



## **2012 KANSAS GAMBLING SURVEY METHODOLOGY**

### **INTRODUCTION**

The Kansas Gambling Survey was conducted on behalf of the Kansas Department of Aging and Disability Services by WhitworthBallou, LLC. The main purpose of this statewide survey was to estimate the scope of at-risk gambling statewide and within defined gaming zones. The results of this study provide information about problem gambling awareness, attitudes toward gambling and problem gambling services, and information about how problem gambling is impacting Kansans. Survey findings will be useful to State agencies and other stakeholders in efforts to mitigate gambling-related harm in Kansas.

### **METHODOLOGY**

The present study was coordinated by WhitworthBallou, LLC and funded by the Kansas Department of Aging and Disability Services. In October and November 2012, a statewide telephone survey of 1,600 adults was conducted with randomly selected landline and cell phone numbers stratified across the state. All telephone calls were made from a central location to insure quality of the data collection.

The survey began with three demographic questions – two of which were quota-based. Respondents were first asked for their age, and those who were under 18 were thanked, and the call was terminated. Second, each potential participant was asked for county of residence. The state is divided into four zones by county – northeast, south-central, southwest and the rest of the state –with 400 completed interviews specified for each region. County of residence information allowed the interviewers to pinpoint which zone the respondent would fit into, therefore determining when quotas had been met.

Respondents were asked to define their racial/ethnic group, using a list of definitions provided to them. The first two questions (age and location of residence) were quota items; the

racial/ethnic question was information that was collected from participants, rather than a factor that was subject to quota. The exception was in the southwest zone, where a floor of 133 Hispanic/Latino respondents was specified, to ensure accurate representation from this group.

Certain limitations should be considered when examining survey data. The survey was restricted to adults living in households with telephones. Face-to-face interviews generally yield more candid responses than phone interviews, and this effect has been observed in other gambling surveys. The survey had an above-average response rate, but even so, generalization of the results may be limited, especially when drawing inferences based on subgroups consisting of fewer than 20 respondents. Another limitation is that participation in the survey by male respondents was lower than anticipated based on population data.

## **SURVEY IMPLEMENTATION**

In the Fall of 2012, KDADS commissioned the Kansas City, Missouri company of WhitworthBallou, LLC to conduct a comprehensive statewide telephone survey to gain a better understanding of the general Kansas adult population's behaviors, attitudes and beliefs related to gambling. KDADS was particularly interested in detecting differences between geographical areas within Kansas. Data gathering was subcontracted to Patron Insight, a Stilwell, Kansas based research group, and survey instrument development was assisted by KDADS problem gambling services consultant, Problem Gambling Solutions, Inc. The survey was modeled after a similar effort in Iowa, conducted by the University of Northern Iowa's Center for Social and Behavioral Research.<sup>1</sup>

In October and November 2012, a statewide telephone survey of 1,600 adults was conducted with randomly selected landline and cell phone numbers located across the state, divided into four zones – three of which, in general, constituted the northeast, south central, and southwest regions, while the fourth zone was the balance of the state. The specific counties in each zone are detailed in Table 1.

The survey began with three demographic questions – two of which were quota-based. Respondents were first asked for their age, and those who were under 18 were thanked, and the call was terminated. Second, each potential participant was asked for county of residence. The state had been divided into four zones by county – (generally speaking) northeast, south central, southwest, and the rest of the state – with 400 completed interviews specified for each region. The county of residence information allowed the interviewers to pinpoint which zone the respondent would fit into and, therefore, to determine if the quota had been met.

Those who lived in a zone where there was still room under the quota when they were

contacted were then asked to define their racial/ethnic group, using a list of definitions provided to them. While the first two questions (age and location of residence) were quota items, the racial/ethnic question was information that was merely collected from those who chose to participate, rather than a factor that was subject to quota. The lone exception was in Southwest, where a floor of 133 Hispanic/Latino respondents was specified, to ensure accurate representation from this group.

Results for the statewide data had a 3% margin of error at the 95% confidence level; this means that the true population estimate is within 3% of the reported findings, with 95% confidence.

In reviewing survey data, it is important to keep in mind that questions with percentages may total more or less than 100%, due to rounding. (Certain questions – where multiple answers were permitted – will total to more than 100 %.)

By way of analytical convention, and for the ease of the reader, the zone designations used throughout this report are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Definition of Zones as Used in this Study**

<b>Zone</b>	<b>Region</b>	<b>Kansas Counties</b>
1	Northeast	Brown, Doniphan, Atchison, Jackson, Leavenworth, Jefferson, Shawnee, Douglas, Wyandotte*, Johnson, Osage, Franklin, Miami
2	South Central	Barton, Rice, McPherson, Marion, Butler, Harvey, Reno, Stafford, Pratt, Kingman, Sedgwick, Harper, Sumner*, Cowley, Barber
3	Southwest	Lane, Ness, Rush, Pawnee, Hodgeman, Finney, Ford*, Gray, Haskell, Seward, Meade, Clark, Comanche, Kiowa
4	Balance of State	See pages 10 and 11 for list of counties in Balance of State

*\* Counties with state owned casino.*

## **STATISTICAL METHODOLOGY**

This study took the utmost care to produce accurate and usable results. It is important for the reader to understand the statistical methodology, which was used for the computations in this report.

To better reflect the behaviors and attitudes of Kansans as a whole, the results for “Kansans Overall” were weighted by county population, such that an under or oversampling of persons from a particular county would not bias the results. No other weighting was used as it was deemed that the sample fell within acceptable deviations in respect to other demographic information.

When rounding was needed the IEC 60559 standard was used.

Pearson's chi-squared test for count data was the statistical test performed for all tables in this report. All tests did not include the "Don't Know", "Not Sure", or other such categories unless there was enough data to include them in the testing procedures. Results found to be significant were deemed to be so at the 0.05 significance level. Some results were significant but the Yates correction method was used to calculate these p-values. Yates correction was used when the responses in at least one factor level were too sparse to satisfy the assumptions of Pearson's chi-squared test. The p-values calculated with this method have been adjusted for the smaller sample sizes. Results which were "Not testable" were cases where there was not enough data available to carry out the chi-squared test. Care should be taken when making comparisons in such cases.

All computation was carried out in the statistical software program R (v2.15.0). The code used to produce the results in this report is available upon request.

