net revenues while lotteries, VLTs, and slot machines located outside casinos claimed 27%, 23%, and 17%, respectively (The Daily, 2003, April 22).

In an effort to accommodate the ever-increasing numbers of gamblers patronizing the casinos, the number of jobs in the gaming industry more than tripled between 1992 and 2002, from 12,000 to 42,000 (Marshall, 2001; The Daily, 2003, April 22). Although this considerable employment boom only represented 0.3% of all jobs in 1999, gaming has accounted for 2% of all new job growth since 1992 (The Daily, 2000, March 8). Currently in Alberta, there is an estimated 11,000 gaming industry employees (Alberta Government, 2002).

#### 1.2 Study Objectives and Significance

The present study's primary objective was to obtain a global 'snapshot' of Albertan casino employees due to the general paucity of literature on this population. Within this general objective, there were several more specific objectives.

The first was to better understand the demographic characteristics of Northern Albertan casino employees. Although previous research has identified some of these features, very little of it has been conducted in Canada and none of the studies have been specific to the province of Alberta.

A second objective was to assess the job satisfaction and job stressors of casino employees. Again, minimal previous research has concentrated on this specific area in Canada. This information will be valuable to gaming industry employers as job turnover rates and job absenteeism are strongly correlated with job satisfaction. Ideally, identification of these stressors will help employers diminish these problems.

A third objective was to assess the substance use patterns of casino employees relative to the general Albertan workforce. Because casino employees are exposed to more tobacco smoke and alcohol consumption than most people, it will be instructive to determine whether this is associated with higher substance use in this group.

A fourth objective was to assess the gambling behaviour, gambling attitudes, gambling beliefs, and problem gambling status of casino employees. Since the majority of gaming industry employees are exposed to gambling on a full-time basis, the study of this unique population may be indicative of future gambling trends within the general adult Canadian population if the Canadian gaming industry maintains its current expansion rate (Shaffer et al., 1999).

The results of the study will also be insightful to government and industry employees focusing on the prevention and treatment of problem gambling. Because casino employees have regular contact with many problem gamblers, they are potentially the first contact point for intervention. Their attitudes towards problem gambling and problem gamblers may be indicative of how receptive they are to both intervening with this population and training designed to heighten their awareness of problem gambling. (Several provinces have recently implemented problem gambling awareness training for gaming employees.) Finally, casino employees' beliefs about the demographic characteristics of problem gamblers will help triangulate information that has been collected about this population from provincial prevalence studies and treatment organizations.

A final objective was to assess the impact of employment on these abovementioned variables. For example, there is some prior research that indicates casino employees have higher rates of gambling and problem gambling. However, it has yet to be established whether people with these characteristics preferentially seek out employment in the gaming industry, or if employment in the industry advances the development of problem gambling. These same cause-effect relationships also need to be further explored with respect to job satisfaction and substance use.

The impact of casino employment will be relevant to the gaming industry's hiring procedures. Presently in Alberta casinos, the only conditions for employment are that the potential employee must be bondable and have no criminal record. If it is determined that working in the industry tends to exacerbate employees' pre-existing gambling problems, casino human resource personnel may wish to consider screening potential employees for conditions such as problem gambling status.



## CHAPTER 2

### 2 Literature Review

Despite the phenomenal growth of the entire Canadian gaming industry, relatively little is known about the individuals who make gambling widely accessible to the Canadian population on a daily basis: the casino employees. The following review exhaustively details the literature that exists on this population.

#### 2.1 Demographics of Gaming Employees

Research has revealed that gaming employees in North America are more likely to be female when compared to employees in non-gaming industries. Statistics Canada found that males hold only 44% of the jobs in the gaming industry, whereas in other non-gaming industries men claim 54% of the positions (The Daily, 2000, March 8; Marshall, 2001). Similarly, a 2003 study of an estimated 255,757 American casino employees reported that of the participating casinos, 48.7% were male and 51.3% were female (American Gaming Association, 2003). In comparison, female workers hold only 47.2% of the positions in the National US workforce (American Gaming Association, 2003).

While full-time wages have increased for males and females in the gaming industry since 1997, both male and female wages remain a full \$3 less than the average full-time wages of employees in non-gaming industries (The Daily, 2000, March 8; Marshall, 2001). Marshall (2001) also reports that employees in the gaming industry are more likely to be under 35, in addition to being paid an hourly wage as opposed to a salary.

#### 2.2 Benefits of Gaming Industry Employment

Nevertheless, there are still some clear benefits associated with employment in the gaming industry. A comprehensive 1997 US national survey of 178,000 casino gaming employees found that as a result of employment, 63% of employees had better access to health care; 43% had better access to day care; 9% were able to get off welfare; 16% were able to stop unemployment benefits; 65% were able to develop new job skills; 33% were able to improve their education; 60% were able to pay their bills more regularly; and 52% were now able to save for their retirement (American Gaming Association, 1997).

#### 2.3 Casino Employees' Exposure to Secondhand Smoke

In the past few decades there have been three overlapping clean indoor air policy initiatives in the US (Siegel & Skeer, 2003). In the first wave, American policy makers aimed to protect the public from secondhand smoke exposure in public places such as movie theatres, retail stores and public buildings. In the second wave, smoking regulation concentrated on the workplace with a focus on office buildings. In the third and current wave, attention is finally being focused on the long-overlooked service workplace. Unfortunately, however, the focus is almost entirely on restaurants, largely neglecting other service establishments such as the "5 B's": bars, bowling alleys, billiard halls, betting establishments, and bingo parlours.

Because of this unsatisfactory pattern of policy focus, protection of employees from secondhand smoke exposure varies depending on the type of establishment. Atlantic City casinos, for example, have set a promising precedent: Most Atlantic City casino employee cafeterias now offer their employees food in a smoke-free environment (Rose, 2002). But this standard is disappointingly rare in the 5

B's. For example, of the 1,388 local clean indoor air ordinances in the US in May 2002, 75% regulated smoking in workplaces, 67% regulated smoking in restaurants, but only 8% regulated smoking in bars (Siegel & Skeer, 2003). Correspondingly, 45 states restrict smoking in workplaces and 30 restrict smoking in restaurants, but as late as July 2003, only five had enacted legislation that regulates smoking in bars (Siegel & Skeer, 2003). Due to this trend in clean indoor air policy adoption, workers in service workplaces – particularly the 5 B's – do not benefit from the same level of protection from secondhand smoke exposure as both the general public and individuals who work in office type settings (Siegel & Skeer, 2003).

Stirred by the inadequate protection to secondhand smoke in the service workplace, Siegel and Skeer (2003) conducted a study to determine the extent of exposure to secondhand smoke in the 5 B's. Their findings were alarming: Nicotine concentrations in the 5 B's proved to be 2.4 to 18 times higher than in offices or residences, and 1.5 to 11.7 times higher than in restaurants. Even in the lowest exposure conditions, nicotine concentrations in the 5 B's exceeded those in offices by a factor of 1.8 to 16.0 and eclipsed those in restaurants by a factor of 1.1 to 10.1. At these exposure levels, estimated working lifetime excess lung cancer mortality risk from secondhand smoke exposure for 5 B employees is between 1.0 – 4.1/1000. This lung cancer mortality risk greatly surpasses the typical de manifestis risk level of 0.3/1000.

Siegel and Skeer's (2003) findings were similar to those reported in a 1998 study by Trout et al. (1998). The latter investigators discovered that a small sample of employees working in the gaming area of a large casino have greater ETS exposure than a representative sample of the US population, as measured in the Third National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES III). Employees working at "non-smoking" tables did not fare much better than employees working at "smoking" tables although Trout et al. (1998) anticipated this result as the non-smoking tables were generally located directly adjacent to other tables where smoking was permitted.

#### **2.4 Prevalence of Smoking among Casino Employees**

In an effort to establish the prevalence of smoking among casino employees, Shaffer et al. (1999) conducted a study of 3,841 full-time casino employees at four American casinos owned and operated by "Casino, Inc." ["Casino, Inc." was a pseudonym assigned by Shaffer et al. (1999) to provide better anonymity.] The study utilized both self-report and cotinine tests to verify the participants' self-reported smoking behaviour.

Overall, Shaffer et al. (1999) found significantly higher tobacco usage among the casino employees in comparison to the general American population. Slightly less than 40% of the casino employees were current smokers compared to 25.6% of adults in the general American population.

In addition to smoking prevalence, Shaffer et al. (1999) also evaluated smoking frequency. Just under 30% of smokers claimed to smoke one to nine cigarettes per day, while the majority of smokers (47.1%) smoked between 10 and 20 cigarettes per day. Roughly 20% smoked 21-30 cigarettes per day, 3.9% smoked 31 to 39 cigarettes per day, and 1.7% smoked over 40 cigarettes a day.

Chong et al. (2000) reported slightly lower smoking prevalence rates in a study of 587 Arizonan casino employees, establishing a prevalence rate of 28% just prior to beginning casino employment and 25% after beginning work at the casino.

Respondents who reported smoking at least once a month were classified as smokers, while those who claimed to smoke less than once a month were categorized as non-smokers.

## **2.5 Impact of Casino Employment on Smoking Behaviour**

As abovementioned, Chong et al. (2000) determined that the proportion of smokers did not change significantly as a result of working in a smoking environment, and, even more unexpectedly, overall smoking behaviour appears to *decrease significantly* after securing employment in the casino industry. The length of casino employment did not appear to be related to change in cigarette consumption, regardless of the employee's respective department at the casino. Although male smokers considerably outnumbered female smokers in the study, the sexes did not greatly differ in their smoking patterns or their changes in the level of smoking. Interestingly, a significant correlation between age and the change score did suggest that younger smokers were more likely to increase their intake while older smoking employees were more likely to decrease their consumption. Of the three ethnic groups that participated in the study (Native Americans, non-Hispanic whites, and Hispanics), only the non-Hispanic white casino employees showed a substantially higher smoking rate at the follow-up than the other groups.

Chong et al. (2000) hypothesized that two major factors might account for their counterintuitive findings. First, the smoking environment coupled with the pungent smell of cigarettes may alone decrease smoking intake as it has been demonstrated that long-term exposure to a smoking environment is just as aversive as rapid chain-smoking (Lichtenstein et al., 1974 as cited in Chong et al., 2000). A second possibility is that because environmental tobacco smoke contains nicotine, individuals may decrease active smoking to compensate for the higher nicotine intake via the environment. Although there is still no direct empirical evidence to support the second hypothesis, research has revealed that smokers do alter their smoking behaviour when exposed to cigarettes delivering varying amounts of tar and nicotine (Stepney, 1984 as cited in Chong et al., 2000).

## **2.6 Job Satisfaction of Casino Employees**

It is a common misconception that the occupation of a casino card dealer is both glamorous and exhilarating, but the reality is that dealers often express high levels of dissatisfaction with many aspects of their work and their work environment (Frey & Carns, 1988). In actuality, "the job of casino card dealer is characterized by low skill requirements, few prospects for advancement, little or no reward for seniority, high turnover, low employer investment in individual worker careers, and very low job security (Edwards, 1979 as cited in Frey & Carns, 1988, p. 159)." Furthermore, these jobs are not typically protected by union membership (Frey & Carns, 1988). Frey and Carns further identify the distrust, patronage, and evaluation based on luck rather than skill endemic to the casino industry as additional contributors to this widespread job dissatisfaction. According to Frey and Carns (1988), the casino environment itself fosters an unfavourable atmosphere where the bulk of its employees exhibit low commitment and dissatisfaction with their work. Moreover, the nature of the casino dealer's work contains all the intrinsic and extrinsic elements that have been demonstrated to produce a dissatisfied employee (Mortimer, 1979 as cited in Frey & Carns, 1988).

Academics first began to explore this previously neglected area in the mid-1980s. In 1985, Posner, Leitner, and Lester conducted a study to test casino floor employees' claim that their occupation is "highly stressful". For the purpose of this particular investigation, casino floor employees included both dealers and slot machine attendants. Posner et al. (1985) compared the scores of 130 casino floor employees (76 men and 54 women) on Girdano and Everly's (1979) stress profile to the scores of 503 employees (268 men and 235 women) in other occupations. While the two groups did not differ in recent stressful life events, frustration level, lack of self-confidence, or anxious reactivity, the casino employees scored lower than the non-casino employees on work-overload, boredom/loneliness, and higher poor-nutrition scores. All of the mean scores for both groups were in the normal range or below average on the norms provided by Girdano and Everly (1979). That is, there was no evidence that casino floor employees were experiencing higher levels of stress than workers in other occupations.

In the winter of 1986-1987, Frey and Carns (1988) distributed a self-administered job satisfaction questionnaire to 110 dealers working in Las Vegas. This questionnaire was supplemented by several unstructured face-to-face and group interviews with working dealers. Unfortunately, the majority of casino managers would not allow them to contact the dealers in the workplace, and the dealers themselves were reluctant to complete the survey for fear of jeopardizing their employment by expressing even the slightest disloyalty. Although Frey and Carns (1988) eventually accessed a sample size that greatly exceeded any previous studies of Las Vegas dealers, the representativeness of the sample is unknown.

The dealers that did participate in the study followed the pattern outlined by the literature on general job satisfaction: although generally satisfied with their current job, most workers would have preferred to hold another job (Blauner, 1964; Kanter, 1977 as cited in Frey & Carns, 1988). When asked if they would choose dealing if they had the chance again, 69% of the participants responded "no" while another 37% answered "definitely no". Because most dealers have limited education and skills, Frey and Carns (1988) contend that dealers are just content to have a job considering their limited skills and lack of qualifications for alternative careers. These findings, however, do not indicate that dealers have resigned themselves to a lifetime career in the gaming industry: Almost 80% of the participants would have rather been working elsewhere while roughly 65% did not see themselves as dealers in the future. Furthermore, only 25% of the dealers expressed a desire to be promoted to "floorman", a management position in the casino that is frequently filled by former dealers. Although a career orientation in the gaming industry appeared to be lacking in the majority of dealers, relatively few dealers actually quit dealing. The fact that 64% of the study's respondents had been employed as a dealer for over five years while another 29% had been dealing for ten years or longer provides further confirmation of this tendency.

Even though most dealers were not committed to their jobs, 74% still asserted they were not unhappy about their initial decision to become a dealer. Frey and Carns (1988) conjectured this unexpected finding might be best interpreted in terms of cognitive dissonance reduction. That is, a dealer in this employment circumstance might justify his or her investment by maintaining either that it was not a mistake or that the job is merely a steppingstone paving the way to a brighter career. Perhaps a more probable explanation is that those respondents who claimed to be satisfied with

becoming a dealer were simply indicating that dealing was an opportunity for them to earn a decent living considering their lack of skills and limited education. Moreover, dealing was likely preferable to any of the alternatives that were available at the time they decided to enter the industry.

Frey and Carnes (1988) concluded that dealers are bored, unhappy with the nature of their work, prefer leisure to work, and are unenthusiastic about going to work. Importantly, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) established that achievement and recognition are the two factors most likely to produce job satisfaction. Frey and Carnes's (1988) respondents, however, did not profess to be satisfied with achievement, recognition, or advancement – three intrinsic factors deemed crucial in producing job satisfaction. As aforementioned, the dealers were not anchored to the job or the organization and most did not envision themselves being promoted to a management position or pursuing a lifelong career as a dealer. Therefore, it appears as though there was neither fatalistic acceptance or active rejection of the job, but rather a complex combination of the two.

Yet another, smaller study found the level of job satisfaction to be lower in casino employees than in the general US population. Darcy and Lester (1995) compared the job satisfaction of 59 poker dealers to the job satisfaction of 62 school teachers living in the same region. Darcy and Lester (1995) established that the casino dealers' average job satisfaction was significantly lower than that of the teachers. The source of the dealers job dissatisfaction appeared to be wide-ranging as their scores appreciably differed from the teachers on 17 of the 18 items on the job satisfaction scale. Gender and length of casino employment were not found to be related to overall job satisfaction.

## **2.7 Gaming Employees' Health and Safety Concerns**

In 1997, a series of inquiries and patient contacts at the Occupational Health Clinics for Ontario Workers (OHCOW) in an Ontario community prompted an investigation into the health and safety concerns of gaming workers (Keith et al., 2001). Clinic physicians diagnosed individual gaming workers with dermatitis, respiratory disease, negative reproductive outcomes, and a range of musculoskeletal injuries. Gaming employees reported ringing in their ears after working in close proximity to loud slot machines as well as personal security and harassment concerns. Some inquired about the possible respiratory and dermal sensitization to coin dust, and drink servers protested that their revealing, uncomfortable uniforms made them feel vulnerable to sexual harassment. Notably, nearly every worker complained of eye and throat irritation that was directly attributed to excessive exposure to secondhand smoke.

When OHCOW's staff resolved to find a solution to the array of identified problems, they quickly realized there was a shortage of research on the gaming environment. This discovery prompted the Ontario clinic director to contact the Manitoba Federation of Labour Occupational Health Centre (MFL OHC), in an area where gaming facilities had already been operating for a number of years. MFL OHC staff revealed that they too had been approached by gaming employees with a range of health and safety concerns. While staff at both centres recognized the unmet needs for occupational health and safety research for the industry, they were unsure how to best address the many concerns in light of their limited resources. After a series of discussions, it was ultimately decided that identifying the most immediate health and

safety concerns of the employees would be the most effective course of action. Thus, a collective consultation process was launched.

Ultimately, 51 gaming workers in Ontario and 20 gaming workers in Manitoba were assessed in a total of 16 separate focus group sessions. Although 16 occupational groups within the gaming industry were represented, the 17 dealers and the 13 cleaners/porters accounted for the largest portion of the sample. Of the 71 participants, 46 had worked at the gaming facilities between one and five year(s). Males and females were almost equally represented with 36 women and 35 men comprising the total sample size. The majority of the participants were under the age of 40 with 26 falling between 21 and 30 and another 26 reporting to be between the ages of 31 and 40. Finally, 56 respondents were full-time employees, 13 were part-time, while one worker was classified as a casual employee.

Gaming employees from both provinces reported similar health, hazard, and psycho-social concerns, prioritizing the issues of stress, ergonomics, indoor air quality (including secondhand smoke and air temperature), biological hazards, physical hazards and noise. The top priority issues identified by the participants in Ontario were stress, indoor air quality, ergonomic hazards, biological hazards, physical hazards, and poor training. Although noise was identified as a serious problem by a significant number of the participants, it was viewed primarily as a cause of stress and was thus included in the stress category along with overcrowding and harassment. Manitoba participants identified indoor air quality, stress, ergonomics, noise, patrons with infectious diseases, and temperature extremes as top priority concerns. Importantly, indoor air quality was a priority problem identified by all occupational groups and the facilitators alike. Ergonomics followed close behind indoor air quality with stress and temperature extremes being priorities for all three groups, including the facilitators.

## 2.8 Prevalence of Problem Gambling and Alcohol Abuse among Casino Employees

In 1999, Shaffer, Vander Bilt, and Hall examined the prevalence of problem gambling and a range of other health related risks in 3,841 full-time casino employees at four American casinos. The survey was administered to employees at four sites: City A, City B, City C, and administrative home office (Headquarters) between June 1997 and January 1998. The sites were selected for participation in the study by Casino, Inc. (pseudonym) management because they were identified as representative sites whose site managers would cooperate with study protocols. Response rates at the four sites ranged from 66.2% to 100%, resulting in an overall response rate of 74.9%. Respondents were aged between 17 and 75 years with a mean age of 37.9 years. Approximately 58% of the sample was female. Caucasians represented 76.3% of the participants while Latinos and Latinas, and mixed races each claimed 16% of the remaining sample. Just over three-quarters of respondents were paid an hourly wage as opposed to a salary, and 44.5% reported their primary work duties to “directly involve gaming activities”.

Shaffer et al. (1999) utilized two assessment instruments to evaluate potentially problematic gambling- and alcohol-related behaviours among the survey respondents. The South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS) (Lesieur & Blume, 1987) was used to investigate gambling-related problems while the CAGE (Ewing, 1984) was selected to assess alcohol-related problems. The SOGS was chosen because it had been the most frequently used assessment instrument in gambling research among the general adult population, however the screen was modified to reference a past-year timeframe. The criteria for past-year level two (problem) gambling was three or four at-risk responses while the criteria for past-year level three (pathological) gambling was five or more at-risk responses on the SOGS. The CAGE was favoured because the four-item screening instrument enables researchers to assess alcohol problems in a host of settings, including the general population.

Shaffer et al. (1999) reported that 87.5% of respondents did not claim to experience any gambling-related problems in the past year. The prevalence of past-year level two (problem) gambling among the casino employees was 1.4% and the prevalence of past-year level three (pathological) gambling was 2.1%. In comparison, past-year level two and three gambling prevalence rates among the US adult population were 2.2% and 1.1%, respectively. Shaffer et al. (1999) speculated that the lower rate of past-year level two gambling could be an example of the process of adaptation demonstrated in the study of other addictive behaviours. That is, individuals immersed in an environment of addictive behaviours may adapt to the environment and develop some immunity toward addictive behaviours (Zinberg, 1984). For casino employees specifically, the ongoing observation of the negative consequences of gambling might actually function as a protective factor against the progression of problem gambling (American Gaming Association, 2002). Notably, Shaffer et al. (1999) hypothesized that this adaptation process may not provide sufficient immunity for more severely addicted employees (pathological gamblers).

However, in a later study of 6,067 full-time American casino employees, Shaffer et al. (2002) utilized the SOGS again (see Section 2.9) but reported considerably higher

past-year level two and three gambling prevalence rates of 21.2% and 4.3%, respectively. In the same study, Shaffer et al. (2002) found the prevalence of past-year level two drinking to be 7.1% and the prevalence of past-year level three drinking to be 4.3%. Shaffer et al. (2002) did not hypothesize why the latter prevalence rates exceeded those reported by Shaffer et al. in 1999.

Shaffer et al. (1999) revealed that the casino employees' rates of depression and alcohol problems far surpassed the prevalence rates of the general American adult population. Nearly 10% of casino employees reported a major depressive episode in the past year compared to only 3.7% of adult Americans. Similarly, 11.5% of casino employees were identified as having alcohol problems, whereas only 7.4% of the general adult American population were classified in this group. It should be noted, however, that no comparison was made to individuals with demographic characteristics comparable to the casino employees (e.g., age, ethnicity, education level). Moreover, Shaffer et al. did not determine the causal direction of these effects: i.e., whether working in a casino places employees at a higher risk for these problems or if the gaming industry attracts individuals with these problems.



## 2.9 Impact of Casino Employment on Problem Gambling and Alcohol Use

In an attempt to establish the causal direction of these effects, Shaffer and Hall (2002) conducted a longitudinal study of 6,067 full-time casino employees at six different "Casino, Inc." sites, again employing the South Oaks Gambling Screen (SOGS) (Lesieur & Blume, 1987) and the CAGE (Ewing, 1984) to assess the prevalence and patterns of alcohol and gambling problems. The six sites were selected to participate in this study because they were identified as representative sites with cooperative site managers that would adhere to study protocols.

Individuals were eligible to participate if they were full-time employees at any one of the six sites during any of the three designated observation periods. Of the 9,943 eligible casino employees across all six Casino, Inc. sites, 6,067 participated in the initial assessment, resulting in an overall initial assessment response rate of 67%. Because response rates across the six sites ranged from 12% to 81%, the overall response rate for all data collection periods was 47%. Due to the casino industry's estimated annual turnover rate of 40% (personal communication, Casino, Inc. Executive, May 10, 2000 as cited in Shaffer et al., 2002), only 52.3% of the original respondents completed the one-year follow-up. The retention rate plunged again at the two-year mark with only 19.4% of the original respondents participating in the follow-up assessment. A discriminant analysis indicated that respondents that did not complete the follow-up questionnaires were more likely to have worked at the casino for shorter periods of time, feel bad or guilty about their drinking, smoke, and be younger than the respondents who completed the follow-up questionnaires.

As seen in Table 1 below, the 1,126 (19.4%) of respondents that participated in all three assessments presented slight increases in level one (non-problem) gambling and drinking prevalence rates from the first to the third time period. There was some corresponding decline in level two (problem) and level three (pathological) gambling and drinking from the first time period to the third. A total of 77.6% maintained the same classification for all three times, 15.7% changed classifications once, and 6.9% changed classifications twice. Roughly 20% moved to a healthier state at some point during the study, 9.2% moved to a healthier state and maintained this state for two consecutive observation points, 10.3% moved to a more disordered state at some point during the course of the study, and only 1.3% progressed to a more disordered state and maintained it for two consecutive observation points.

Similarly, of the casino employees that provided CAGE data at all three collection periods, 83.0% maintained the same classification the entire time, 11% changed classifications once, and 6.2% changed classifications twice. Among these respondents, 14.8% moved to a healthier state at some point during the study, 7.3% moved to a healthier state and maintained this state for two consecutive observation points, 8.3% moved to a more disordered state at some point during the course of the study, and 0.2% progressed to a more disordered state and maintained it for two consecutive observation points.

**TABLE 1**  
**Shaffer et al. (2002) Respondents Participating in All Three Assessments'**  
**Prevalence of Past-Year Gambling and Drinking (n = 1,176)**

Time Period	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3	
	G <sup>1</sup>	D <sup>2</sup>	G	D	G	D
Baseline	77.2%	89.3%	18.4%	6.9%	4.4%	3.8%
1 year	86.2%	92.1%	11.8%	5.8%	2.0%	2.2%
2 years	85.2%	94.5%	13.0%	4.0%	1.8%	1.6%

<sup>1</sup> Gambling

<sup>2</sup> Drinking

The results of this study suggest there is more fluctuation associated with gambling and drinking problems than conventional wisdom would suggest. Additionally, there is actually a greater tendency for continued casino employment to be associated with *improvements* in gambling and drinking behaviour despite a small portion of employees' progressing to more disordered states of gambling.

However, these results should be interpreted with caution as there are two critical limitations to this study. First, the retention rate was very low. More than 80% of the respondents assessed at the first observation period failed to provide data at the third and final observation point. Those individuals who are able to maintain regular employment for two years may be more functional and therefore less affected by their employment than those individuals who are either terminated or quit on their own accord. Thus, it is possible that the 80% of initial respondents that did not provide data at Time 3 were more adversely affected by casino employment than the 19.4% of respondents that participated in the study at all three observation points.

The second limitation was that there was no analysis of gambling or drinking status as a function of length of employment. It may be that new employees are more adversely affected than long-term employees. This is impossible to know when the data for all employees is aggregated.

## CHAPTER 3

### 3 Methods

#### 3.1 Sample

##### 3.1.1 Site Selection

Securing casino participation in the study proved to be an exceedingly challenging task. The study's initial intent was to attain a representative sample of Western Canadian casinos. Although every casino in both Alberta and British Columbia was invited to participate in the study through phone calls, letters, and e-mail, only two Northern Albertan casinos ultimately agreed to participate.

In order to provide better anonymity, the pseudonym of "Casino Alberta" will be collectively assigned to the two participating Northern Albertan casinos for the purpose of this thesis. When necessary, "Casino Alberta A" and "Casino Alberta B" will be used to distinguish between the two sites.

##### 3.1.2 Casinos

"Casino Alberta A" is located in a mid-sized Northern Albertan city with a population of 47,240 (Alberta Municipal Affairs, 2003). It is one of the province's smaller casinos with only 14 table games. When the baseline and follow-up questionnaires were distributed and collected, the casino had 182 electronic gaming machines, but it has since expanded to 200 machines. Casino Alberta A's gaming floor is approximately 12,000 square feet and there are 70 employees on their payroll.

"Casino Alberta B" is located in a slightly smaller Northern Albertan city with a population of 36,983 (Alberta Municipal Affairs, 2003). The casino has 18 tables, 200 electronic gaming machines, and 114 employees.

#### 3.2 Survey Design

A baseline questionnaire (Appendices 7.1 and 7.2) was created to assess the demographics, employment and job satisfaction, substance use and abuse, gambling beliefs, and actual gambling behaviour of the casino employees. Though the survey was mostly comprised of multiple-choice questions, there were four open-ended questions that allowed the participants to make additional comments if they so desired.

The preamble assured the participants of their anonymity and confidentiality, in addition to stating that the collected data would be used exclusively by the research team for research purposes only. The respondents were instructed not to write their names on the questionnaire. All participation in the study was voluntary and the research protocol was approved by the University of Lethbridge Human Subjects Research Committee.

The questionnaire took approximately 15 minutes to complete. It included the Canadian Problem Gambling Index (CPGI) (Ferris & Wynne, 2001) to measure problem gambling, questions from the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT) (World Health Organization, 1992), and questions from the Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST) (Skinner, 1982) (The entire AUDIT and DAST could not be administered due to time constraints and Human Resource concerns.) The CPGI (Ferris & Wynne, 2001), AUDIT (World Health Organization, 1992), and DAST (Skinner, 1982) were selected because they are all well-validated instruments (Allen, Litten, Fertig, & Babor, 1997; Bohn, Babor, Kranzler, 1995; Daeppen, Yersin, Landry, Pecoud, Decrey, 2000; Ferris & Wynne, 2001; Gavin, Ross, & Skinner, 1989; Selin, 2003; Staley & El-Guebaly, 1990). In addition, all three instruments were used in the *Substance Use and Gambling in the*

*Alberta Workplace Survey, 2002: A Replication Study.* This study was a random survey of 2,836 Alberta employees conducted by R.A. Malatest & Associates Ltd. for AADAC in February 2003. By employing the same assessment instruments, we were able to directly compare problem gambling, substance use, job satisfaction, and drug use patterns between casino employees and the general Albertan workforce in roughly the same time period.

It should be noted that the baseline questionnaire format varied slightly between the two sites. Casino Alberta A's baseline questionnaire had an additional section assessing the participants' gambling beliefs and attitudes towards problem gambling. Although this additional section was not included in Casino Alberta B's baseline questionnaire, all other sections of both sites' surveys were identical.

### **3.3 Baseline Questionnaire Administration**

The baseline questionnaires were distributed at Casino Alberta A on April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2003 and on April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003 at Casino Alberta B. The questionnaires were placed in envelopes and stapled to the employees' pay stubs at both Casino Alberta sites by the respective Human Resource Managers. Thus, the actual distribution and collection dates were ultimately determined by the respective casinos' pay periods.

The questionnaire's preamble instructed the participants to drop their completed questionnaires in a clearly marked "University of Lethbridge" drop box specifically designated for the study. At Casino Alberta A the drop box was located in the staff room, and at Casino Alberta B the drop box was placed at the security desk. The Human Resource Managers at both Casino Alberta sites decided where the drop boxes would best be located in order to maximize employee participation while still maintaining anonymity.

At the end of the two week collection period, the Human Resource Managers at both sites collected the completed questionnaires from the designated drop boxes and roughly estimated the response rates for their respective sites. At Casino Alberta A the baseline collection date was May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2003 while at Casino Alberta B the baseline collection date was April 18<sup>th</sup>, 2003. Because response rates were somewhat low at both sites, the questionnaire deadline was extended for another two weeks. In addition to the deadline extension, it was decided that one randomly selected employee at each Casino Alberta site would receive a \$100 cheque for their participation in the study. Attention-grabbing fluorescent 8½ x 11" posters announcing the extended deadline and the cash incentive were placed in the staff rooms at both sites to generate interest and boost participation.

The measures taken to increase response rates ultimately proved successful. When the drop boxes were reassessed at the end of the second deadline, overall participation had significantly improved. The Human Resource Managers then removed the completed, sealed questionnaires from the drop boxes and mailed them back.

### **3.4 Follow-Up Questionnaire Administration**

Six months following the distribution and collection of the baseline questionnaire, an identical follow-up questionnaire was re-administered and collected in the same way at the two Casino Alberta sites (Appendix 7.3). This questionnaire's purpose was to assess the changes that had occurred in the employees in the six months since the collection of the baseline questionnaire. A simple tracking method involving the participants' date of birth, casino of employment, ancestry, and sex was utilized in order

to track individual changes from baseline. The follow-up questionnaires were stapled to the pay stub of every individual employed by Casino Alberta at the time of the follow-up. The questionnaires were identical for both casinos. Similar fluorescent 8½ x 11” posters stating the follow-up distribution and collection dates and outlining the eligibility criteria for the \$100 cash incentive were placed in the staff rooms at both sites several days prior to the distribution of the questionnaires.

The follow-up questionnaire was distributed at Casino Alberta A on October 20<sup>th</sup>, 2003. At Casino Alberta B, the follow-up questionnaire was distributed on October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2003. At the end of the two week collection period, response rates were low at both sites, so the deadlines were extended. The final follow-up questionnaire collection date was December 5<sup>th</sup>, 2003 at Casino Alberta A, and November 28<sup>th</sup>, 2003 at Casino Alberta B.

### **3.5 Research Questions and Hypotheses**

The specific research questions and hypotheses used in this study were as follows:

1. What are the demographics of Northern Albertan casino employees and how do they compare to the demographics of casino employees as established in the rest of Canada and the US? My hypothesis is that the demographics of Northern Albertan casino employees will be comparable to the demographics of casino employees across both Canada and the US.
2. How do Northern Albertan casino employees rate their job satisfaction compared to the general Albertan workforce and what are their specific job stressors? I anticipate that the casino employees will rank their job satisfaction lower than most Albertan employees. My prediction is that the employees' specific job stressors will be the casino environment (i.e., excessive secondhand smoke exposure, constant noise, and inadequate ventilation), late hours, and poor wages with no benefits.
3. What are the substance use prevalence rates of Northern Albertan casino employees and how do these rates compare to those found in the general Albertan adult population? My hypothesis is that casino employees' substance use prevalence rates will surpass those of the general Albertan adult population.
4. What are the gambling behaviours, gambling attitudes, gambling beliefs, and problem gambling prevalence rates of Northern Albertan casino employees and how do they compare to the general Albertan adult population? I hypothesize that the gambling behaviours and problem gambling prevalence rates of Northern Albertan casino employees will exceed those found in the general Albertan adult population. I predict that the casino employees' gambling attitudes and beliefs will be generally favourable and tolerant.
5. What is the impact of casino employment on casino employees' substance use, gambling behaviours, gambling attitudes, gambling beliefs, and problem gambling prevalence rates? My hypothesis is that casino employment will increase casino employees' substance use, gambling behaviours, and problem gambling prevalence rates. I also speculate that casino employment will promote even more favourable gambling attitudes and gambling beliefs among casino employees.

## CHAPTER 4

### 4 Results

#### 4.1 Response Rates

As detailed in Table 2, a total of 123 baseline questionnaires were completed and returned between April 4<sup>th</sup>, 2003 and May 2<sup>nd</sup>, 2003. Casino Alberta A accounted for 42 of the returned baseline questionnaires while Casino Alberta B – the larger of the two sites – yielded the remaining 81 questionnaires. There was a collective total of 184 eligible employees on the payrolls of both casinos during their respective baseline collection periods, producing an average baseline response rate of 65.6%.

Between October 17<sup>th</sup>, 2003 and December 5, 2003, a total of 42 follow-up questionnaires were completed and returned. Casino Alberta A accounted for 27 of the completed follow-up questionnaires while the remaining 15 respondents were Casino Alberta B employees. Seventeen of Casino Alberta A's 27 follow-up questionnaires were tracked, one was not tracked, and nine questionnaires were completed by new participants that either secured casino employment after the baseline collection period or were employed during the baseline but did not complete the questionnaire. Casino Alberta A's follow-up response rate was 40.5%. Similarly, 10 of Casino Alberta B's 15 completed follow-up questionnaires were tracked to the baseline, one was not tracked, and four were new participants. Casino Alberta B's follow-up response rate was 12.3%, resulting in a 22.0% overall follow-up response rate.

Statistical tests were employed to determine if there were systematic differences in the characteristics of individuals who completed the follow-up questionnaires and individuals who did not. A Chi Square test was used for nominal variables (gender, ancestry, marital status, smoking status, gambling status), a Mann-Whitney test was used for ordinal variables (highest level of education, gambling frequency, CPGI score, and approximate amount of money spent on gambling activities in a typical month), and a T-test was used for interval level variables (gross annual household income). No significant difference was found with the exception of education, where people who completed the follow-up questionnaire were more likely to have higher levels of education ( $U = 748.5, p \leq .05$ ).

TABLE 2

### Casino Alberta A and B Baseline and Follow-Up Response Rates

Collection Period	Casino Alberta A	Casino Alberta B	Total
<b>Baseline:</b>			
Total completed questionnaires	42	81	123
Eligible employees on payroll during questionnaire distribution and collection period	70	114	184
Response rate	60.0%	71.1%	65.6%
<b>Follow-up:</b>			
Total completed questionnaires	27	15	42
Tracked questionnaires	17	10	27
Questionnaires that were not tracked	1	1	2
New participants	9	4	13
Response rate (tracked questionnaires only)	40.5%	12.3%	22.0%

## 4.2 Demographics

Table 3 lists the sample's demographic characteristics. The demographic characteristics of the general Albertan workforce and Canadian gambling workers are also presented for comparison purposes. The former is from the *Substance Use and Gambling in the Alberta Workplace, 2002: A Replication Study* (henceforth referred to simply as the *AADAC Employee Survey*) and the latter is from Marshall's (2001) survey of Canadian gambling workers.

As can be seen, there are some commonalities between all three studies. Females, for example, represent over half the sample in all three studies while roughly three-quarters of the respondents in every study are full-time employees.

Although Marshall (2001) did not provide information concerning Canadian gambling workers' marital status, the greater part of the casino and AADAC Employee Survey respondents were married. Most participants in all three studies either did not graduate from high school or were high school graduates or equivalent.

Finally, the bulk of the casino and the AADAC Employee Survey participants claimed to bring in a gross annual household income of somewhere between \$50,000 and \$99,999.



**TABLE 3**  
**Demographic Characteristics of Canadian Gambling Workers,**  
**and Casino and AADAC Employee Survey Respondents**

Characteristic	Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution	AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution	Canadian Gambling Workers (Marshall, 2001) Sample % Distribution
<b>Sex (n = 122):*</b>			
Male	27.9%	46%	44%
Female	72.1%	54%	56%
<b>Age (n = 118):</b>			
Mean	33.8 years	N/A <sup>1</sup>	N/A <sup>2</sup>
Standard Deviation	12.2		
<b>Ethnicity (n = 116):</b>			
European	84.5%	N/A <sup>3</sup>	N/A <sup>3</sup>
Aboriginal	6.0%		
Other	3.4%		
South Asian	1.7%		
East Asian	0.9%		
Middle Eastern	0.9%		
Caribbean	0.9%		
Latin American	0.9%		
African	0.9%		
<b>Marital Status (n = 122):*</b>			
Married (including common-law)	50.0%	63%	N/A <sup>3</sup>
Separated/divorced	18.9%	11%	
Widowed	0.0%	2%	
Never married	31.1%	24%	
<b>Student Status (n = 122):</b>			
Students	6.6%	N/A <sup>3</sup>	N/A <sup>3</sup>
Not students	93.4%		
<b>Highest Level of Education (n = 121):*</b>			
Did not graduate from high school	12.4%	6%	55%
High school graduate or equivalent	37.2%	20%	
Some college, technical school, or university	30.6%	18%	N/A <sup>3</sup>
Completed technical school	14.9%	26%	36%

or college			
One or more university degrees	5.0%	30%	9%
<b>Employment Status (n = 122):</b>			
Full-time	70.5%	76%	80%
Other <sup>4</sup>	29.5%	24%	20%
<b>Gross Annual Household Income (n = 114):*</b>			
Under \$10,000	7.9%	3%	N/A <sup>3</sup>
\$10,000 - \$19,999	19.3%	7%	
\$20,000 - \$34,999	20.2%	15%	
\$35,000 - \$49,999	15.8%	19%	
\$50,000 - \$99,999	26.3%	38%	
\$100,000 or over	10.5%	19%	
<b>Length of Casino Employment (n = 110):</b>			
Mean	40.5 months	N/A <sup>3</sup>	N/A <sup>3</sup>
Median	23 months		
Mode	3 months, 26 months		
Std. Deviation	54.7 months		

\* Chi Square test with  $p < .05$

<sup>1</sup> AADAC Employee Survey Age Distribution: 18-34 years: 33%; 35-50 years: 46%; 50+ years: 21%

<sup>2</sup> Marshall (2001) Age Distribution: 15-34 years: 53%; 35+ years: 47%

<sup>3</sup> Demographic information not available

<sup>4</sup> Part-time, seasonal, having worked in the past 12 months but currently on workers' compensation, maternity leave, or temporarily unemployed but looking for work

### 4.3 Employment and Job Satisfaction

#### 4.3.1 Initial Motivation for Seeking Employment in the Casino Industry

It appears that casino employees are not much different from employees in other service industries. Table 4 illustrates that the largest group of respondents reported that they initially sought employment in the casino industry simply because they needed a job and knew the casino was hiring. Other popular reasons included (in descending order of popularity): expecting to enjoy the nature of the work; expecting to enjoy the atmosphere; expecting to enjoy interacting with players and/or customers, and applying upon the suggestion of a casino employment.

**TABLE 4**  
**Initial Motivation for Seeking Employment in the Casino Industry**

Reason (n = 114)	%
I needed a job and knew they were hiring	38.2%
I thought I would enjoy the nature of the work (i.e., dealing cards, attending slots, etc.)	36.6%
I thought I would enjoy the atmosphere	32.5%

I thought I would enjoy interacting with the players and/or customers	30.9%
A casino employee suggested I apply	31.7%
I liked the staff	9.8%
I thought the money would be good	17.1%
The hours appealed to me	16.3%
Don't know	1.6%
Other	8.1%

### 4.3.2 An Overview of Casino Employees' Job Satisfaction

Table 5 indicates that casino employees appear to be fairly satisfied with their work on the whole, despite 61.5% rating their position as “somewhat stressful”. It appears, however, that casino employment may not be quite as stressful as other occupations in the general Albertan workforce - 64.5% of adult Albertans regarded their position as “somewhat stressful”, and 16.5% ranked it as “extremely stressful”. In comparison, only 10.7% of casino employees deemed their position to be “extremely stressful”.

Roughly three-quarters of casino employees claimed to find their work either “always interesting” (35.2%) or “often interesting” (37.7%), while a collective total of 86.8% of participants rated their coworkers as either “very supportive” (28.9%) or “supportive” (57.9%). Quality of supervision also ranked high with 40% of respondents rating it as “very good” and another 45.8% classifying it as “good”.

Over half of the casino employees and the Albertan workforce rated their overall job satisfaction as either “very high” (15.7% and 28.6%, respectively), or “high” (43% and 43.4%, respectively). Importantly, the majority of respondents have no plans to seek employment elsewhere within the next year with 23.0% expecting to “definitely” be employed in the casino industry in one year, and 44.3% planning to “most likely” be employed in the casino industry in one year.

**TABLE 5**

#### Job Satisfaction

Characteristic	Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution	AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution
<b>Interestingness of work (n = 122):</b>		
Always interesting	35.2%	N/A
Often interesting	37.7%	
Sometimes interesting	21.3%	
Not often interesting	5.7%	
Never interesting	0.0%	
<b>Coworkers' supportiveness (n = 121):</b>		
Very supportive	28.9%	N/A

Supportive	57.9%	
Minimally supportive	11.6%	
Unsupportive	1.7%	
Very unsupportive	0.0%	
<b>Supervision rating (n = 120):</b>		
Very good	40.0%	N/A
Good	45.8%	
Average	13.3%	
Poor	0.9%	
Very poor	0.0%	
<b>Job stressfulness (n = 122):*</b>		
Not at all stressful	27.9%	19%
Somewhat stressful	61.5%	64.5%
Extremely stressful	10.7%	16.5%
<b>Overall job satisfaction (n = 121):*</b>		
Very high	15.7%	28.6%
High	43.0%	43.4%
Moderate	37.2%	23.7%
Low	4.1%	2.8%
Very Low	0.0%	1.4%
<b>Expectations to be working in the casino industry in one year (n = 122):</b>		
Definitely	23.0%	N/A
Most likely	44.3%	
Unsure	23.0%	
Doubt it	8.2%	
Definitely not	1.6%	

\* Chi Square test with  $p < .05$

### 4.3.3 Analysis of Open-Ended Questions

Upon data collection, three of the four open-ended questions in the baseline and follow-up questionnaires were coded. The coded open-ended questions were, “What would you identify as your primary sources of job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction?”, “In your opinion, what are the primary causes of problem gambling?”, and, “In your opinion, what measures could the casino industry take to decrease problem gambling?”. The fourth and final open-ended question, “Do you have any other additional comments?” was not coded as responses were wide-ranging and not possible to code. The primary sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and the additional comments were copied verbatim and are Appendices 7.6, 7.7, and 7.8, respectively.

### 4.3.4 Primary Sources of Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction

Interestingly, the greater part of casino employees’ primary sources of job satisfaction also topped the list of primary sources of job dissatisfaction. For example, in Table 6, 18.8% of respondents cited customers/players as a primary source of job satisfaction while another 10.6% identified working and interacting with the public as a

source of job satisfaction. Still another 5.9% claimed meeting new people to be as a source of job satisfaction. But despite the substantial percentages listing interaction with players and the public as a source of satisfaction, 22.8% of respondents reported rude, irate players to be a primary source of job dissatisfaction while 5.3% considered inebriated players to be a major source of job dissatisfaction.

The management team was another entry found in almost equal percentages on both lists with 9.4% finding it to be a source of satisfaction and 12.3% citing it as a source of dissatisfaction. Intriguingly, 5.3% of respondents complained specifically of management drinking while at work.

Exactly double the percentage of respondents found hours to be a source of dissatisfaction (7% compared to 3.5%), while work environment/atmosphere weighed in almost equally on both lists with 8.2% classifying it as a source of satisfaction and 10.5% distinguishing it as a source of dissatisfaction.

Although “money” was a widespread source of job dissatisfaction at 19.3%, 10.6% of respondents still identified “money/tips” as a source of job satisfaction. Notably, “no benefits” ranked third on the list of primary sources of job dissatisfaction at 12.3%, while having to rely on tips was not far behind at 7%.

**TABLE 6**  
**Primary Sources of Job Satisfaction**

<b>Satisfaction (n = 121)</b>	<b>%</b>
Coworkers	44.7%
Job is fun/nature of the work	25.9%
Customers/players	18.8%
Other	12.9%
Satisfaction of doing job well	10.6%
Money/tips	10.6%
Working/interacting with the public	10.6%
Management team	9.4%
Stimulating work	8.2%
Atmosphere	8.2%
Meeting new people	5.9%
Hours	3.5%

**TABLE 7**  
**Primary Sources of Job Dissatisfaction**

<b>Dissatisfaction (n= 120)</b>	<b>%</b>
Other	36.9%
Rude players	22.8%
Money	19.3%
No benefits	12.3%
Management team	12.3%
Favouritism	10.5%
Work Environment (i.e., smoke, noise, etc.)	10.5%

Hours	7.0%
Relying on tips	7.0%
Stress	5.3%
Backstabbing/rumours	5.3%
Management team drinking at work	5.3%
Inebriated players	5.3%

#### 4.4 Tobacco Use

##### 4.4.1 Smoking Prevalence

As exhibited in the Table 9, there is a considerable smoking prevalence discrepancy between the general Albertan workforce and casino employees. In Alberta's workforce, only 30% of employees have smoked or used tobacco within the past month, while almost double that amount (56.6%) of Casino Alberta employees have smoked or used tobacco (e.g., smoked cigarettes, pipes, cigars, or used snuff or chewing tobacco) in the past month. Moreover, 100% of the 56.6% of casino smokers used tobacco while at work in the past month, while only 27% of the general Alberta workforce smoke cigarettes on a daily basis.

**TABLE 8**

#### Smoking Prevalence

	Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution	AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution
<b>Smoking Status (n = 122):*</b>		
Non-smoker <sup>1</sup>	43.4%	70%
Smoker <sup>2</sup>	56.6%	30%

\* Chi Square test with  $p < .05$

<sup>1</sup> Former smokers, and those who have never smoked

<sup>2</sup> Non-daily, and light smokers

#### 4.5 Alcohol Use

##### 4.5.1 Alcohol Consumption Frequency and Quantity

Not only are casino employees drinking more frequently than the Alberta workforce, they are also consuming considerably more alcohol when they drink. Table 9 shows that almost 54% of casino employees consume more than three alcoholic beverages on a typical drinking day, while only 34% of Alberta's 2002 workforce reported to consume the same amount. Similarly, 14.5% of casino employees reported to drink between five and six alcoholic beverages on a typical drinking day, while less than half that percentage (7%) of the Albertan workforce professed to consume the same amount. Finally, a mere 2% of the Albertan workforce drinks 10 or more alcoholic beverages on a typical drinking day while over four times that number (8.2%) of casino employees consume the same amount.

**TABLE 9**  
**Alcohol Consumption Frequency and Quantity in**  
**Casino Employees and the General Albertan Workforce<sup>1</sup>**

Characteristic	Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution	AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution
<b>Frequency of drinking (n = 121):</b>		
Never	11.6%	19%
Monthly or less	29.8%	29%
Two to four times a month	32.2%	30%
Two to three times a week	20.7%	15%
Four or more times a week	5.8%	6%
<b>Alcohol consumption on a typical day drinking (n = 110):*</b>		
1 or 2	46.4%	66%
3 or 4	26.4%	23%
5 or 6	14.5%	7%
7 or 8	4.5%	3%
10 or more	8.2%	2%

\* Chi Square test with  $p < .05$

<sup>1</sup> AUDIT questions 2 and 3

#### 4.5.2 Prevalence of Alcohol Related Problems

Table 10 shows that 5.5% of casino employees reported that a relative, friend, doctor, or other health care worker has suggested they cut down their alcohol consumption in the past year. This is more than double the rate of 2.2% in the general Alberta workforce. However, in a question designed to establish the general prevalence of alcohol problems, only 3.4% of casino employees reported that they have had serious problems caused by drinking in the past year. Although not directly comparable, 10% of the AADAC Employee Survey sample scored eight or higher on the AUDIT, indicating hazardous drinking.

**TABLE 10**  
**Prevalence of Alcohol Related Problems**

Question	Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution			AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution		
	No	Yes, but not in the last year	Yes, during the last year	No	Yes, but not in the last year	Yes, during the last year
Has a relative or friend or doctor or other health care worker been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down? (n = 110) <sup>1</sup>	92.7%	1.8%	5.5%	94.5%	3.2%	2.3%
Have you had any serious problems caused by drinking (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)? (n = 117)	92.3%	4.3%	3.4%	N/A		

<sup>1</sup> AUDIT question 10

#### 4.6 Medication and Illicit Drug Use

##### 4.6.1 Prevalence of Medication Use among Casino Employees and the General Albertan Adult Workforce in the Past Year

Table 11 shows that 94.5% of casino employees have used medications in the past year compared to 88% of the Albertan working population. With the exception of sleeping pills and over-the-counter stimulants, casino employees reported less medication use in the past year than did the general Albertan workforce. Interestingly, 14.1% of casino employees reported to use sleeping pills while less than half that percentage (7%) of the Alberta workforce did. The percentage of casino employees using over-the-counter stimulants also greatly exceeded the percentage of over-the-counter stimulant users in the Albertan workforce by a ratio of nearly six to one.

**TABLE 11**  
**Prevalence of Medication Use in the Past Year**



<b>Medication Type (n = 118)*</b>	<b>Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>
Anti-depressants or other mood stabilizers	8.5%	9.2%
Tranquilizers (Ativan, Librium, Valium)	1.4%	2.1%
Sleeping Pills	14.1%	7.2%
Medications for cough, cold, sinus problems or allergies	59.2%	59.3%
Over-the-counter painkillers (Tylenol, Ibuprofen)	60.3%	73.9%
Prescription painkillers	11.1%	14.9%
Over-the-counter stimulants (diet pills, "wake up" pills)	11.3%	1.9%
Other medications	5.3%	N/A

\* Chi Square test with p < .05

#### **4.6.2 Prevalence of Illicit Drug Use among Casino Employees and the General Albertan Adult Workforce in the Past Year**

The majority of both casino employees and members of the general Albertan workforce do not report using illicit drugs. Still, illicit drug use is more prevalent among casino employees than it is in the general Albertan workforce with 28.8% of casino employees reporting to have used illicit drugs in the past year compared to only 10% of the AADAC Employee Survey respondents (see Table 12). Although marijuana is the most commonly used illicit drug, it does not appear as prevalent among casino employees as it is in the Albertan working population at large. However, LSD/PCP, cocaine/crack, amphetamines or other stimulants, heroin or other street opiates, and other street drugs were all found to be more prevalent among casino employees than the Albertan workforce with prevalence ratios between the two groups ranging roughly between two to one and three to one.

**TABLE 12  
Prevalence of Illicit Drug Use in the Past Year**

<b>Illicit Drug (n = 118)*</b>	<b>Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>
Marijuana/hash	8.7%	10%
LSD/PCP or other hallucinogens	2.6%	1%
Cocaine/crack	3.4%	1%
Amphetamines or other stimulants	3.4%	1%
Heroin or other street	0.4%	0%

opiates		
Other street drugs	1.9%	0.2%

\* Chi Square test with  $p < .05$

#### 4.6.3 Prevalence of Drug Related Problems

Although 93% of casino employees stated that a relative, friend, doctor, or other health care worker has never suggested they cut down on their drug use, 27.3% of respondents reported that they *have* had serious problems caused by their drug use, although these problems were not encountered in the last year.

**TABLE 13**  
**Prevalence of Drug Related Problems<sup>1</sup>**

Question	No	Yes, but not in the last year	Yes, during the last year
Has a relative or friend or doctor or other health care worker been concerned about your drug use or suggested you cut down? (n = 55)	92.7%	3.6%	3.6%
Have you had any serious problems caused by drug use (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)? (n = 55)	70.9%	27.3%	1.8%

<sup>1</sup> Statistical analysis of individual questions not available in AADAC report

The Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST) assesses the degree of problems associated with non-medicinal drug and prescription medication abuse. Ninety-two percent of the AADAC Employee survey sample reported no problems with any drug use, 5% were identified as having low-level problems, 2% had moderate level problems, and 0.4% were classified as having substantial problems. In comparison, 1.8% of casino employees admitted to having serious problems caused by drug use during the past year.

#### 4.6.4 Prevalence of Mental Health Problems

Mental health status was assessed by the following question: “In the past 12 months have you had any serious problems with depression, anxiety, or other mental health problems?” Due to a formatting error on both baseline questionnaires, only those respondents who reported to use illicit drugs were directed to respond to the question. Among the self-reported illicit drug users at baseline, 46.7% claimed to have experienced serious problems with depression, anxiety, or other mental health problems in the past year.

Following the collection of the baseline questionnaires, the formatting error was detected and the follow-up questionnaire was accordingly revised. The modified questionnaire instructed every follow-up respondent to complete the mental health question. Of the follow-up respondents, 6.3% reported to have experienced serious problems with depression anxiety or other mental health problems in the past year.

#### 4.7 Gambling Beliefs

#### 4.7.1 Estimation of the Percentage of Problem Gamblers in the General Albertan Adult Population

Casino employees grossly overestimated the percentage of problem gamblers in the general Albertan adult population. (For the purpose of the questionnaires, problem gambling was defined as “gambling that results in significant negative consequences for the gambler or others in his or her social network.”) The respondents’ average estimate of 33.4% was considerably higher than the 5.2% of problem gamblers established by Smith and Wynne (2002) in their 2001 prevalence study.

#### 4.7.2 Primary Causes of Problem Gambling / Motivations for Gambling

It is interesting to compare the casino employees’ perceptions of the primary causes of problem gambling to the motivations for partaking in gambling activities cited by moderate risk and severe problem gamblers in the Smith and Wynne (2002) prevalence study.

As seen in Table 14, casino employees and Albertan moderate risk and problem gamblers alike ranked money as one of the primary motives for gambling with 28.6% of casino employees listing “chasing losses/big win” specifically, and 16.7% designating “easy money” as a principal cause. Correspondingly, 39.6% of problem gamblers and 43.4% of moderate risk gamblers identified “to win money” as their chief reason for gambling. But money was one of the select few commonalities between the two groups.

In order of descending popularity, casino employees listed “easy money”, “addiction”, “boredom”, “loneliness”, “lack of will power”, “depression”, and “don’t know when to quit” as leading causes of problem gambling. But none of the moderate risk or problem gamblers polled by Smith & Wynne (2002) identified these factors as motives for gambling. Rather, moderate risk and problem gamblers cited “entertainment or fun”, “to support worthy causes”, “in order to do things with friends”, “for excitement or as a challenge”, and “out of curiosity” as their top motives for gambling.

**TABLE 14**  
**Casino Employees’ Perception of the Primary Causes of Problem Gambling Versus Moderate Risk and Problem Gamblers’ Reported Motivations for Gambling (Smith & Wynne, 2002)**

<b>Cause / Motivation</b>	<b>As Perceived By Casino Employees (n = 123)</b>	<b>Moderate Risk Gamblers’ Motivations for Gambling (Smith &amp; Wynne, 2002)</b>	<b>Severe Problem Gamblers’ Motivations for Gambling (Smith &amp; Wynne, 2002)</b>
Other	42.9%	9.7%	9.4%
Chasing losses/big win	28.6%	43.4%	39.6%
Easy money	16.7%		
Problems at work/home	16.7%	0.7%	1.9%

Addiction	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Boredom	14.3%	0.0%	0.0%
Loneliness	11.9%	0.0%	0.0%
Lack of will power	9.5%	0.0%	0.0%
Depression	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Don't know when to quit	4.8%	0.0%	0.0%
Entertainment or fun	0.0%	23.3%	26.4%
To support worthy causes	0.0%	9.7%	5.7%
In order to do things with friends	0.0%	3.1%	5.7%
For excitement or as a challenge	0.0%	6.9%	8.5%
Out of curiosity	0.0%	2.1%	2.8%

#### 4.7.3 Most Common Demographic Characteristics of Problem Gamblers

Casino employees were also asked to identify the most common characteristics of problem gamblers from their experience working in the gaming industry and were encouraged to select as many characteristics as they deemed applicable in each of the respective categories. The results of the question are detailed in Table 15 below.

**TABLE 15**

#### **Most Common Demographic Characteristics of Problem Gamblers as Identified by Casino Employees**

<b>Demographic Characteristic (n = 122)</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>Sex:</b>	
Male	50.0%
Female	10.5%
Both	39.5%
<b>Age:</b>	
19-24	24.5%
25-29	30.6%
30-39	50.0%
40-49	63.3%
50-59	36.7%
60-69	10.2%
70+	4.1%
All	16.3%
<b>Ancestry:</b>	
European-Canadian	51.1%
Aboriginal	51.1%
Asian-Canadian	35.6%

African-Canadian	11.1%
Other	11.1%
All	17.8%
<b>Marital Status:</b>	
Single	36.2%
Married	44.7%
Common-law	12.8%
Divorced/separated	38.3%
Widowed	8.5%
All	27.7%
<b>Education:</b>	
Elementary school education	17.1%
High school education	58.5%
College or university education	22.0%
All	24.4%
<b>Income:</b>	
Lower income	51.0%
Middle income	65.3%
Higher income	42.9%
All	18.4%
<b>Employment Status:</b>	
Employed	83.3%
Unemployed	41.7%
Student	37.5%
Homemaker	27.1%
Retired	20.8%
All	10.4%
<b>Game of choice:</b>	
Slots	75.7%
Table games	32.4%
Blackjack	24.3%
VLTs	16.2%
Lottery	5.4%
Poker	2.7%
Roulette	2.7%
Mini Baccarat	0.0%
All	8.1%

#### 4.7.4 Casino Employees' Perceptions of the Most Common Demographic Characteristics of Albertan Problem Gamblers Compared to the Demographic Characteristics of Albertan Problem Gamblers (Smith & Wynne, 2002)

Once again, it is fascinating to compare the profile of the casino employees' perceived archetypal problem gambler to the profile of an adult Albertan problem

gambler identified in the Alberta prevalence study (Smith & Wynne, 2002). Intriguingly, gender was the only correspondence. Table 16 outlines the discrepancies.

**TABLE 16**  
**Demographic Profile of Albertan Problem Gamblers**

Demographic Characteristic	As perceived by Casino Employees (n = 122)	Smith and Wynne (2002) Study
Sex	Male	Male
Age	40-49 years	19-24 years
Ancestry	Aboriginal or European Canadian	European Canadian
Marital Status	Married	Common-law or Single
Highest level of education	High school education	N/A <sup>1</sup>
Income	Middle income	Lower income <sup>2</sup>
Employment Status	Employed	Unemployed
Game of choice	Slots	VLTs

<sup>1</sup> A relationship between problem and at-risk gambling behaviour and low education was evident, but the trend was not statistically significant

<sup>2</sup> Less than \$20,000

#### 4.7.5 Beliefs About Gambling's Societal Impact

Table 17 demonstrates that the greatest percentage of respondents (47.9%) deemed the harm that gambling causes to either *somewhat* outweigh (32.2%) or *far* outweigh (15.7%) the good that comes from it. The remaining respondents were almost evenly divided between believing the benefits to be equivalent to the negative effects (24.3%), and considering the recreational and economic benefits to either *far* outweigh (9.6%) or *somewhat* outweigh any negative effects (18.3%).

**TABLE 17**  
**Beliefs About Gambling's Societal Impact**

Belief (n = 115)	%
The recreational and economic benefits of gambling far outweigh any negative effects	9.6%
The recreational and economic benefits of gambling somewhat outweigh its negative effects	18.3%
The benefits of gambling are equivalent to its negative effects	24.3%
The harm that gambling causes somewhat outweighs the good that comes from it	32.2%
The harm that gambling causes far outweighs the good that comes from it	15.7%

#### 4.7.6 Susceptibility to Gambling Fallacies

Most respondents either disagreed (50%) or strongly disagreed (36.1%)

with the single question designed to assess susceptibility to gambling fallacies. Interestingly, casino employees appear to be less susceptible than the general Alberta populace.

**TABLE 18**  
**Susceptibility to Gambling Fallacies**

<b>While gambling, after losing many times in a row, you are more likely to win (n = 122):</b>	<b>Casino Employee Survey Sample Distribution %</b>	<b>General Albertan Adult Population Survey Sample Distribution % (Smith &amp; Wynne, 2002)</b>
Strongly agree	0%	1.0%
Agree	2.5%	9.9%
Disagree	50.0%	53.5%
Strongly disagree	36.1%	35.7%
Don't know	11.5%	N/A

#### **4.7.7 Suggested Measures to Decrease Problem Gambling**

Just over 35% of respondents feel the industry could reduce problem gambling by intervening more with problem gamblers and by increasing problem gambling awareness, while 22.7% believe the industry is already doing everything in its power to decrease problem gambling. Finally, another 22.7% feel that alcohol should either be eliminated altogether or its consumption should be more closely monitored. An open-ended question was used to ascertain what casino employees think could be done to decrease problem gambling. The coded results are presented in Table 19.

**TABLE 19**  
**Suggested Measures to Decrease Problem Gambling**

<b>Suggestion (n = 120)</b>	<b>%</b>	
More problem gambling intervention and awareness	36.4%	<b>4.8</b>
The industry is already taking every measure possible	22.7%	
Eliminate alcohol or monitor its consumption more closely	22.7%	<b>Gambling</b>
More aggressive self-exclusion program promotion	4.5%	
Ban smoking in all casinos	4.5%	
Remove ATMs from all casinos	4.5%	<b>4.8.1</b>
Close all casinos entirely	4.5%	
Restrict hours of operation and/or close all casinos on Sundays	4.5%	<b>Gambling Prevalence</b>
Ban problem gamblers	4.5%	
Other	4.5%	

**e**

Just over 80% of casino employees, exactly 66% of AADAC Employee Survey respondents, 85% of Northern Albertan Smith and Wynne (2002) Survey respondents, and 82% of general Albertan Smith and Wynne (2002) Survey respondents identified themselves as gamblers.

Participants in the AADAC survey were classified as gamblers if they answered yes to the question that asked if they had bought lottery or scratch tickets, bet on sports either at the racetrack or against other people, participated in internet gambling, or

played bingo, slot machines, VLTs, or casino table games in the past 12 months. Similarly, participants in the Smith and Wynne (2002) survey were categorized as gamblers if they had wagered on one or more of the following in the past year: gambling tickets (lottery, daily lottery, instant-win, raffles); bingo; gambling with family or friends (cards, board games); electronic gambling (VLTs, casino or racetrack gaming terminals, internet); sports betting (Sports Select, sports pools, sporting events, bookmaker); horse racing, casino table games; speculative investments (stocks, options, commodities); or other gambling (games of skill, unregulated card rooms, any other).

Contrastingly, respondents in the Casino Employee Survey were simply asked to answer the multiple choice question, “Do you currently gamble?” Answer options were “Yes”, “Yes, but very rarely”, “No, I have never gambled”, and “No, I quit gambling”. It should be noted that all available gambling formats were not listed in the gambling status question on the casino employee questionnaire and some respondents may not have classified certain gambling activities as “gambling”.

**TABLE 20**  
**Gambling Prevalence**

	<b>Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>Smith and Wynne (2002) Survey Northern Albertan Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>Smith and Wynne (2002) Survey General Albertan Sample % Distribution</b>
<b>Gambling Status (n = 118):*</b>				
Gambler <sup>1</sup>	80.5%	66.0%	85.0%	82.0%
Non-gambler <sup>2</sup>	19.5%	34.0%	15.0%	18.0%

\* Chi Square test with  $p < .05$

<sup>1</sup> Non-problem CPGI, Low CPGI risk, Moderate problem CPGI, Severe problem CPGI

<sup>2</sup> Former gamblers, and those who have never gambled

#### **4.8.2 Motivations for Quitting Gambling**

Of the 4.2% of participants who quit gambling, 60.0% quit because it is prohibited by their employment, 10.0% quit because it was causing them too many problems, 10.0% quit because watching other players gamble while at work changed their attitude, and another 10.0% quit because a spouse, significant other, family member, or friend suggested they quit.

#### **4.8.3 Gambling Frequency in the Past Six Months**

As presented in Table 21 below, lottery, raffle, and instant win tickets are the most popular gambling activity among casino employees with 79.4% of respondents playing at least one of the three in the past six months. A significant portion of respondents played lottery, raffle, and instant win tickets quite frequently in the last six months with 14% playing two to three times a month, another 14% playing about once a week, and 6.5% playing between two to six times a week. This finding is consistent with



Smith and Wynne's 2002 study which found gambling ticket ("gambling tickets" include lottery tickets, daily lottery, instant win or scratch tickets, and raffle or fund raising tickets) purchases to be the most popular form of gambling for Albertans with 74.4% of non-problem gamblers, 79.7% of low risk gamblers, 76.1% of moderate risk gamblers, and 87.0% of severe problem gamblers purchasing lottery tickets within the past 12 months.

Cards, or board games with family or friends ranked second in popularity among casino employees with 67% of respondents playing in the past six months. Notably, cards, or board games with family or friends are also played frequently with 9% of respondents playing roughly once a week, 4% playing between two to six times a week, and 2% playing daily. Games of skill are also favoured by casino employees with 41% participating in the past six month.

**TABLE 21**  
**Gambling Frequency in the Past Six Months<sup>1</sup>**

<b>Activity (n = 107)</b>	<b>Never or almost never</b>	<b>Once or twice</b>	<b>Between 3-6 times</b>	<b>About once/month</b>	<b>2-3 times/month</b>	<b>About once/week</b>	<b>2-6 times/week</b>	<b>Daily</b>
Lottery, Raffle, or Instant Win Tickets	20.6	18.7	17.8	7.5	14.0	14.0	6.5	0.9
Slot machines	57.7	21.6	9.3	6.2	4.1	1.0	0.0	0.0
VLTs	46.5	31.7	6.9	7.9	3.0	4.0	0.0	0.0
Poker	76.0	7.0	6.0	0.0	2.0	7.0	0.0	2.0
Other card games	69.0	22.0	3.0	1.0	3.0	1.0	1.0	0.0
Roulette	79.8	14.1	3.0	1.0	2.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Craps or other dice games	87.5	6.3	2.1	1.0	2.1	1.0	0.0	0.0
Pai Gow or other tile games	97.9	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0
Bingo	71.0	17.0	2.0	1.0	6.0	3.0	0.0	0.0
Internet gambling	93.8	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	2.1	1.0
Horse racing	93.8	4.2	1.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Sports Select	90.6	2.1	3.1	1.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	1.0
Other sports betting	97.9	0.0	1.0	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Stocks, options, or futures	86.5	9.4	2.1	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0
Cards, or board games with family or friends	33.0	23.0	12.0	13.0	4.0	9.0	4.0	2.0

Games of skill	59.0	14.0	10.0	5.0	4.0	4.0	2.0	2.0
----------------	------	------	------	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

<sup>1</sup> Percentages derived solely from gambling respondents

As presented in Table 22, more casino employees participate in every type of gambling activity when compared to the general Albertan adult population. The only exception to this trend is “other sports betting”, where 4.4% of polled Albertans played in the past year compared to only 2.1% of casino employees.

**TABLE 22<sup>1</sup>**

**Casino Employees’ Participation in Gambling Activities Versus the General Albertan Adult Population’s Participation in Gambling Activities**

<b>Activity (n = 107)</b>	<b>Casino Employee Survey Sample Distribution %</b>	<b>General Albertan Adult Population Survey Sample Distribution % (Smith &amp; Wynne, 2002)</b>
Lottery Tickets	79.4%	61.8%
Raffles or Fund Raising Tickets		49.5%
Instant Win or Scratch Tickets		29.2%
Slot machines	42.3%	15.9%
VLTs	53.5%	13.4%
Poker	24.0%	5.7%
Other card games	31.0%	
Roulette	20.2%	
Craps or other dice games	12.5%	
Pai Gow or other tile games	2.1%	
Bingo	29.0%	8.5%
Internet gambling	6.2%	0.3%
Horse racing	6.2%	4.7%
Sports Select	9.4%	3.1%
Other sports betting	2.1%	4.4%
Stocks, options, or futures	13.5%	12.3%
Cards, or board games with family or friends	67.0%	9.2%
Games of skill	41.0%	6.5%

<sup>1</sup> Percentages derived solely from gambling respondents

#### **4.8.4 Approximate Amount of Money Spent in a Typical Month on Gambling Activities**

Casino employees were asked approximately how much money they spent in a typical month on gambling activities. The mean was \$89.02, the median was \$50.00, and the mode was \$200.00. There are no directly comparable figures for the general Alberta populace due to methodological differences in how the question was asked in the Smith & Wynne (2002) study. However, a recent Ontario study by Williams and Wood (2004) used comparable wording and found the Ontario populace average to be \$38.21 with a median of \$20.00 and mode of \$20.00.

#### **4.8.5 CPGI Categorization**

As demonstrated in Table 23 below, the majority of those that did gamble in the past year were categorized by the CPGI as non-problem gamblers. Individuals classified as non-problem gamblers respond “never” to all of the behavioural problem indicators on the CPGI and are not likely to have experienced any adverse consequences due to their gambling activities (Smith & Wynne, 2002).

Like non-problem gamblers, low risk gamblers primarily answer “never” to the indicators of behavioural problems. However, low risk gamblers answer “sometimes” or “most of the time” at least once. Although gamblers in this group may be at risk if they are heavily involved in gambling and if they respond positively to at least two of the correlates of problem gambling, they too are not likely to experience any adverse consequences as a result of their gambling activities (Ferris & Wynne, 2001).

Individuals classified as moderate problem gamblers score three or higher on the CPGI. (The moderate problem gambling category is also referred to as the moderate risk gambling category.) The ‘moderate problem gambling’ description appears to be the more appropriate designation for two reasons. The first concerns comparability to other instruments, as people who score three to seven on the CPGI most typically score in the ‘problem gambling’ range on the SOGS (three to four) and people who score eight and above on the CPGI tend to score in the ‘pathological gambling’ range on the SOGS and DSM-IV. Secondly, almost everyone scoring three and above on the CPGI reports *problems* associated with their gambling. In the present study (as well as other CPGI studies), this most commonly is: feeling guilty about gambling, chasing losses, and betting more than they can afford to lose. Score distributions for the CPGI and SOGS show gambling to exist on a continuum with problem and pathological gambling with no clear pattern of scores or symptoms differentiating ‘problem gamblers’ from non-problem gamblers. Thus, self-report of ‘problems’ would appear to offer the best method of making this demarcation.

Respondents classified as severe problem gamblers score eight or higher on the CPGI. These are pathological gamblers who have experienced serious adverse consequences as a result of their gambling involvement.

As can be seen, roughly 25% of casino employees were deemed to be either moderate or severe problem gamblers, a prevalence rate several times higher than the general populace or the Alberta workforce.

**TABLE 23**  
**Canadian Problem Gambling Index (CPGI) Scores**

<b>Categorization (n = 113)*</b>	<b>Casino Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>2002 AADAC Employee Survey Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>Smith and Wynne (2002) Survey Northern Albertan Sample % Distribution</b>	<b>Smith and Wynne (2002) Survey General Albertan Sample % Distribution</b>
Non-problem gambler	60.7%	88.0%	79.7%	67.0%
Low risk gambler	14.3%	9.0%	12.3%	9.8%
Moderate problem gambler	18.9%	3.0%	5.7%	3.9%
Severe problem gambler	6.3%	1.0%	2.3%	1.3%

\* Chi Square test with p < .05

**4.8.6 Prevalence of Problem Gambling among Family Members**

It appears that a family history of problem gambling is not common among casino employees as the preponderance of respondents contended that no one in their family has ever had a gambling problem. Even so, the 25% rate of problem gambling among family members still appears to be higher than that found in the general populace.

**TABLE 24**  
**Prevalence of Problem Gambling among Family Members**

<b>Has anyone in your family ever had a gambling problem? (n = 112)</b>	<b>%</b>
Yes	25.0%
No	61.6%
Don't know	13.4%

## 4.9 Impact of Casino Employment

### 4.9.1 Retrospective Estimate of Impact

The impact of casino employment was assessed in three ways. First, respondents were simply asked at baseline how they believed their casino employment had affected a particular activity (e.g., smoking, drinking, etc.) or attitude. Tables 25 and 26 detail the respondents' answers to these questions. As illustrated in Table 25, the greater part of respondents feel casino employment has not affected their tobacco use, alcohol consumption, drug use, or gambling activities. Among the minority who did feel that these activities had been affected, most reported an increase in tobacco and alcohol use and a decrease in drug use and gambling.

**TABLE 25**  
**Casino Employees' Perceived Impact of Employment on Tobacco Use, Substance Use, and Gambling Behaviour<sup>1</sup>**

Activity	No Affect	Decreased	Increased
Tobacco Use (n = 92)	54.3%	12.0%	33.7%
Alcohol Consumption (n = 117)	85.5%	4.3%	10.3%
Drug Use (n = 54)	85.2%	14.8%	0%
Gambling Activities (n = 114)	50.9%	28.9%	20.2%

<sup>1</sup> Reported changes for respondents who currently engage or previously engaged in these activities

As presented in Table 26, the majority of respondents held that casino employment has made them either *much* more (29.8%) or *somewhat* more (33.1%) sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers. Contrastingly, a collective total of only 17.3% of casino employees asserted that casino employment has either *somewhat* (11.5%) or *very much* (5.8%) desensitized them to the issue of problem gambling and problem gamblers.

**TABLE 26**  
**Impact of Casino Employment on Attitude Towards Problem Gambling and Problem Gamblers**

Attitude (n = 121)	%
I have become much more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers	29.8%
I have become somewhat more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers	33.1%
My casino employment has not affected my attitude towards problem gambling or problem gamblers	19.8%
I have become somewhat desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and problem gamblers	11.5%
I have become very much desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and problem gamblers	5.8%

#### **4.9.2 Correlation between Length of Casino Employment at Baseline and Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction**

Secondly, impact of casino employment was measured by correlating length of employment with particular characteristics of interest (e.g., gambling status, gambling frequency, approximate amount of money spent in a typical month on gambling activities, etc.). A contingency coefficient (C) was used for nominal variables and a Spearman rho was used for all other variables. Most variables were found not to be statistically associated with length of employment. There were a few exceptions. Longer casino employment at baseline was associated with greater job stress, lower drinking quantity, less susceptibility to gambling fallacies, and a greater tendency to deem gambling harmful to society. The results of the analyses are listed in Table 27.

**TABLE 27**

**Correlation Between Length of Casino Employment at Baseline and Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction**

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Length of Employment at Baseline (n = 123)</b>
<b>Job Satisfaction:</b>	
Overall job satisfaction	rho = .172, ns
Job stressfulness	rho = .22, p < .05
<b>Smoking:</b>	
Smoking Status	C = .593, ns
<b>Drinking:</b>	
Drinking Status	C = .565, ns
Drinking Frequency	rho = -.027, ns
Drinking Quantity	rho = -.244, p < .05
<b>Illicit Drug Use:</b>	
Illicit Drug Use	rho = -.052, ns
<b>Gambling:</b>	
Gambling Status	C = .573, ns
Gambling Frequency	rho = -.005, ns
Approximate amount of money spent in a typical month on gambling activities	rho = .144, ns
CPGI score	rho = .055, ns
Attitude towards the benefit versus the harm of gambling	rho = -.25, p < .05
Susceptibility to gambling fallacies	rho = .235, p < .05
Attitude towards problem gamblers	rho = -.039, ns
Estimation of the percentage of problem gamblers in the general Albertan adult population	rho = -.237, ns

**4.9.3 Correlation between Length of Casino Employment at Baseline with Changes in Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction at Follow-Up**

Thirdly, impact of casino employment was assessed by correlating length of employment at baseline and changes in various attributes (e.g., gambling status, gambling frequency, approximate amount of money spent in a typical month on gambling activities, etc.) from baseline to the six month follow-up. As displayed in Table 28, none of the analyzed attributes were found to be statistically significant. However, the small sample size also limited the statistical power of these correlations.

**TABLE 28**

**Correlation Between Length of Casino Employment and Change in Gambling Behaviour, Gambling Attitudes, Substance Use, and Job Satisfaction from Baseline to Six Month Follow-Up**



Characteristic	Length of Employment at Baseline (n = 27)*
<b>Job Satisfaction:</b>	
Δ Overall job satisfaction	rho = -.034, ns
Δ Job stressfulness	rho = -.150, ns
<b>Smoking:</b>	
Δ Smoking Status	C = .622, ns
<b>Drinking:</b>	
Δ Drinking Status	C = .480, ns
Δ Drinking Frequency	rho = -.144, ns
Δ Drinking Quantity	rho = -.042, ns
<b>Illicit Drug Use:</b>	
Δ Illicit Drug Use:	rho = -.707, ns
<b>Gambling:</b>	
Δ Gambling Status	C = .652, ns
Δ Gambling Frequency	rho = -.041, ns
Δ Approximate amount of money spent in a typical month on gambling activities	rho = -.062, ns
Δ CPGI score	rho = -.137, ns
Δ Attitude towards the benefit versus the harm of gambling	rho = .330, ns
Δ Susceptibility to gambling fallacies	rho = -.140, ns
Δ Attitude toward problem gamblers	rho = .330, ns
Δ Estimation of the percentage of problem gamblers in the general Albertan adult population	rho = .021, ns

## CHAPTER 5

### 5 Discussion

#### 5.1 Job Satisfaction

Most casino employees appear to be fairly satisfied with their work, with the majority reporting their job satisfaction to be either “high” or “very high” and only 4% reporting “low” or “very low” satisfaction. The casino employees’ top sources of job satisfaction are their coworkers and the nature of their work. There do not appear to be any marked differences in job satisfaction compared to Albertan employees generally, although fewer casino employees reported very high job satisfaction compared to the general workforce. Paradoxically, a somewhat higher percentage of the general workforce report their jobs to be stressful compared to casino employees.

Similarly, Frey and Carns (1988) found casino dealers in Las Vegas to have good job satisfaction. But unlike Frey and Carns’s (1988) respondents, Northern Albertan casino employees are not generally bored, unhappy with the nature of their work, or unenthusiastic about going to work. Rather, they deem their work interesting, coworkers supportive, supervision good, and overall job satisfaction high.

Perhaps these discrepancies are partly due to the sense of achievement Northern Albertan casino employees reported. This sense of accomplishment was evident in many of the respondents’ replies to the questionnaires’ open-ended question assessing job satisfaction. For example, one casino employee stated his primary source of job satisfaction as “When we achieve sales goals”, while another listed “Our success as a casino operation” as her leading source of job satisfaction. A third respondent remarked, “Satisfaction comes from doing my job well and learning more about the games I deal”. Finally, one participant stated a “sense of accomplishment” as his major source of job satisfaction.

The majority of Northern Albertan casino employees also claim to be adequately recognized by the management team. Again, this sense of management recognition was a common theme found in the respondents’ sources of job satisfaction. Some of the managerial-related replies included: “The satisfaction of being told you are doing a good job”; “They’re very supportive and understanding”; “The casino appreciates their staff and they show it in numerous ways”; and “My supervisor is easy to talk to and is helpful with everything”. Conflictingly, the respondents in Frey and Carns’ 1988 study did not feel a sense of achievement, and did not expect management to adequately recognize them for suggestions or contributions about working conditions or practices. As discussed in the literature review, achievement and recognition are critical in producing and sustaining job satisfaction.

Although this study did not ascertain whether the respondents would prefer to hold another job in a different industry, 67.3% expect to be working in the casino industry in one year. Contrastingly, 65% of dealers in Frey and Carns (1988) study did *not* see themselves as dealers in the future. This inconsistency suggests that Northern Albertan casino employees may enjoy their work more than the Las Vegas casino employees polled by Frey and Carns. Alternatively, they may simply realize that their limited education and transferable skills drastically reduce their viable employment options, particularly in a smaller city. These restrictions might simply render casino employment the most promising opportunity to earn a decent living.

#### 5.2 Substance Use and Abuse

Casino employees have alarmingly high rates of smoking: Fifty-seven percent of Northern Albertan casino employees used tobacco in the past month compared to 30% of the general Albertan workforce (AADAC, 2002). This finding is strikingly similar to Shaffer et al.'s (1999) discovery that the prevalence of smoking among US casino employees is roughly 50% higher than the prevalence rate among the general adult American population. It should be noted, however, that just under 40% of casino employees reported to be smokers in Shaffer et al.'s (1999) study.

The prevalence rate of alcohol consumption among casino employees slightly exceeds the prevalence rate of drinking in the general Albertan workforce. Approximately 88% of casino employees drink while only 81% of Albertans in the general workforce drink. Their frequency of drinking is similar, however, with the majority of both casino employees and members of the general Albertan workforce reporting to drink once a week or less.

Despite these parallels, casino employees appear to be heavier drinkers, with 8% of respondents reporting to drink 10 or more drinks per occasion compared to only 2% in the AADAC Employee Survey study. This discrepancy may be due to the casino employees' younger age, the social atmosphere inherent in the casino environment, or the greater availability and exposure to alcohol. The excessive quantity of alcohol consumed by casino employees suggests there may also be higher rates of alcohol problems within this population. Though time constraints prevented a full assessment of alcohol abuse in the questionnaires, over two times as many casino employees than members of the general Albertan workforce reported that a relative, friend, doctor or other health care worker had been concerned about their drinking in the past year (5.5% versus 2.3%). These results are consistent with Shaffer et al. (1999) who reported that the prevalence rate of alcohol problems among US casino employees significantly surpassed the prevalence rate of alcohol problems found in the general adult American population (11.5% compared to 6.3%).

For the most part, casino employees are using *less* medication than the general Albertan adult population. But because many casino employees receive no benefits, medication use may be a sometimes-unaffordable luxury for many of the study's participants.

However, there are two notable exceptions to this trend: sleeping pills, and over-the-counter stimulants (e.g., diet pills, and "wake up" pills). Twice as many casino employees reported to use sleeping pills than the general Albertan adult population (14.1% compared to 7.2%), and over five times as many casino employees claimed to use over-the-counter stimulants than the general Albertan adult population (11.3% versus 1.9%). These comparatively high prevalence rates may be attributed to casino workers' irregular shifts as both sleeping pills and over-the-counter stimulants would help counteract the physical effects of unusually late hours followed by early morning start times.

The uneven sex representation found in the casino employee sample might also specifically account for the high sleeping pill prevalence rate. (Just under 75% of the casino employee survey sample was female compared to only 54% of the AADAC employee survey sample). Because women are more likely than men to use sleeping

pills, it is possible that the uneven sex distribution could account for the prevalence discrepancy between the two samples (AADAC, 2000). However this explanation is not as compelling as the former since women are also more likely to use tranquilizers, yet only 1.4% of casino employees reported to use tranquilizers compared to 2.1% of the AADAC Employee Survey respondents (AADAC, 2000).

Despite lower medication prevalence rates, more casino employees reported using illicit drugs than the general Albertan adult population. Marijuana was the only minor exception to this pattern where casino employees lagged 1.3% behind the general population. Aside from this anomaly, anywhere from two and a half to nine and a half times more casino employees admitted to using illicit drugs than did members of the general population.

Some of the demographic dissimilarities between the two samples might help to account for the illicit drug use prevalence discrepancies between casino employees and the general population. For example, the mean age of casino employees was 33.8 years while the majority of the AADAC Employee Survey's respondents were between 35 and 50 years. Similarly, 30% of AADAC Employee Survey participants held one or more university degrees whereas only 5% of casino employees claimed to hold the same distinction. These demographic characteristics in combination with the atypical work environment and the late-night shifts characteristic of casino employment may simply place casino employees at a higher risk for illicit drug use.

### **5.3 Gambling and Problem Gambling**

Differences between casino employees and the general workforce were anticipated to emerge in this area because of casino employees' excessive exposure to gambling and problem gambling. Unfortunately, casino employees' overall prevalence rate of gambling compared to the general populace and general workforce is unclear due to methodological differences in the phrasing of the question intended to assess gambling prevalence in the various studies. Nevertheless, 81% of casino employees identified themselves as gamblers compared to 66% of Albertan employees (AADAC, 2002) and 82% of adult Albertans (85% of Northern Albertans) (Smith & Wynne, 2002).

The very definition - or lack of definition, in some cases - of the somewhat ambiguous term "gambling" might help to account for the difference in prevalence rates. For example, the AADAC Employee Survey classified a respondent as a gambler "if they had in the past 12 months bought lottery or scratch tickets, played bingo, played slot machines or VLTs, played casino table games, bet on sports/at the racetrack/against other people or participated in Internet gambling" (Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, 2002, p. 27). Similarly, Smith and Wynne (2002) classified an individual as a gambler if they had wagered on one or more of the following gambling activities in the past year: gambling tickets (lottery, daily lottery, instant-win, raffles); bingo; gambling with family or friends (cards, board games); electronic gambling (VLTs, casino or racetrack gaming terminals, internet); sports betting (Sports Select, sports pools, sporting events, bookmaker); horse racing, casino table games; speculative investments (stocks, options, commodities); or other gambling (games of skill, unregulated card rooms, any other).

Contrastingly, respondents in the Casino Employee Survey were simply asked to answer the multiple choice question, "Do you currently gamble?" Answer options were, "Yes", "Yes, but very rarely", "No, I have never gambled", and "No, I quit gambling". It

should be noted that all currently available gambling formats were not listed in the gambling status question on the Casino Employee questionnaire. Due to this omission, some respondents may not have recognized certain gambling activities as “gambling” and mistakenly categorized themselves as non-gamblers, resulting in lower prevalence rates of gambling.

Lottery, raffle, and instant win tickets are the favoured gambling formats among both casino employees and the general Albertan population. However, these formats are more popular among casino employees with 79.4% of casino employee survey respondents reporting to wager money on these activities in the past year compared to only 61.4% of the general Albertan population (Smith & Wynne, 2002). Cards or board games with family or friends ranked second among the casino employees with 67% participating in the past twelve months while slot machines and VLTs tied for second among the general population at 23.4% (Smith & Wynne, 2002). VLTs and slots were also popular among the casino employees placing third and fourth at 53.5% and 42.3%, respectively. Stocks, options, and futures were more popular among the general population than the casino employees with 15.6% of the general adult population reporting to have participated in the past twelve months (Smith & Wynne, 2002).

In a typical month, casino employees reported spending an average of \$89.02 on gambling activities. Their median monthly gambling expenditure was \$50.00 compared to the general Albertan adult population’s average median monthly expenditure of \$59 (Smith & Wynne, 2002). However, this comparison could be misleading as expenditure was assessed differently in the two studies. Research has demonstrated that different question wording produces large discrepancies in estimated expenditure (Woods & Williams, 2004). In the Smith and Wynne (2002) study, expenditure for each type of gambling was assessed then added together, while the present study invited the respondents to provide an aggregate amount. A more appropriate comparison may be a recent Ontario study that used the identical wording and found the average expenditure to be \$38.21 and the median to be \$20.00 (Williams & Wood, 2004).

There are also clear differences in problem gambling prevalence rates. Roughly 19% of casino employees were categorized as moderate problem gamblers and another 6% were classified as severe problem gamblers. This compares to 3% and 1% in the Alberta workforce and 4% and 1% in the general Alberta populace. And, interestingly, it appears there is an awareness of this trend among casino employees. One casino employee remarked, “I do know and realize that dealers are a large part of problem gamblers.” while another respondent commented, “I think this questionnaire is an excellent idea. Many people who work at casinos are problem gamblers. More than people realize.”

The present findings are remarkably similar to Shaffer et al. (2002) who identified 21% of US casino employees as level two (problem) gamblers and another 4% as level three (pathological) gamblers. However, the present results are inconsistent with Shaffer et al.’s (1999) study where respective past-year level two and three prevalence rates of 1% and 2% were obtained.

The high rates in the present study may be partly attributable to the casinos’ geographic location. Smith and Wynne (2002) document that “Northern Alberta residents are more at risk or are already experiencing gambling problems than are other citizens in the other three regions of the province” (2002, p. 57). And Smith and Wynne

were not the first to detect this trend: A recent AADAC report established that per capita expenditures on lotteries and VLTs were highest in the Northern Alberta Regional Health Authority districts (James, 1999). The same AADAC report also found that calls to AADAC's Provincial Gambling Help Line were highest in the Northern Alberta Regional Health Authority districts.

Yet the rates obtained in the present study are still considerably higher than the rates reported in the general Northern Albertan population (6% moderate problem; 2% severe problem). Therefore, there must be other causative factors. As previously discussed, one possibility is that casino employment creates high rates of problem gambling. Another possibility is that problem gamblers are more likely to seek employment in the industry, and a third possibility is that problem gamblers are more likely to maintain their employment in the industry once hired. These possibilities will be examined more closely later in this paper (Section 5.4 Impact of Employment).

### **5.3.1 Beliefs and Attitudes about Gambling and Problem Gambling**

It is interesting to note the inconsistencies between the casino employees' perceived archetypal problem gambler and the demographic profile of an adult Albertan problem gambler outlined in Smith and Wynne's (2002) study. Though both studies identified the problem gambler as more likely to be male, there were noteworthy discrepancies with respect to age, marital status, ethnicity, highest level of education, income, employment status, and game of choice.

While the casino employees' problem gambler profile was shaped by their collective experience interacting with problem gamblers in the casino itself, Smith and Wynne's (2002) profile was generated exclusively by random telephone interviews. Though the latter methodology might initially appear to be the more valid of the two, there are some limitations inherent in this approach.

Because most prevalence surveys have significant nonresponse rates, it is possible that perhaps those problem gamblers that fit the profile created by the casino employees were somehow underrepresented in Smith and Wynne's sample. But despite the possibility of sampling bias, Smith and Wynne's (2002) demographic profile of an Albertan problem gambler is likely the more accurate depiction as the casino employees' profile is based entirely on subjective experience. As illustrated by the casino employees' overestimation of the problem gambling prevalence rate in the general population (33.4%), subjective experience can severely distort reality.

Interestingly, few casino employees demonstrated faulty cognition when responding to the question that assessed susceptibility to gambling fallacies, despite having significantly higher rates of problem gambling in comparison to the general Albertan adult population. (The single question that evaluated susceptibility to gambling fallacies was, "While gambling after losing many times in a row, you are more likely to win.") Just short of 1% of Albertans "strongly agreed" with this statement while 0% of casino employees did (Smith & Wynne, 2002). Correspondingly, 9.9% of Albertans "agreed" with this statement compared to only 2.5% of casino employees.

This paradoxical finding suggests there is at least *some* awareness of the true odds of gambling among casino employees. This consciousness tends to be uncommon among problem gamblers as they tend to routinely ignore the actual odds of winning, and often do not comprehend the concept that past history does not influence the outcome of random events.

#### 5.4 Impact of Casino Employment

The present study has established that compared to the general Albertan workforce, casino employees in Northern Alberta have roughly equivalent levels of job satisfaction, drinking prevalence, drinking frequency, medication use, and gambling prevalence. However, they appear to have higher rates of smoking, heavy drinking, problem drinking, sleeping pill use, over-the-counter stimulant use, illicit drug use (except marijuana), drug problems, gambling involvement (range of activities), gambling expenditure, and problem gambling. In addition, casino employees are more inclined to believe that the harm gambling causes outweighs the good that derives from it. They also appear to be less susceptible to gambling fallacies.

It is instructive to ascertain whether these similarities and differences are due to people with these characteristics preferentially seeking employment in the industry or whether employment in the industry further advances these characteristics.

It does not appear that casino employment has a major impact on smoking behaviour. There are three findings that bolster this assertion: First, 54% of casino employees that smoke reported that casino employment had not affected their tobacco use. Of the 46% reporting a change in tobacco use, 34% contended that casino employment had increased tobacco use while 12% asserted that casino employment had actually decreased tobacco use. Secondly, there was no significant association between smoking status at baseline and length of casino employment. Thirdly, there was no significant association between length of employment and change in smoking status from baseline to follow-up.

These results are fairly consistent with Chong et al.'s (1999) findings that the proportion of smokers does not change considerably as a result of working in a smoking environment. Chong et al. (1999) also found that length of casino employment does not appear to be related to change in cigarette consumption. The present study did not measure amount of cigarettes smoked in order to establish whether total consumption decreased, as was found by Chong et al. (1999).

Because the present study relied exclusively on self-report and did not verify the accuracy of the respondents' assertions, it is possible that social desirability bias influenced the integrity of the data, particularly considering the increasing stigmatization of smoking in North American society (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1999). Although it is plausible that respondents underreported tobacco use altogether, it is more likely that casino employees enjoy an elevated level of social acceptance for smoking and do not feel pressure to misreport smoking status. Furthermore, when Shaffer et al. (1999) employed plasma cotinine tests to verify the accuracy of 3,841 casino employees' self-reported smoking behaviour, the respondents' claims were found to be extremely truthful. Additionally, Shaffer et al. (1999) advised that it may not always be necessary to spend limited resources on biochemical verification of self-report.

On the whole, casino employment also does not appear to greatly impact casino employees' rates of alcohol consumption as 86% of drinkers maintained that casino employment had not affected their alcohol consumption. Of the remainder of self-reported drinkers, 4% claimed a decrease in alcohol consumption levels while 10% indicated that casino employment had increased their alcohol consumption. In addition,

there was no significant association between drinking status and drinking frequency at baseline and length of casino employment. There was also no significant association between length of employment and change in drinking status, drinking frequency, and drinking quantity from baseline to follow-up.

Drinking quantity, however, was statistically related to length of employment at baseline, indicating that casino employees tend to consume less alcohol the longer they work in the casino. There are several possible explanations for this finding. The first is that alcohol quantity levels might diminish as the novelty of socializing with coworkers begins to fade. (Casinos are extremely social settings where drinking after work with coworkers is normative.) The second explanation is that quantity of alcohol consumption is not actually linked to length of employment but to age. As employees get older, their quantity of alcohol consumption might naturally taper off as their familial commitments increase and their lifestyle and their priorities shift.

Illicit drug use does not appear to be impacted by casino employment as 85.2% of illicit drug users held that employment had not affected their drug use. Additionally, illicit drug use was not found to be statistically significant in relation to length of employment at baseline or at follow-up.

One of the primary interests of this study is the impact of casino employment on gambling behaviour. If casino employment does place individuals at a higher risk for developing problem gambling behaviour, then it follows that a casino employee's gambling behaviour should increase the longer that individual is employed at the casino. This, however, does not appear to be the case. As outlined in chapter four, an array of gambling behaviours including gambling status, gambling frequency, approximate amount of money spent in a typical month on gambling activities, and CPGI score were correlated with length of employment at baseline. None of these associations were found to be statistically significant. In addition, the individual changes between baseline and follow-up of these same four gambling behaviours were compared against length of employment and were not found to be significantly related. Finally, when asked this question directly, over half of respondents reported that casino employment had not affected gambling activities whatsoever, while 28.9% claimed casino employment actually *decreased* their gambling activities. The remaining 20.2% - the smallest portion of the three - asserted that casino employment increased their gambling activities

The reasons for this lack of change must be examined more closely, however. One might assume that there was no increase because of an unsettling awareness of the true odds, or perhaps a newfound appreciation of the perils of problem gambling. But this assumption, though sound, might not be entirely accurate.

Casino Alberta A and Casino Alberta B are the lone casinos in their respective smaller cities. Because Albertan casino employees are prohibited by law to gamble in their casino of employment, Casino Alberta A and Casino Alberta B employees are unable to engage in gambling formats that are exclusively available in casinos in their respective cities. If a Casino Alberta A employee wishes to gamble in a casino, they are forced to travel 430 kilometers to the nearest "legal" casino. Similarly, a Casino Alberta B employee in an analogous position would have to travel 466 kilometers. The sheer inaccessibility of casino-type gambling alone is likely a significant contributing factor to the percentage reporting a decrease in gambling activities.



If both casinos were located in larger cities with other casinos where employees could legally gamble, the results may have differed. This conjecture is buttressed by the candid comments respondents volunteered at the end of the baseline and follow-up questionnaires. One respondent boldly stated, “The best cure for gambling addicts is to become a dealer”, while another commented, “I go play casino games when I go to a different town. We only have one casino and can’t play here.” Remarks such as, “Now that I’m employed at the casino, I don’t miss gambling at all” and, “I know when I was gambling very heavily I would feel very guilty, but now that I have stopped...” make it seem as though some casino employees regard casino employment as an unusual variation of the self-exclusion program.

Further support of this hypothesis is provided by the fact that of the 4.2% who reported to have quit gambling, 60% quit because it is prohibited by their employment. Still more evidence can be found in the popularity of certain gambling activities among casino employees. Interestingly, the casino employees’ second favourite gambling activity, betting on cards or board games with family or friends, was overwhelmingly popular with 67% of respondents having participated it in the past year. Contrastingly, only 9.2% of adult Albertans reported to have participated in the past year (Smith & Wynne, 2002). It is possible that casino employees attempt to compensate for prohibited gambling activities such as slots and casino table games by increasing participation in those activities that are accessible such as lotteries, and cards with family and friends.

But regardless of the underlying motivations behind casino employment, a crucial implication cannot be misconstrued: there is very little evidence that the high rates of problem gambling among casino employees are a result of their casino employment. Rather, it appears that the gaming industry actually attracts problem gamblers. Additional evidence for this hypothesis can be found in the motives reported for seeking employment in the casino industry. A full 31.7% of respondents claimed that they initially sought work in the industry because “a casino employee suggested I apply”. If a casino employee knew the future employee well enough to recommend they apply for a position at the casino, it is probable that in at least some of these instances, the future employee was a regular patron of the casino, thus lending further credence to the theory that problem gamblers are intrinsically attracted to work in the casino industry.

The second and third most popular responses to this question were, “I thought I would enjoy the nature of the work (i.e., dealing cards, attending slots, etc.)”, and “I thought I would enjoy the atmosphere”. Casinos are notoriously smoky, exceptionally noisy, dimly lit, and often packed with intoxicated patrons. These signature characteristics are not typically associated with the ideal work environment. An even greater percentage of respondents claimed to be attracted to the nature of the work. Again, consider the nature of casino work: Although sporadically entertaining, it is often tedious and altogether wearing. Intoxicated gamblers or gamblers on prolonged losing streaks can be exceedingly difficult to tolerate, regardless of one’s respective position. Dealers are frequently forced to stand at the same table for entire shifts even when there are no players, while pit bosses circle the pit supervising action at the tables for hours on end. Slot attendants maneuver through the maze-like aisles with cumbersome bags filled with coins for whole shifts. Plus, the hours are often grueling. These are not typically desirable working conditions.

Yet a significant percentage of respondents assert that these are the very features that initially attracted them to work in the industry. If an individual is attracted to working in this environment, it is reasonable to suppose that that same individual would also be drawn to socializing in this environment. Therefore, these results also seem to further advance the conjecture that problem gamblers are drawn to work in the casino industry.

While gambling behaviour is not impacted by casino employment, gambling attitudes and beliefs *do* appear to be influenced. Casino employees' attitudes towards the benefit versus the harm that gambling has on society are less favourable the longer they are employed at the casino. Although not statistically significant because of a small sample size at follow-up, there was also a tendency for more negative attitudes to develop between baseline and follow-up in employees who had been employed for a shorter period of time.

This sentiment was echoed in the open-ended job dissatisfaction question, and the space provided for additional comments at the end of both the baseline and follow-up questionnaires. One respondent wrote, "This job is hard when you deal to a lot of problem gamblers (regularly). You get to know the people well, so it makes it hard to watch them destroy their lives." Another participant commented, "I think it is very sad to see some people enter the building right at opening at 10 a.m. and they are still here when I leave at 6 or 7 p.m." Finally, a third respondent remarked, "I hate to see people losing their money if I know they cannot afford to lose and not be able to tell them to go home."

It is certainly understandable how casino employees' views on the controversial issue of gambling availability shift over time. Problem gamblers are no longer faceless statistics, but actual people with familiar faces and names. The once-foreign issue of problem gambling gradually transforms into a troubling daily reality.

Susceptibility to gambling fallacies was assessed in both the baseline and follow-up questionnaire by the question, "While gambling, after losing many times in a row, you are more likely to win." Casino employees are less likely to agree to this statement the longer they are employed at the casino. Again, this trend is commonsensical – when an individual is exposed to either casino table games or electronic gaming machines as an impartial witness or even a dealer with no vested interest in the game's outcome, they discern through repeated exposure that neither superstition, fate, nor luck influences the result of the game. Thus, a senior casino employee would be less likely to fall prey to a gambling fallacy than an uninitiated individual – or, perhaps, a newer employee with less seniority – might accept unquestioningly.

## 5.5 Study Limitations

This study was limited in four key ways. A primary limitation is that the study only presents results from casino employees of two small Northern Albertan casinos. In the absence of comparable data from other Albertan or Canadian casinos, it is impossible to ascertain whether these results are representative of Albertan or Canadian casino employees generally. However, the demographic data of the present sample does seem to be fairly comparable to the demographics reported for other Canadian and US casinos. In addition, most casinos in North America have similar minimal hiring criteria and working conditions (including low wages). Finally, the similarity of many of the present findings to what has been found in other studies (e.g., smoking status, problem gambling rates, etc.) provides further support that the results have some generalizability.

Response rates are a second limitation. Although a reasonably good response rate (66%) was achieved at baseline, it is unclear how representative this sample is. Because the study utilized written questionnaires, eligible casino employees that were either illiterate or not able to read and/or write proficiently in English may have been inadvertently excluded from study participation. The follow-up response rate was fairly poor (22%). The strongest evidence concerning impact of employment would have been the separate analysis of new employees' and longer term employees' changes from baseline to follow-up. But because only 27 people provided data at follow-up, other, less rigorous correlational methods had to be used to investigate causal impacts. Thus, the "Impact of Employment" section tends to be methodologically weaker and the results less certain than the other sections.

A third limitation is that it is difficult to determine the extent to which methodological differences account for the difference in prevalence rates reported by the two comparison studies investigating the general Albertan workforce, and the adult Albertan population. Although subtle differences in question wordings account for some of these differences, the administration approach was also different. The present study used self-administered written surveys, whereas the other two studies utilized telephone interviews.

The present study was also restricted because it relied exclusively on self-reported data. The questionnaires were not supplemented by personal interviews and none of the respondents' claims were verified. Because the questionnaires were distributed, completed, and collected all within the respective casinos, respondents may have overrated job satisfaction, and underreported rates of substance use, and gambling behaviour even though they were explicitly assured in the questionnaire's preamble that the information reported would remain strictly anonymous. Research has revealed that this potential bias can prevail even when surveys are anonymous (Meston, Heiman, Trapnell, & Paulhus, 1998 as cited in Shaffer et al., 2000). Considering the possibility of social desirability bias manipulating the accuracy of self-report, external validation would have been beneficial.

A final caveat of the study was the ambiguous composition of some questions on the questionnaire itself. Overall, questions assessing prevalence rates should have been more specific. The question assessing drinking prevalence, for example, did not provide a timeframe for respondents to reference. Rather it simply asked, "How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?" Secondly, the term "gamble" was not clarified

in the question, “Do you currently gamble?” It is possible that some respondents were not aware of the host of activities that are officially classified as gambling, and responded “no” when they should have answered “yes”.

## **5.6 Conclusion**

Northern Albertan casino employees appear to be a unique population, particularly when compared to the general Albertan workforce and the Albertan adult population. Although demographically comparable in many respects, their continuous exposure to gambling, alcohol, and tobacco separates them from any other group of employees in the province.

Researchers have long speculated that individuals in environments with immediate access to substances may have higher than average rates of substance use. However, it has been demonstrated that medical personnel and pharmacists are no more likely than other professionals to abuse substances non-medically (McAuliffe, Santangelo, Gingras, Rohman, Sobol, & Magnuson, 1987; McAuliffe, Rohman, Breer, Wyshak, Santangelo, & Magnuson, 1991 as cited in Shaffer et al., 1999). This, however, does not appear to be the case for Northern Albertan casino employees who have higher rates of smoking, alcohol use, illicit drug use, medication use, and problem gambling than the general Albertan workforce. This finding prompts the obvious, initial question: Does working in a casino place employees at a higher risk for problem gambling, or does the gaming industry actually attract problem gamblers?

Although it is not possible to conclude with absolute certainty that problem gamblers are intrinsically attracted to work in the casino industry, this explanation seems to be the more compelling of the two for numerous reasons. First, the associations between a range of gambling behaviours and length of casino employment were not found to be statistically significant. Secondly, the majority of casino employees assert that casino employment has not affected their gambling behaviour. Thirdly, a significant percentage of casino employees reported that they initially sought work in the industry because “a casino employee suggested I apply”. This result indicates that this percentage of employees were at the very least socializing with casino employees prior to securing casino employment. Whether these exchanges occurred within the walls of the casino cannot be confirmed, but it is reasonable to assume that at least some of these individuals patronized the casino as players prior to their employment at the casino.

## 6 REFERENCES

- Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission (2002). *Substance use and gambling in the Alberta workplace, 2002: A replication study*. Edmonton, AB: R.A. Malatest and Assoc. Ltd.
- Alberta Gaming and Liquor Commission (AGLC) (2001). *Casino voluntary self-exclusion program: Policies and procedures*. Retrieved May 22, 2002, from <http://www.aglc.gov.ab.ca/policies/vse.asp>
- Alberta Government (2000). *AGLC works with AADAC, gaming industry on problem gambling*. Retrieved May 20, 2002, from <http://www.gov.ab.ca/can/200008/9569.html>
- Alberta Government (2004). *Budget 2004: On route on course*. Retrieved July 11, 2004, from <http://www.finance.gov.ab.ca/publications/budget/budget2004/gaming.html>
- Alberta Municipal Affairs (2003). *2002 official population list*. Retrieved May 20, 2004, from <http://www.municipalaffairs.gov.ab.ca/ms/pdf/2002pop.pdf>
- Allen, J.P., Litten, R.Z., Fertig, J.B., & Babor, T.F. (1997). A review of research on the Alcohol Use Disorders Test (AUDIT). *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 21(4), 613-619.
- American Gaming Association (1997). *Gaming industry employee impact survey*. Conducted by Coopers & Lybrand L.L.P. for the American Gaming Association.
- American Gaming Association (2002). *Research report: Health risks of casino employees (Fall 2002)*. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from [http://www.americangaming.org/publications/newsletter/aga\\_rgq.cfm/ID/63](http://www.americangaming.org/publications/newsletter/aga_rgq.cfm/ID/63)
- American Gaming Association (2003). *2003 Gaming industry diversity snapshot*. Conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers for the American Gaming Association.
- Bohn, M.J., Babor, T.F., & Kranzler, H.R. (1995). The Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT): Validation of a screening instrument for use in medical settings. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 56(4): 423-432.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (1999). Preemptive state tobacco-control laws-United States, 1982-1998. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 47, 1112-1114.

- Chong, J., Ingram, M., McClelland, D.J., Lopez, D.C.W., & De Zapien, J.G. (2000). Smoking behaviour in a smoking workplace. *Journal of Substance Abuse, 11*(3), 231-240.
- Daily, The (2000, March 8). Gambling: An update. *The Daily, 13*(2). Retrieved October 1, 2002, from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/00308d000308e.htm>
- Daily, The (2002, July 18). Gambling: An update. *The Daily, 3*(7). Retrieved October 1, 2002, from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/020718/d020718e.htm>
- Daily, The (2003, April 22). Gambling: An update. *The Daily, 4*(4). Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/030422/d030422c.htm>
- Daily, The (2003, December 12). Problem gambling. *The Daily, 4*(12). Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/031212/d031212c.htm>
- Daeppen, J.B., Yersin, B., Landry, U., Pecoud, A., & Decrey, H. (2000). Reliability and validity of the Alcohol Use Disorders Test (AUDIT) imbedded within a general health risk screening questionnaire: Results of a survey in 332 primary care patients. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research, 24*(5), 656-665.
- Darcy, P., & Lester, D. (1995). Job satisfaction of casino card dealers. *Sociology and Social Research, 72*(3), 642.
- Ewing, J.A. (1984). Detecting alcoholism: The CAGE questionnaire. *Journal of the American medical Association, 252* (14), 1905-1907.
- Ferris, J., & Wynne, H. (2001). *Canadian Problem Gambling Index: User Manual*. Retrieved October 4, 2002, from [http://www.ccsa.ca/docs/cpgi\\_manual.htm](http://www.ccsa.ca/docs/cpgi_manual.htm)
- Ferris, J., & Wynne, H. (2001). *The Canadian Problem Gambling Index: Final Report*. Retrieved August 24, 2004, from <http://www.gamblingresearch.org>
- Frey, J.H., & Carns, D.E. (1988). Job satisfaction of casino card dealers. *Psychological Reports, 77*(3), 159-164.
- Gavin, D.R., Ross, H.E., & Skinner, H.A. (1989). Diagnostic validity of the Drug Abuse Screening Test in the assessment of DSM-III drug disorders. *British Journal of Addiction, 84*(3), 301-307.
- Girdano, D., & Everly, G. (1979). *Controlling stress and tension*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: Wiley.
- James, D. (1999). *Social and health indicators of addiction*. A report prepared for the Alberta Alcohol and Drug Abuse Commission, Edmonton, AB.
- Keith, M.M., Cann, B., Brophy, J.T., Hellyer, D., Day, M., Egan, S., Mayville, K., & Watterson, A. (2001). Identifying and prioritizing gaming workers' health and safety concerns using mapping for data collection. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 39(1), 42-51.
- 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), 1184-1188.
- Marshall, K. (1998). The gambling industry: Raising the stakes. *Perspectives on labour and income*, 10(4), 7-11.
- Marshall, K. (2001). Fact-sheet on gambling. *Perspectives on labour and income*, 13(2), 47-51.
- Posner, I., Leitner, L.A., & Lester, D. (1985). Stress in casino floor employees. *Psychological Reports*, 57(1), 246.
- Rose, E. (2002, November 4). Finer dining for casino workers: Employee cafeterias offer better selection in smoke-free setting. *PressofAtlanticCity.com*. Retrieved February 11, 2004, from <http://www.pressofatlanticcity.com/news/business-casino/110402BREAKROOMSNOV4...>
- Selin, K.H. (2003). Test-retest reliability of the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test in a general population sample. *Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research*, 27(9), 1428-1435.
- Shaffer, H.J., Hall, M.N., & Vander Bilt, J. (1997). *Estimating the prevalence of disordered gambling behavior in the United States and Canada: A meta-analysis*. Boston: Presidents and Fellow of Harvard College.
- Shaffer, H.J., Vander Bilt, J., & Hall, M.N. (1999). Gambling, drinking, smoking, and other health risk activities among casino employees. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine*, 36(3), 365-378.
- Shaffer, H.J., Eber, G.B., Hall, M.N., & Vander Bilt, J. (2000). Smoking behavior among casino employees: Self-report validation using plasma cotinine. *Addictive-Behaviors*, 25(5), 693-704.

- Shaffer, H.J., & Hall, M.N. (2002). The natural history of gambling and drinking problems among casino employees. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 142(4), 405-424.
- Siegel, M., & Skeer, M. (2003). Exposure to secondhand smoke and excess lung cancer mortality risk among workers in the "5 B's": bars, bowling alleys, billiard halls, betting establishments, and bingo parlours. [Electronic version.] *Tobacco Control*, 12, 333-338.
- Skinner, H.A. (1982). The Drug Abuse Screening Test. *Addictive Behaviour*, 7(4), 363-367.
- Smith, G.J., & Wynne, H.J. (2002). *Measuring gambling and problem gambling in Alberta using the Canadian Problem Gambling Index*. A report prepared for the Alberta Gaming Research Institute, Edmonton, AB.
- Smith, R.W., Preston, F.W., & Humphries, H.L. (1976). Alienation from work: A study of casino card dealers. In W.R. Eadington (Ed.), *Gambling and society* (pp. 229-246). Springfield, IL: Thomas.
- Staley, D., & El-Guebaly, N. (1990). Psychometric properties of the Drug Abuse Screening Test in a psychiatric patient population. *Addictive Behaviors*, (15)3, 257-264.
- Stedham, Y., & Mitchell, M.C. (1996). Voluntary turnover among non-supervisory casino employees. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 12(3), 269-290.
- Stedham, Y., & Mitchell, M.C. (1998). Sexual harassment in casinos: Effects in employee attitudes and behaviors. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 14(4), 381-400.
- Trout, D., Decker, J., Mueller, C., Bernert, J.T., & Pirkle, J. (1998). Exposure of casino employees to environmental tobacco smoke. *Journal Of Occupational And Environmental Medicine*, 40(3), 270-276.
- Wager, The (2001, July 4). Gaming Employees: Mapping Health Concerns. *The Wager*, 6(27). Retrieved October 1, 2002, from <http://www.thewager.org/Backindex/vol6pdf/wager627.pdf>
- Williams, R.J. & Wood, R.T. (2004). *Demographic Sources of Ontario Gaming Revenue*. Final Report submitted to the Ontario Problem Gambling Research Centre. June 23, 2004.
- Wood, R.T. & Williams, R.J. (2004). How much do you spend gambling?



Reliability and validity of different question wordings to assess gambling expenditure. Unpublished manuscript. Available from author.

World Health Organization. (1992). *AUDIT. The alcohol use disorders identification test: Guidelines for use in primary health care*. (Document No. WHO/PSA/92.4). Geneva, Switzerland: Babor, T.F., de la Fuente, J.R., Saunders, J., & Grant, M. Retrieved July 12, 2004, from [http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2001/WHO\\_MSD\\_MSB\\_01.6a.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/hq/2001/WHO_MSD_MSB_01.6a.pdf)

Zinberg, N.E. (1984). *Drug, set, and setting: The basis for controlled intoxicant use*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

## 7 APPENDICES

### 7.1 Casino Alberta A Baseline Questionnaire



**University of Lethbridge**  
4401 University Drive  
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada  
T1K 3M4



**Alberta Gaming Research  
Institute**  
4-05H, University Extension Centre  
University of Alberta  
8303 - 112 Street  
Edmonton, AB T6G 2T4

Dr. Robert Williams and Lyndsey Dangerfield with the University of Lethbridge and Alberta Gaming Research Institute are doing a survey of casino employees to better understand their job satisfaction, demographics, substance use, opinions about gambling, and actual gambling behaviour. The results of this study will be an important supplement to a similar study recently conducted by AADAC on 3,000 employees in the Alberta workforce. Completion of the questionnaire is entirely voluntary, and all data will be kept strictly confidential. When the study is completed you will be able to see a summary of the results at: [www.abgaminginstitute.ualberta.ca](http://www.abgaminginstitute.ualberta.ca).

We do not wish to know your name, but we would like to know your birth date, which casino you work at, and gender so that we can track individual changes as the questionnaire will be given again in 6 months. Please complete all of the questions in this survey as accurately and honestly as possible. When you are finished, place your questionnaire in the attached envelope and return it to \*\*\*\*\*.

*One completed questionnaire from this casino will  
be randomly selected to win \$100 cash!*

.....

**CASINO EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE (baseline – April 2003)**

**SECTION A - DEMOGRAPHICS**

1. **What is your date of birth?** \_\_\_\_\_(day)\_\_\_\_\_(month)\_\_\_\_\_(year)
  
2. **Which of the following best describes your ancestry?**
  - a) European
  - b) East Asian
  - c) South Asian
  - d) Aboriginal
  - e) African
  - f) Latin American
  - g) Caribbean
  - h) Middle Eastern
  - i) Polynesian
  - j) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)
  
3. **What is your sex?**
  - a) M
  - b) F
  
4. **What is your current marital status?**
  - a) Married (including common law)
  - b) Separated
  - c) Divorced
  - d) Widowed
  - e) Never Married
  
5. **Are you currently a student?**
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
  
6. **Which of the following best describes your education?**
  - a) Did not graduate from high school
  - b) High school graduate or equivalent
  - c) Some college, technical school, or university
  - d) Completed technical school or college
  - e) One or more university degrees

**7. What is your gross annual household income?**

- a) Under \$10,000
- b) \$10,000 to \$19,999
- c) \$20,000 to \$34,999
- d) \$35,000 to \$49,999
- e) \$50,000 to \$99,999
- f) \$100,000 or over

**SECTION B - EMPLOYMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION**

**1. Which casino are you employed at?** \_\_\_\_\_

**2. Which of the following best describes your current position(s) at the casino? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)**

- a) Slots (includes Attendants and Cashiers)
- b) Dealer
- c) Pit Boss
- d) Security Personnel
- e) Lounge, Dining Room, Bartender, Cocktail Waitress/Waiter, or Kitchen Staff
- f) Housekeeping or Maintenance
- g) Administration or Management
- h) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)

**3. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?**

- a) Full-time
- b) Part-time
- c) Temporary/Seasonal

**4. When did you begin employment in the casino industry?**

\_\_\_\_\_(month)\_\_\_\_\_(year)

**5. Why did you initially seek employment in the casino industry? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)**

- a) I needed a job and knew they were hiring
- b) I thought I would enjoy the atmosphere
- c) I thought I would enjoy interacting with the players and/or other customers
- d) I thought I would enjoy the nature of the work (i.e., dealing cards, attending slots, etc.)
- e) I liked the staff
- f) A casino employee suggested I apply
- g) I thought the money would be good
- h) The hours appealed to me
- i) Don't know
- j) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)

**6. How interesting is the work you do?**

- a) Always interesting
  - b) Often interesting
  - c) Sometimes interesting
  - d) Not often interesting
  - e) Never interesting
- 7. How supportive do you consider your coworkers to be?**
- a) Very supportive
  - b) Supportive
  - c) Minimally supportive
  - d) Unsupportive
  - e) Very unsupportive
- 8. How would you rate the supervision you receive?**
- a) Very good
  - b) Good
  - c) Average
  - d) Poor
  - e) Very poor
- 9. How stressful do you consider your job?**
- a) Not at all stressful
  - b) Somewhat stressful
  - c) Extremely stressful
- 10. How would you rate your overall job satisfaction?**
- a) Very high
  - b) High
  - c) Moderate
  - d) Low
  - e) Very low
- 11. Do you expect you will still be working in the casino industry a year from now?**
- a) Definitely
  - b) Most likely
  - c) Unsure
  - d) I doubt it
  - e) Definitely not

12. What would you identify as your primary sources of job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction?

---

---

---

---

---

**SECTION C – SUBSTANCE USE**

1. In the past month, have you smoked or used tobacco (e.g., smoked cigarettes, pipe, or cigar or used snuff or chewing tobacco)?
- a) Yes
  - b) No – I have never smoked (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 4**)
  - c) No – I quit smoking (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 3**)
2. In the past month, did you smoke or use tobacco while at work?
- a) No
  - b) Yes
3. In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your tobacco use?
- a) No, it has not affected my tobacco use
  - b) Yes, it has decreased my tobacco use
  - c) Yes, it has increased my tobacco use
4. How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?
- a) Never – I have never drank (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 9**)
  - b) Never – I quit drinking (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 7**)
  - c) Once a month or less
  - d) Two to four times a month
  - e) Two to three times a week
  - f) Four or more times a week
5. How many drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day when you are drinking?
- a) 1 or 2
  - b) 3 or 4
  - c) 5 or 6
  - d) 7 or 8
  - e) 10 or more
6. Has a relative, friend, doctor or other health worker ever been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down?
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year

7. **Have you had any serious problems caused by drinking (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
8. **In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your alcohol consumption?**
- a) No, it has not affected my alcohol consumption
  - b) Yes, it has increased my alcohol consumption
  - c) Yes, it has decreased my alcohol consumption
9. **Have you used any of the following in the past year? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)**
- a) Yes
    - Marijuana or Hash
    - LSD (Acid), PCP, or other hallucinogens (e.g., Mushrooms)
    - Cocaine or Crack
    - Amphetamines or other stimulants (e.g., Speed, Crystal Meth, Ecstasy)
    - Heroin or other street opiates (e.g., morphine)
    - Any other street drugs (e.g., GHB)
  - b) No – I have never used drugs other than those required for medical reasons (PLEASE GO TO SECTION D)
  - c) No – I quit using drugs other than those required for medical reasons
10. **Has a relative, friend, doctor or other health worker ever been concerned about your drug use or suggested you cut down?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
11. **Have you had serious problems caused by drug use (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
12. **In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your drug use?**
- a) No, it has not affected my drug use
  - b) Yes, it has decreased my drug use
  - c) Yes, it has increased my drug use
13. **In the past 12 months have you had any serious problems with depression, anxiety, or other mental health problems?**
- a) Yes

- b) No
14. Which of the following substances have you used in the past year?  
(PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)
- Anti-depressants or other mood stabilizers
  - Tranquilizers (e.g., Ativan, Librium, and Valium)
  - Sleeping Pills
  - Medications for cough, cold, sinus problems, or allergies
  - Over the counter painkillers (Tylenol, Ibuprofen)
  - Prescription painkillers
  - Over the counter stimulants (e.g, diet pills, wake-up pills)
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION D – GAMBLING BELIEFS**

1. What is your estimate of the percentage of “problem gamblers” in the general Alberta adult population? (*problem gambling is gambling that results in significant negative consequences for the gambler or others in his or her social network*) \_\_\_\_\_%
2. In your opinion, what are the primary causes of problem gambling?  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. From your experience working in the gaming industry, what would you say are the most common characteristics of problem gamblers in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, education, income, employment, and game of choice: (MARK AS MANY BOXES THAT APPLY IN EACH CATEGORY)
- Male  Female
- 19 – 24  25 – 29  30 – 39  40 – 49  50 – 59
- 60 – 69  70+
- Aboriginal  African-Canadian  Asian-Canadian
- European-Canadian  Other
- Single  Married  Common-Law  Divorced/Separated  Widowed
- Elementary School Education  High School Education
- College or University Education
- Lower income  Middle income  Higher income
- Employed  Unemployed  Student  Retired  Homemaker
- Game of choice (e.g., slots, VLTs, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_
4. Which of the following statements most accurately describes your belief about the benefit or harm that gambling has for society?



- a) The recreational and economic benefits of gambling far outweigh any negative effects.
- b) The recreational and economic benefits of gambling somewhat outweigh its negative effects.
- c) The benefits of gambling are equivalent to its negative effects.
- d) The harm that gambling causes somewhat outweighs the good that comes from it.
- e) The harm that gambling causes far outweighs the good that comes from it.

**5. While gambling, after losing many times in a row, you are more likely to win. Would you say you:**

- a) Strongly agree
- b) Agree
- c) Disagree
- d) Strongly disagree
- e) Don't know

**6. In your opinion, how has your employment at the casino affected your attitude towards problem gamblers?**

- a) I have become much more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers.
- b) I have become somewhat more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers.
- c) My employment at the casino has not affected my attitude towards problem gambling or problem gamblers.
- d) I have become somewhat desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and to problem gamblers.
- e) I have become very much desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and to problem gamblers.

**SECTION E – GAMBLING**

**1. Do you currently gamble?**

- a) Yes **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 3)**
- b) Yes – but very rarely **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 3)**
- c) No – I have never gambled **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 16)**
- d) No – I quit gambling

**2. Why did you quit? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)**

- a) I can no longer gamble because my employment prohibits me
- b) It was causing me too many problems
- c) Watching other players gamble while at work changed my attitude
- d) A spouse, significant other, family member, or friend suggested I quit
- e) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)

3. In the past 6 months, how often would you say you played, bet, or spent money on the following:	Never or almost never	Once or twice	Between 3-6 times	About once/month	2-3 times/month	About once/week	2 to 6 times/week	Daily
Lottery, Raffle, or Instant Win tickets								
Slot machines								
Video Lottery Terminals (VLTs)								
Poker (includes Caribbean Stud, Let-It-Ride, etc.)								
Other card games (e.g., Blackjack, etc.)								
Roulette								
Craps or other dice games								
Pai Gow or other tile games								
Bingo								
Internet gambling								
Horse racing (live at the track and/or off-track)								
Sports Select								
Other Sports Betting								
Stocks, options, or futures								
Cards, or board games with family or friends								
Games of skill (e.g., pool, bowling, or darts)								

4. **Approximately how much money do you spend on a typical month on these activities (spending means out of pocket and does not mean money won and then spent)? \$\_\_\_\_\_**

**\*\*Questions #5 – 13 in this section only refer to THE PAST 12 MONTHS!\*\***

5. **Have you bet more than you could really afford to lose?**

- a) Never
- b) Sometimes
- c) Most of the time
- d) Almost always

6. **Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?**

- a) Never

- b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
7. **When you gambled, did you go back another day to win back the money you lost?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
8. **Have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
9. **Have you felt you might have a problem with gambling?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
10. **Has gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
11. **Have people criticized your betting or told you that you had a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
12. **Has your gambling caused any financial problems for you or your household?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
13. **Have you felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble?**

- a) Never
- b) Sometimes
- c) Most of the time
- d) Almost always

**14. Has anyone in your family ever had a gambling problem?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**15. In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your gambling activities?**

- a) No, it has not affected my gambling activities
- b) Yes, it has decreased my gambling activities
- c) Yes, it has increased my gambling activities

**16. Do you have any other additional comments?**

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your time and cooperation is appreciated. Please place your questionnaire in the attached envelope and put it in the drop box designated for this study in the staff lounge.**

## 7.2 Casino Alberta B Baseline Questionnaire



***University of Lethbridge***  
4401 University Drive  
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada  
T1K 3M4



***Alberta Gaming Research  
Institute***  
4-05H, University Extension Centre  
University of Alberta  
8303 - 112 Street  
Edmonton, AB T6G 2T4

Dr. Robert Williams and Lyndsey Dangerfield with the University of Lethbridge and Alberta Gaming Research Institute are doing a survey of casino employees to better understand their job satisfaction, demographics, substance use, opinions about gambling, and actual gambling behaviour. The results of this study will be an important supplement to a similar study recently conducted by AADAC on 3,000 employees in the Alberta workforce. Completion of the questionnaire is entirely voluntary, and all data will be kept strictly confidential. When the study is completed you will be able to see a summary of the results at: [www.abgaminginstitute.ualberta.ca](http://www.abgaminginstitute.ualberta.ca).

We do not wish to know your name, but we would like to know your birth date, which casino you work at, and gender so that we can track individual changes as the questionnaire will be given again in 6 months. Please complete all of the questions in this survey as accurately and honestly as possible. When you are finished, place your questionnaire in the attached envelope and put it in the drop box designated for this study in the staff lounge.

***One completed questionnaire from this casino  
will be randomly selected to win \$100 cash!***

.....

**CASINO EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE (baseline – April 2003)**

**SECTION A - DEMOGRAPHICS**

1. **What is your date of birth?** \_\_\_\_\_(day)\_\_\_\_\_(month)\_\_\_\_\_(year)
  
2. **Which of the following best describes your ancestry?**
  - a) European
  - b) East Asian
  - c) South Asian
  - d) Aboriginal
  - e) African
  - f) Latin American
  - g) Caribbean
  - h) Middle Eastern
  - i) Polynesian
  - j) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)
  
3. **What is your sex?**
  - a) M
  - b) F
  
4. **What is your current marital status?**
  - a) Married (including common law)
  - b) Separated
  - c) Divorced
  - d) Widowed
  - e) Never Married
  
5. **Are you currently a student?**
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
  
6. **Which of the following best describes your education?**
  - a) Did not graduate from high school
  - b) High school graduate or equivalent
  - c) Some college, technical school, or university
  - d) Completed technical school or college
  - e) One or more university degrees
  
7. **What is your gross annual household income?**
  - a) Under \$10,000
  - b) \$10,000 to \$19,999
  - c) \$20,000 to \$34,999
  - d) \$35,000 to \$49,999
  - e) \$50,000 to \$99,999
  - f) \$100,000 or over

**SECTION B- EMPLOYMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION**

1. Which casino are you employed at? \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. Which of the following best describes your current position(s) at the casino? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
  - a) Slots (includes Attendants and Cashiers)
  - b) Dealer
  - c) Pit Boss
  - d) Security Personnel
  - e) Lounge, Dining Room, Bartender, Cocktail Waitress/Waiter, or Kitchen Staff
  - f) Housekeeping or Maintenance
  - g) Administration or Management
  - h) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)
  
3. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?
  - a) Full-time
  - b) Part-time
  - c) Temporary / Seasonal
  
4. When did you begin employment in the casino industry?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (month) \_\_\_\_\_ (year)
  
5. Why did you initially seek employment in the casino industry? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)
  - a) I needed a job and knew they were hiring
  - b) I thought I would enjoy the atmosphere
  - c) I thought I would enjoy interacting with the players and/or other customers
  - d) I thought I would enjoy the nature of the work (i.e., dealing cards, attending slots, etc.)
  - e) I liked the staff
  - f) A casino employee suggested I apply
  - g) I thought the money would be good
  - h) The hours appealed to me
  - i) Don't know
  - j) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)
  
6. How interesting is the work you do?
  - a) Always interesting
  - b) Often interesting
  - c) Sometimes interesting
  - d) Not often interesting
  - e) Never interesting

7. **How supportive do you consider your coworkers to be?**  
a) Very supportive  
b) Supportive  
c) Minimally supportive  
d) Unsupportive  
e) Very unsupportive
8. **How would you rate the supervision you receive?**  
a) Very good  
b) Good  
c) Average  
d) Poor  
e) Very poor
9. **How stressful do you consider your job?**  
a) Not at all stressful  
b) Somewhat stressful  
c) Extremely stressful
10. **How would you rate your overall job satisfaction?**  
a) Very high  
b) High  
c) Moderate  
d) Low  
e) Very low
11. **Do you expect you will still be working in the casino industry a year from now?**  
a) Definitely  
b) Most likely  
c) Unsure  
d) I doubt it  
e) Definitely not
12. **What would you identify as your primary sources of job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction?**

---

---

---

**SECTION C – SUBSTANCE USE**

1. **In the past month, have you smoked or used tobacco (e.g., smoked cigarettes, pipe, or cigar or used snuff or chewing tobacco)?**  
a) Yes  
b) No – I have never smoked (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 4**)



- c) No – I quit smoking
- 2. In the past month, did you smoke or use tobacco while at work?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes
- 3. In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your tobacco use?**
- a) No, it has not affected my tobacco use
  - b) Yes, it has decreased my tobacco use
  - c) Yes, it has increased my tobacco use
- 4. How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?**
- a) Never – I have never drank (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 9**)
  - b) Never – I quit drinking (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 7**)
  - c) Once a month or less
  - d) Two to four times a month
  - e) Two to three times a week
  - f) Four or more times a week
- 5. How many drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day when you are drinking?**
- a) 1 or 2
  - b) 3 or 4
  - c) 5 or 6
  - d) 7 or 8
  - e) 10 or more
- 6. Has a relative, friend, doctor or other health worker ever been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
- 7. Have you had any serious problems caused by drinking (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
- 8. In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your alcohol consumption?**
- a) No, it has not affected my alcohol consumption
  - b) Yes, it has increased my alcohol consumption
  - c) Yes, it has decreased my alcohol consumption

9. **Have you used any of the following in the past year? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)**
- a) Yes
    - Marijuana or Hash
    - LSD (Acid), PCP, or other hallucinogens (e.g., Mushrooms)
    - Cocaine or Crack
    - Amphetamines or other stimulants (e.g., Speed, Crystal Meth, Ecstasy)
    - Heroin or other street opiates (e.g., morphine)
    - Any other street drugs (e.g., GHB)
  - b) No – I have never used drugs other than those required for medical reasons (PLEASE GO TO SECTION D)
  - c) No – I quit using drugs other than those required for medical reasons
10. **Has a relative, friend, doctor or other health worker ever been concerned about your drug use or suggested you cut down?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
11. **Have you had serious problems caused by drug use (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
12. **In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your drug use?**
- a) No, it has not affected my drug use
  - b) Yes, it has decreased my drug use
  - c) Yes, it has increased my drug use
13. **In the past 12 months have you had any serious problems with depression, anxiety, or other mental health problems?**
- a) Yes
  - b) No
14. **Which of the following substances have you used in the past year? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)**
- Anti-depressants or other mood stabilizers
  - Tranquilizers (e.g., Ativan, Librium, and Valium)
  - Sleeping Pills
  - Medications for cough, cold, sinus problems, or allergies
  - Over the counter painkillers (Tylenol, Ibuprofen)

- Prescription painkillers
- Over the counter stimulants (e.g, diet pills, wake-up pills)
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

## **SECTION D – GAMBLING**

1. **Which of the following statements most accurately describes your belief about the benefit or harm that gambling has for society?**
  - a) The recreational and economic benefits of gambling far outweigh any negative effects.
  - b) The recreational and economic benefits of gambling somewhat outweighs its negative effects.
  - c) The benefits of gambling are equivalent to its negative effects.
  - d) The harm that gambling causes somewhat outweighs the good that comes from it.
  - e) The harm that gambling causes far outweighs the good that comes from it.
  
2. **If a gambler has lost many times in a row, he or she is more likely to win. Would you say you:**
  - a) Strongly agree
  - b) Agree
  - c) Disagree
  - d) Strongly disagree
  - e) Don't know
  
3. **In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your attitude towards problem gamblers?**
  - a) I have become much more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers.
  - b) I have become somewhat more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers.
  - c) My employment at the casino has not affected my attitude towards problem gambling or problem gamblers.
  - d) I have become somewhat desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and to problem gamblers.
  - e) I have become very much desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and to problem gamblers.
  
4. **Do you currently gamble?**
  - a) Yes **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 6)**
  - b) Yes – but very rarely **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 6)**
  - c) No – I have never gambled **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 19)**
  - c) No – I quit gambling
  
5. **Why did you quit? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)**
  - a) I can no longer gamble because my employment prohibits me

- b) It was causing me too many problems
- c) Watching other players gamble while at work changed my attitude
- d) A spouse, significant other, family member, or friend suggested I quit
- e) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)

6. In the past 6 months, how often would you say you played, bet, or spent money on the following:	Never or almost never	Once or twice	Between 3-6 times	About once/month	2-3 times/month	About once/week	2 to 6 times/week	Daily
Lottery, Raffle, or Instant Win tickets								
Slot machines								
Video Lottery Terminals (VLTs)								
Poker (includes Caribbean Stud, Let-It-Ride, etc.)								
Other card games (e.g., Blackjack, etc.)								
Roulette								
Craps or other dice games								
Pai Gow or other tile games								
Bingo								
Internet gambling								
Horse racing (live at the track and/or off-track)								
Sports Select								
Other Sports Betting								
Stocks, options, or futures								
Cards, or board games with family or friends								
Games of skill (e.g., pool, bowling, or darts)								

7. **Approximately how much money do you spend on a typical month on these activities (spending means out of pocket and does not mean money won and then spent)? \$\_\_\_\_\_**

**\*\*Questions #8 – 16 in this section only refer to THE PAST 12 MONTHS!\*\***

8. **Have you bet more than you could really afford to lose?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time

- d) Almost always
9. **Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
10. **When you gambled, did you go back another day to win back the money you lost?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
11. **Have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
12. **Have you felt you might have a problem with gambling?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
13. **Has gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
14. **Have people criticized your betting or told you that you had a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
15. **Has your gambling caused any financial problems for you or your household?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes

- c) Most of the time
- d) Almost always

**16. Have you felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble?**

- a) Never
- b) Sometimes
- c) Most of the time
- d) Almost always

**17. Has anyone in your family ever had a gambling problem?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**18. In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your gambling activities?**

- a) No, it has not affected my gambling activities
- b) Yes, it has decreased my gambling activities
- c) Yes, it has increased my gambling activities

**19. Do you have any other additional comments?**

---

---

---

---

---

---

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your time and cooperation is appreciated. Please place your questionnaire in the attached envelope and put it in the drop box designated for this study in the staff lounge.**

### 7.3 Follow-Up Questionnaire



***University of Lethbridge***  
4401 University Drive  
Lethbridge, Alberta, Canada  
T1K 3M4



***Alberta Gaming Research  
Institute***  
4-05H, University Extension Centre  
University of Alberta  
8303 - 112 Street  
Edmonton, AB T6G 2T4

Dr. Robert Williams and Lyndsey Dangerfield with the University of Lethbridge and Alberta Gaming Research Institute are doing a survey of casino employees to better understand their job satisfaction, demographics, substance use, opinions about gambling, and actual gambling behaviour. The results of this study will be an important supplement to a similar study recently conducted by AADAC on 3,000 employees in the Alberta workforce. Completion of the questionnaire is entirely voluntary, and all data will be kept strictly confidential. When the study is completed you will be able to see a summary of the results at: [www.abgaminginstitute.ualberta.ca](http://www.abgaminginstitute.ualberta.ca).

We do not wish to know your name, but we would like to know your birth date, which casino you work at, and gender so we can track individual changes as the questionnaire was initially distributed six months ago. Please complete all of the questions in this survey as accurately and honestly as possible. When you are finished, please place your questionnaire in the blue drop box located in the staff room.

***One completed questionnaire from this casino will  
be randomly selected to win \$100 cash!***

.....

**CASINO EMPLOYEE QUESTIONNAIRE (Follow-Up – October 2003)**

**SECTION A - DEMOGRAPHICS**

1. **Did you complete this questionnaire in the spring of 2003?**
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
  
2. **What is your date of birth? \_\_\_\_\_(day)\_\_\_\_\_(month)\_\_\_\_\_(year)**
  
3. **Which of the following best describes your ancestry?**
  - a) European
  - b) East Asian
  - c) South Asian
  - d) Aboriginal
  - e) African
  - f) Latin American
  - g) Caribbean
  - h) Middle Eastern
  - i) Polynesian
  - k) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)
  
4. **What is your sex?**
  - a) M
  - b) F
  
5. **What is your current marital status?**
  - a) Married (including common law)
  - b) Separated
  - c) Divorced
  - d) Widowed
  - e) Never Married
  
6. **Are you currently a student?**
  - a) Yes
  - b) No
  
7. **Which of the following best describes your education?**
  - a) Did not graduate from high school
  - b) High school graduate or equivalent
  - c) Some college, technical school, or university
  - d) Completed technical school or college
  - e) One or more university degrees



**8. What is your gross annual household income?**

- a) Under \$10,000
- b) \$10,000 to \$19,999
- c) \$20,000 to \$34,999
- d) \$35,000 to \$49,999
- e) \$50,000 to \$99,999
- f) \$100,000 or over

**SECTION B - EMPLOYMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION**

1. Which casino are you employed at? \_\_\_\_\_

2. Which of the following best describes your current position(s) at the casino? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- a) Slots (includes Attendants and Cashiers)
- b) Dealer
- c) Pit Boss
- d) Security Personnel
- e) Lounge, Dining Room, Bartender, Cocktail Waitress/Waiter, or Kitchen Staff
- f) Housekeeping or Maintenance
- g) Administration or Management
- h) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)

3. Which of the following best describes your current employment status?

- a) Full-time
- b) Part-time
- c) Temporary/Seasonal

4. When did you begin employment in the casino industry?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (month) \_\_\_\_\_ (year)

5. Why did you initially seek employment in the casino industry? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

- a) I needed a job and knew they were hiring
- b) I thought I would enjoy the atmosphere
- c) I thought I would enjoy interacting with the players and/or other customers
- d) I thought I would enjoy the nature of the work (i.e., dealing cards, attending slots, etc.)
- e) I liked the staff
- f) A casino employee suggested I apply
- g) I thought the money would be good
- h) The hours appealed to me
- i) Don't know
- j) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)

- 6. How interesting is the work you do?**
- a) Always interesting
  - b) Often interesting
  - c) Sometimes interesting
  - d) Not often interesting
  - e) Never interesting
- 7. How supportive do you consider your coworkers to be?**
- a) Very supportive
  - b) Supportive
  - c) Minimally supportive
  - d) Unsupportive
  - e) Very unsupportive
- 8. How would you rate the supervision you receive?**
- a) Very good
  - b) Good
  - c) Average
  - d) Poor
  - e) Very poor
- 9. How stressful do you consider your job?**
- a) Not at all stressful
  - b) Somewhat stressful
  - c) Extremely stressful
- 10. How would you rate your overall job satisfaction?**
- a) Very high
  - b) High
  - c) Moderate
  - d) Low
  - e) Very low
- 11. Do you expect you will still be working in the casino industry a year from now?**
- a) Definitely
  - b) Most likely
  - c) Unsure
  - d) I doubt it
  - e) Definitely not
- 12. What would you identify as your primary sources of job satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction?**

---

---

---

## **SECTION C – SUBSTANCE USE**

1. **In the past month, have you smoked or used tobacco (e.g., smoked cigarettes, pipes, or cigars or used snuff or chewing tobacco)?**
  - a) Yes
  - b) No – I have never smoked (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 4**)
  - c) No – I quit smoking (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 3**)
  
2. **In the past month, did you smoke or use tobacco while at work?**
  - a) No
  - b) Yes
  
3. **In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your tobacco use?**
  - a) No, it has not affected my tobacco use
  - b) Yes, it has decreased my tobacco use
  - c) Yes, it has increased my tobacco use
  
4. **How often do you have a drink containing alcohol?**
  - a) Never – I have never drank (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 9**)
  - b) Never – I quit drinking (**PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 6**)
  - c) Once a month or less
  - d) Two to four times a month
  - e) Two to three times a week
  - f) Four or more times a week
  
5. **How many drinks containing alcohol do you have on a typical day when you are drinking?**
  - a) 1 or 2
  - b) 3 or 4
  - c) 5 or 6
  - d) 7 or 8
  - e) 10 or more
  
6. **Has a relative, friend, doctor or other health worker ever been concerned about your drinking or suggested you cut down?**
  - a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
  
7. **Have you had any serious problems caused by drinking (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)?**
  - a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year

8. **In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your alcohol consumption?**
- a) No, it has not affected my alcohol consumption
  - b) Yes, it has increased my alcohol consumption
  - c) Yes, it has decreased my alcohol consumption
9. **Which of the following substances have you used in the past year? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)**
- Anti-depressants or other mood stabilizers
  - Tranquilizers (e.g., Ativan, Librium, and Valium)
  - Sleeping Pills
  - Medications for cough, cold, sinus problems, or allergies
  - Over the counter painkillers (e.g., Tylenol, Ibuprofen)
  - Prescription painkillers
  - Over the counter stimulants (e.g, diet pills, wake-up pills)
  - Other \_\_\_\_\_
10. **Have you used any of the following in the past year? (PLEASE CHECK ALL THAT APPLY)**
- a) Yes
    - Marijuana or Hash
    - LSD (Acid), PCP, or other hallucinogens (e.g., Mushrooms)
    - Cocaine or Crack
    - Amphetamines or other stimulants (e.g., Speed, Crystal Meth, Ecstasy)
    - Heroin or other street opiates (e.g., morphine)
    - Any other street drugs (e.g., GHB)
  - b) No – I have never used drugs other than those required for medical reasons (PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 14)
  - c) No – I quit using drugs other than those required for medical reasons
11. **Has a relative, friend, doctor or other health worker ever been concerned about your drug use or suggested you cut down?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
12. **Have you had serious problems caused by drug use (e.g., relationship, work, financial, health, legal, psychological, family, or school)?**
- a) No
  - b) Yes, but not in the last year
  - c) Yes, during the last year
13. **In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your drug use?**
- a) No, it has not affected my drug use

- b) Yes, it has decreased my drug use
- c) Yes, it has increased my drug use

14. In the past 12 months have you had any serious problems with depression, anxiety, or other mental health problems?

- a) Yes
- b) No

**SECTION D – GAMBLING BELIEFS**

1. What is your estimate of the percentage of “problem gamblers” in the general Alberta adult population? (*problem gambling is gambling that results in significant negative consequences for the gambler or others in his or her social network*) \_\_\_\_\_%

2. In your opinion, what are the primary causes of problem gambling?

---



---



---

3. From your experience working in the gaming industry, what would you say are the most common characteristics of problem gamblers in terms of gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, education, income, employment, and game of choice: (MARK AS MANY BOXES THAT APPLY IN EACH CATEGORY)

Male  Female

19 – 24  25 – 29  30 – 39  40 – 49  50 – 59  60 – 69  70+

Aboriginal  African-Canadian  Asian-Canadian  European-Canadian  Other

Single  Married  Common-Law  Divorced/Separated  Widowed

Elementary School Education  High School Education

College or University Education

Lower income  Middle income  Higher income

Employed  Unemployed  Student  Retired  Homemaker

Game of choice (e.g., slots, VLTs, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_

4. Which of the following statements most accurately describes your belief about the benefit or harm that gambling has for society?

- a) The recreational and economic benefits of gambling far outweigh any negative effects.
- b) The recreational and economic benefits of gambling somewhat outweigh its negative effects.
- c) The benefits of gambling are equivalent to its negative effects.

- d) The harm that gambling causes somewhat outweighs the good that comes from it.
- e) The harm that gambling causes far outweighs the good that comes from it.

**5. While gambling, after losing many times in a row, you are more likely to win. Would you say you:**

- a) Strongly agree
- b) Agree
- c) Disagree
- d) Strongly disagree
- e) Don't know

**6. In your opinion, how has your employment at the casino affected your attitude towards problem gamblers?**

- a) I have become much more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers.
- b) I have become somewhat more sensitive and aware of problem gambling and problem gamblers.
- c) My employment at the casino has not affected my attitude towards problem gambling or problem gamblers.
- d) I have become somewhat desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and to problem gamblers.
- e) I have become very much desensitized to the issue of problem gambling and to problem gamblers.

**7. In your opinion, what measures could the casino industry take to decrease problem gambling?**

---



---



---



---

**SECTION E – GAMBLING**

**1. Do you currently gamble?**

- a) Yes **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 3)**
- b) Yes – but very rarely **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 3)**
- c) No – I have never gambled **(PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 16)**
- d) No – I quit gambling

**2. Why did you quit? (PLEASE CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)**

- a) I can no longer gamble because my employment prohibits me
- b) It was causing me too many problems
- c) Watching other players gamble while at work changed my attitude
- d) A spouse, significant other, family member, or friend suggested I quit
- e) Other (PLEASE SPECIFY \_\_\_\_\_)

6. In the past 6 months, how often would you say you played, bet, or spent money on the following:	Never or almost never	Once or twice	Between 3-6 times	About once/month	2-3 times/month	About once/week	2 to 6 times/week	Daily
Lottery, Raffle, or Instant Win tickets								
Slot machines								
Video Lottery Terminals (VLTs)								
Poker (includes Caribbean Stud, Let-It-Ride, etc.)								
Other card games (e.g., Blackjack, etc.)								
Roulette								
Craps or other dice games								
Pai Gow or other tile games								
Bingo								
Internet gambling								
Horse racing (live at the track and/or off-track)								
Sports Select								
Other Sports Betting								
Stocks, options, or futures								
Cards, or board games with family or friends								
Games of skill (e.g., pool, bowling, or darts)								

4. **Approximately how much money do you spend on a typical month on these activities (spending means out of pocket and does not mean money won and then spent)? \$\_\_\_\_\_**

**\*\*Questions #5 – 13 in this section only refer to THE PAST 12 MONTHS!\*\***

5. **Have you bet more than you could really afford to lose?**

- a) Never
- b) Sometimes
- c) Most of the time
- d) Almost always

6. **Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?**

- a) Never
- b) Sometimes

- c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
- 7. When you gambled, did you go back another day to win back the money you lost?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
- 8. Have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
- 9. Have you felt you might have a problem with gambling?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
- 10. Has gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
- 11. Have people criticized your betting or told you that you had a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
- 12. Has your gambling caused any financial problems for you or your household?**
- a) Never
  - b) Sometimes
  - c) Most of the time
  - d) Almost always
- 13. Have you felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble?**
- a) Never



- b) Sometimes
- c) Most of the time
- d) Almost always

**14. Has anyone in your family ever had a gambling problem?**

- a) Yes
- b) No
- c) Don't know

**15. In your opinion, has your employment at the casino affected your gambling activities?**

- a) No, it has not affected my gambling activities
- b) Yes, it has decreased my gambling activities
- c) Yes, it has increased my gambling activities

**16. Do you have any other additional comments?**

---

---

---

**Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Your time and cooperation is appreciated. Please place your questionnaire in the attached envelope and put it in the blue drop box located in the staff room.**

#### **7.4 Description of the Canadian Problem Gambling Index (CPGI)**

The Canadian Problem Gambling Index was designed by the Canadian Centre on Substance abuse to assess problem gambling within the Canadian adult population. The index consists of a total of nine questions that apply exclusively to the respondents' past 12 months. The answers are scored as follows:

- Never = 0
- Sometimes = 1
- Most of the time = 2
- Almost always = 3

The respondents' total score is then tallied and classified according to the following scale:

- 0 = Non problem gambler
- 1-2 = Low risk gambler
- 3-7 = Moderate risk gambler
- 8-27 = Problem gambler

All questionnaire respondents who answered "Yes" or "Yes, but very rarely" to the question, "Do you currently gamble" completed the entire CPGI on both the baseline and follow-up questionnaire at both Casino Alberta sites.

## 7.5 The Canadian Problem Gambling Index

### Canadian Problem Gambling Index

*Ferris & Wynne (2001)*

	Never	Sometimes	Most of the time	Almost always	Don't know
Have you bet more than you could really afford to lose?					
Have you needed to gamble with larger amounts of money to get the same feeling of excitement?					
When you gambled, did you go back another day to try to win back the money you lost?					
Have you borrowed money or sold anything to get money to gamble?					
Have you felt that you might have a problem with gambling?					
Has gambling caused you any health problems, including stress or anxiety?					
Have people criticized your betting or told you that you had a gambling problem, regardless of whether or not you thought it was true?					
Has your gambling caused any financial problems for you or your household?					
Have you felt guilty about the way you gamble or what happens when you gamble?					

## 7.6 Primary Sources of Job Satisfaction

- I like my job
- Working with different people
- Coworkers
- Meeting new people
- I am very satisfied that I get to play a game without using my own money plus it relieves me of my everyday stress instead of working in a hectic environment.
- It's good to see the players' reaction when they win.
- The staff members are very supportive which is always a plus in any job.
- Being around the cards and atmosphere
- Enjoy coworkers, working with the public, the fun we have at work
- The atmosphere – it's exciting to interact with numerous people. I am a waitress/bartender so I also find it interesting to deal with my customers. I always find my job challenging because I have to be cautious when servicing my customers.
- Those that are supportive are very kind and nice
- Variety of tasks
- Great staff and pit staff are excellent
- Interaction with other casino workers
- Everyday is different
- My primary sources of job satisfaction are the people I work with and the hours
- I like the people I work with
- Interacting with the players and the camaraderie with the other casino workers
- I really enjoy my job as I have an opportunity to work with different charity groups which makes it very interesting and satisfying that I can help assist in their fundraising
- Great staff
- From previous experience of working with people, responsibility and self discipline
- I enjoy the people I work with
- Customer relations
- Coworkers
- Money
- Sense of accomplishment
- Interesting atmosphere
- Great staff/management
- Creative aspect – promotions, etc.
- Watching the business succeed because of things I'm doing
- Understanding coworkers
- Great atmosphere
- Working with the public
- Socializing with people
- I love dealing the games that I deal. I enjoy the hours and the players.

- I like interacting with people and balancing numbers
- I love my job. I hope to be very successful in my job.
- Doing my job the best they let me
- The public
- Tips
- The satisfaction of being told you are doing a good job
- The people you work with make all the difference
- Satisfying
- When we achieve sales goals
- Money is good, atmosphere is great
- Giving good service, making all my customers happy, and wanting them to come back. Having customers remember me and bring up what good service I gave them the last time they were in.
- Always busy
- Coworkers always working together in harmony
- Being able to ask and discuss problems
- Friendly atmosphere
- Interacting with customers and staff
- My primary job satisfaction is the staff. We have a great staff which is always great to work with, which helps push off the stress of other things.
- Able to meet people and mingle
- I enjoy dealing to a table where the customers are having fun and kidding around.
- I love the people contact, the players and my coworkers
- I enjoy working with the public – most customers are friendly and I enjoy talking to them. I also have great bosses and good floor staff.
- Customer interaction
- Fellow employee interaction
- Fun with customers
- Following rules and regulations
- The people and management I work with are great! Can't wait for expansion to make things even better!
- Friendly coworkers and players
- I like my job!
- Meeting people and working with the majority of employees
- I love working with the other dealers here
- Almost all of my job satisfaction comes from the people I work with
- I like that my hours are flexible
- Good people you work with and balancing
- I love the customers! The time flies by and my coworkers are ALWAYS fun!
- Work with great people in which we have common interests
- I very much enjoy dealing cards, etc.
- Great travel opportunities
- Relatively good pay for a temporary job

- The fact that my job is different everyday
- Dumping
- This is a part-time job that fills my need to interact with other people
- Coworkers
- Providing enjoyment to customers, i.e., come to casino to have fun
- Customers who are fun to serve
- Always learning new duties and information
- Our success as a casino operation
- Have good coworkers
- Know where and from whom I can find answers to my questions
- Working with the public is satisfying
- Breaks every 45 minutes
- Camaraderie
- I love serving customers and the satisfaction I get from helping other people have a better day
- I would identify my job satisfaction as patrons of the casino are enjoying themselves and I'm removing the ones that are causing trouble for others.
- Great job, fun to work, almost never a dull moment, and the staff is great
- Money
- Each day normally brings something new and interesting. Not such a mundane place to work as a manager/administrator. Majority of management and staff are fun to work with.
- The option to move upwards on the casino ladder
- The energy, money, and the nature of my job
- The people you meet
- Meeting other people
- The convenience of choosing your own schedule and negotiable emergency situation
- Love the people I work with and the cooperative friendly environment
- Making money for the casino
- Being told good job
- Making staff happy and satisfied with job
- The primary source of my job satisfaction is that the money is good. Also, I enjoy the people I work with.
- Flexibility in times when I work
- Enjoy my coworkers
- Enjoy the atmosphere
- Good relations with coworkers and management
- Job is fun
- Satisfaction comes from doing my job well and learning more about the games I deal
- Coworkers
- Customers
- Interaction with coworkers and customers

- Ability to enjoy the act of dealing
- Hours are great
- Having children they're very flexible with call-ins
- The people are great
- They're very supportive and understanding
- Primary source of job satisfaction is the flexibility in hours so I can work weekends
- Ability to be playing cards and interacting with the customers
- It is a good social job. There's lots of staff so there's always someone to talk to. You work with a lot of really great people.
- Social aspect
- Coworkers
- Clients
- Pay cheque
- Good public customers/players (excellent community group)
- The coworkers
- Easy work! No real effort is needed!
- Wages and tips
- The convenience of choosing your schedule
- The casino appreciates their staff and they show it in numerous ways
- Making new friends
- Good customers and coworkers
- Good money for good service
- Some of the other employees are great to work for/with. Regulars make the day interesting as well as customers coming from other areas.
- Balancing, caring about my work
- Interaction with players and employees
- Enjoy the customers and some staff
- I make good money off tips
- I love working with the people
- I like and get along with most of the people I work with. I enjoy talking and interacting with customers. My supervisor is easy to talk to and is very helpful with everything.
- Flexibility of hours and time off
- I like the people I work with and enjoy most of the customers
- I enjoy working with the public and the atmosphere
- Tips
- Pay cheque
- Seeing broke people win
- Helping grateful customers

## 7.7 Primary Sources of Job Dissatisfaction

- I don't like the players that are rude.
- Dealing with drunks
- Some workers are too stressed with work/home lives making working with them difficult.
- Rich people who walk away with loads of money and leave no tip
- Working with slow, rude, and inexperienced, lazy workers
- Not being recognized for my awesome work
- I disagree with the fact that our table games manager has no previous gaming experience. I think that it has been the result of us losing a lot of valuable employees. I also disagree that our wages are considered by the amount we make in tips.
- Other people (staff) not caring
- Need higher rate of pay. McDonald's starts at \$8/hour for full time
- Management
- I don't get paid enough
- Management needs to take a more active role
- Some rules apply to some but not everyone
- Dissatisfied with rules not equally applied
- Tossing out problem gamblers and patrons in general is both annoying and highly amusing
- Coworkers moods (but understand that goes with working crew and must say minimum in our group)
- Poor wages
- Understaffed
- Crowding of space
- Lack of communication with upper management
- Sometimes the work can be stressful with the expectations of the customers at times
- This job is hard when you deal to a lot of problem gamblers (regularly). You get to know the people well, so it makes it hard to watch them destroy their lives. The job also pays very little so it makes it hard to live (especially with no benefits).
- Primary source of dissatisfaction is drunk players coming to the table
- Dissatisfaction comes from drunk and/or obnoxious players who *expect* to win every time
- Sometimes seems to be so much gray area
- People not understanding rules and regulations that we must follow – they think we are cheating them
- The primary dissatisfaction of my job is the secondhand smoke. It would be a much more pleasant place to work if there were no smoking.
- It doesn't appeal to me when players start to swear when they're losing money.
- When players lose they can be quite rude
- Being forced to pay shortages



- Having to repeat myself a million times to managers
- Cranky players chasing lost money
- Lack of recognition by management of physical and mental effort required to do this job
- A lot of rules
- Can be frustration
- Managers not following through on things they say they will
- Smoke
- Not equally applied
- I don't like the players – they're rude.
- Backstabbing, pettiness, favoritism - very "high school behaviour" with some \*\*\*\*\* players.
- Too much smoke!
- Recently I have been dissatisfied with employee favoritism.
- Too much pressure and very stressful
- This casino is too slow. Need a faster paced environment. Not challenging enough
- Overqualified - know many more games than the ones just at this casino.
- I hate to see people losing their money if I know they cannot afford to lose and not be able to tell them to go home.
- I don't like the verbal abuse sometimes received from customers.
- Early morning starts
- I dislike angry, rude customers and the feeling of being just another person hired. I feel I should be valued more and shown that I am valued. As goes for all my coworkers.
- Unhealthy work environment
- The pay rate
- The lack of respect others have for security
- I'm not allowed to physically remove the patrons that are causing troubles for others from the premises when I should be able to!
- No non-smoking staff room
- The hours
- Noise pollution
- Shift work – getting off work at 2 a.m.
- Working an 11 hour day with no overtime
- Smoke (air pollution)
- Poor ventilation
- Hard to be on my feet for so many hours
- The upper management (not those directly in my area) does not seem to understand the nature of our jobs and does not give clear orders that are not subject to change on what seems like a whim.
- Too many secrets and sometimes only know half of what I should because of it.
- Dealing with drunken gamblers
- Very long hours

- Having to work a job that is low pay with no benefits and having to rely on tips as a source of income. We shouldn't have to rely on our tips as much as we do.
- Poor wage
- No benefits
- Being a charity casino, we shouldn't have to work for charity wages
- Problem gamblers
- Not paid enough
- Management
- Watching people escalate from minimum to maximum bets over a period of months
- Having to put up with players/customers who get pissed off because they lose money and are too stupid to get up and leave! AND our wages suck so we have to rely on tips which aren't that great either.
- Other departments make us feel unwanted sometimes
- Working at a minimum pay job with no benefits
- This job has health risks, both mental and physical
- I'm starting to dislike the hours and I miss my kids and I miss having a life
- Gamblers
- Drunk people
- Too many bosses
- Favoritism
- Understaffed when very busy
- Not enough pay for what you're responsible for (amount of money)
- Ignorant people
- Wages
- Stress
- Underpaid, no benefits
- Irate players
- Lack of structure (minor casinos)
- Irate/drunk customers
- Lack of communication with and within departments
- Too much favoritism in management
- The lack of respect we get from ownership and management
- Lack of teamwork with and within departments
- Would be nice to have higher wages and benefits
- Minimal opportunity and minimal morale boosters for staff
- Others not following rules and regulations
- I dislike the smoke
- No development program for managers and staff
- The low pay and lack of benefits or bonuses
- The belief that if you work in a casino you are evil and just out to suck the public dry of their money
- Dealing with drunks and with underlings' complaints
- No health and wellness program

- Highly stressful position
- Benefits
- The attitude that we make lots of money when after three years my dealing wage is \$7.25 and after two years of pitting my wage is \$14.75. New people who have started make as much in the pit as I do.
- I am unsatisfied with the management being able to drink while on shift in the casino. To me, this does not look very professional.
- Problems with holding staff for slot attendants
- Being referred to as “little people” by management
- Inadequately paid/rewarded
- Cranky customers
- Unable to perform duties like actual security work
- Bosses who play favourites
- Somewhat stifling and undermining
- Rumours, hearsay
- Management being lazy and unsupportive

## 7.8 Additional Comments

- Sometimes I wish I could tell certain players (problems) to go home, alas we're in the entertainment industry. It's hard to be empathetic and a dealer at the same time.
- The best cure for gambling addicts is to become a dealer
- I know when I was gambling very heavily I would feel very guilty, but now that I have stopped I still do it sometimes with a friend for fun now.
- My employers need to have more respect for their employees who have to deal with problem gamblers on a daily basis.
- I think it is very sad to see some people enter the building right at opening at 10 a.m. and they are still here when I leave at 6 or 7 p.m. Also, 99% of the people sit and chain smoke. I think casinos should be non-smoking. That would cut the hours a person sits there and gambles.
- My full time job is teaching and I work at the casino part-time. I used to be full-time, I found that gamblers (as well as myself) went through very distinct patterns of behaviours. Sometimes it felt as though I was watching animals at a zoo. They, as well as most dealers, are very superstitious and any change to their ritually played games throws them off.
- The job pays very little and the cost of living in \*\*\*\*\* is very high. It is impossible to live off a full-time income in \*\*\*\*\* at \*\*\*\*\* Casino.
- I do know and realize that dealers are a large part of problem gamblers. As a dealer, I find the nice polite customers at my table who I like, I can never give them good cards or money. When there is an idiot at my table rude and very impolite, I can't get rid of them. I always pay them blackjacks double-downs or even progressive pot. I just don't get it.
- You should make players in the casino fill this out.
- I do understand about addictions, however I still believe that adults need to be responsible for their own actions.
- Observing of liquor an ongoing problem.
- Too much drinking and smoking at the tables, rudeness, etc.
- I believe the age to gamble should be raised to the age of 21. By then they will be able to understand what gambling is and how it can affect a person.
- Gaming houses in Alberta give charity groups an opportunity to raise money to keep their clubs thriving. I believe in their own way gamblers realize the money they spend gives to charity.
- Before I was employed at the casino, I would gamble once in a blue moon. When I did gamble, I found it exciting to have the potential to win money. Now that I'm employed at the casino, I don't miss gambling at all.
- I go play casino games when I go to a different town. We only have one casino and can't play here. Before I worked at the casino I never gambled - only the occasional instant win ticket.
- I think this questionnaire is an excellent idea. Many people who work at casinos are problem gamblers. More than people realize.

- If the owners of a casino (mine in particular) would pay and treat their staff better, then we as staff would be more professional and make the experience more enjoyable for the customers. Treat us like \*\*\*\*\*, you get \*\*\*\*\*!
- I think that VLTs contribute much more to problem gambling than table games and ordinary slot machines
- Before I worked in the casino I never gambled, only the occasional instant win ticket.
- Alcohol and gambling do not mix. It's bad enough to lose but being intoxicated makes it worse and makes you lose with your money. Drinking has no place in a gambling establishment.
- I feel there should be more anti-gambling campaigning. An industry like casinos that causes mental and financial hardship to its participants should not be viewed as "O.K." because the government has their hand in it. Gambling and drinking should not be done on the same premises.
- I've never gambled.
- Alcohol and gambling do not mix. I worked in a casino where drinking was not allowed. It made our jobs a lot less stressful.
- Why not do a survey from casinos in AB about how they feel working at one, towards management, staff, and AGLC?
- Tips help a lot but we shouldn't get taxed for them. I wish we had day shifts. Why don't we have more respect for what we do, who we are because we are working for them? Casino owners have no respect and don't care what happens to us, e.g., \*\*\*\*\* Casino.
- I have never gambled but working at the casino has made that decision very definite. And I don't drink often, but the hours I work will now influence me to drink even less.
- The customers should not be served as many drinks. When they have too much, the slot attendants are the ones that receive the bad end of it.
- Give this to AADAC, drug abusers! If you offend me again with this stupidity, I'll \*\*\*\*\* your \*\*\*\*\*. You waste my time. \*\*\*\*\* you.
- I don't like the management playing favourites with certain staff members or allowing them to sluff their work off on other staff so they can sit and drink coffee all day and do nothing else. Or also allowing other management to drink alcohol on the job. I also don't like security plunging a toilet or shovelling snow in a \$500 tuxedo that they pay for themselves.
- This casino is an awesome place to work. It has opened my eyes about gambling. The only thing that bothers me is shift instability.
- Interesting questionnaire.
- They should have this survey in AADAC for people with drug or gambling problems. I don't care about this questionnaire, it's a waste of my time. Most people know when they have a problem but just won't admit it or get help. So that's their problem, not mine!
- Alcohol mixed with gambling is a real concern. I have seen responsible gamblers revert to irresponsible within a couple drinks. Unless there is a breathalyzer on the premises, whose idea of drunk is drunk?

- The casino business, whether it be for charity or not, pays and treats its employees very poorly. No benefits, except for tips. McDonald's pays more. Being a dealer is very stressful and should pay a lot more, as well as more staff appreciation needed!
- I believe that alcohol and gambling do not mix. Alcohol should not be served in a casino. It causes gamblers to spend more money stupidly which causes problem gamblers.
- By learning how to deal each table game or by learning how a slot machine operates, it gives you knowledge about that game. Making it more likely for you to play that game. At times, players are intimidated by a game because of the lack of knowledge towards it.
- Alcohol should not be served in the casino / playing area. Lounge ONLY!
- My issue is with our management and that is, is the fact that they will openly ask staff about problems in the casino and our input on what can change and we all tell them our opinions and let's just say my view is, is don't ask what can change when nothing changes. It is ignorant to think your opinion is going to be heard and nothing is done about it.